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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

The precedent for termination of the academic presidency was set early in the history of American higher education. Nathaniel Eaton, a graduate of Trinity College and first Master of Harvard College, led the institution into such financial straights during the first year of his administration that he was relieved of his duties by the General Court of Massachusetts.1

Yet there are means other than involuntary termination by which the presidential office can be vacated. Death and retirement are obviously two. While leaving the presidency of one institution to accept the presidency of another college or university is technically a termination of office, it would appear that such is a change in role rather than change in office. A final means of termination is that of resignation.

It is this final type of termination with which this study is concerned, that of resignation; the request by an individual to be relieved of specific duties, responsibilities, position, and office.

The matter of presidential resignation has been an area of increasing concern, particularly in recent years. The extended tenure of
academic presidents has become the exception, and the sixty-two year term in office such as that of President Eliphalet Nott at Union College will not be seen again. Tenure for the average president in the early 1960's was eleven years. By 1967 that average had dropped to between seven and eight years, with the median being six. By the following year, 1968, the average was reported to be somewhat less than six. In some limited circumstances tenure was being measured in months rather than years. San Francisco State College at the height of disturbances in 1968-1969 had three presidents in a period of six months. At any one time it is said that three hundred American colleges and universities are seeking a chief administrative officer. The matter of presidential termination would thus appear to be one of some significance as we enter the latter part of the twentieth century.

It is interesting to note the status of individuals who have left the presidency. A 1966 survey sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association asked all presidents of colleges and universities offering the liberal arts degree the current status of their predecessor. It was found that thirty percent were employed by business organizations or foundations, twenty-nine percent were deceased, twenty-three percent were retired, nine percent were college faculty members, and eight percent had accepted the presidency of another educational institution. Such information, then, would indicate that thirty-nine percent of the former presidential group were still actively employed in endeavors other than the academic presidency. As the group had left the presidency on the average of some seven or eight years prior to the
questioning, it is not known how many of the fifty-two percent indicated as retired or deceased had involved themselves in active employment for a period of time after their termination and prior to their retirement or death. In any event, there is strong indication that a significant number, at least thirty-nine percent, left the presidency to become active in other positions of employment.

A brief survey was made by the writer of those announcements of presidential termination found in The Chronicle of Higher Education during the six month period of March through August, 1970. Of 133 such announcements, forty-eight percent resigned, thirty-three percent retired, fourteen percent accepted another college presidency, four percent died while in office, and somewhat less than one percent were relieved of duty. Although a percentage of those resigning will eventually accept another college presidency, and some will choose to retire, a group of almost half the sample whose initial means of termination was resignation stands as an impressive statistic.

These three facts would then appear to be true. First, presidential termination is not a new phenomenon in American higher education. Second, the tenure length of the American college president is growing shorter, with average tenure during the past decade decreasing markedly. Third, the number of college presidents who have chosen to leave the office to enter other areas of endeavor represents a significant percentage of the total group leaving the position.

A basic premise which would seem to be abroad deals with the complexity of the presidential office. This complexity would appear to stem from the close identity which the academic president shares with
higher education, and the many roles and purposes both perceived and projected which colleges and universities serve as social institutions. Former president of Queens College, Harold W. Stoke, has commented that "it is impossible to understand the college president without first fully understanding the environment in which he works." In this light, then, it is important to gain some insight into both the role of the president within the institution, and that of the institution within society. For without such understanding a thorough background to the problem itself cannot be attained.

In viewing the role of the president within the institution it is the common practice to devise taxonomies within which the operating modes of the president may be considered. Numerous writers have devised numerous systems. Yet in the final analysis such systems find common denomination in the relationship which the president shares with other variables within the institution, be they of a constituent nature or of an operational area. One configuration is that of Henry G. Harmon, former president of Drake University. It is his contention that the president is responsible for four major phases of university life: (1) Internal institutional administration, (2) program development, (3) promotion, and (4) educational interpretation. He then adds interrelating variables when he indicates that these four variables relate themselves to five distinct although not mutually exclusive groups: (1) The board of control, (2) the staff, (3) the student body, (4) the alumni, and (5) the general public. One then begins very basically with a mathematical relationship of nine factors and finds, when realistic interrelated variables are added, the number to be
nearly astronomical.

John J. Corson, in his well-known text Governance of Colleges and Universities, perceives the individual - institutional relationship somewhat differently, yet with recognizable similarity. Utilizing a structure of operational decision areas, Corson would see relationships with the educational and research program, faculty affairs, student affairs, external relations, finance, and physical development. President Peter Sammartino, former chief administrative officer at Fairleigh Dickinson College, views such relationships within a pure constituent framework, citing these to be faculty, students, administration, staff, parents, alumni, and the community at large.

Robert M. Hutchins has best summarized the complexities and difficulties of such relationships when he comments that "A university administrator has at least five constituencies: The faculty, the trustees, the students, the alumni, and the public. He can profitably spend all his time with any one of the five. What he actually does, of course, is to spend just enough with each of the five to irritate the other four." And it is through the functions of administration that John Millett observes the administrative - institutional relationship. For he sees the purposes of the administrator to (1) provide educational leadership and to cultivate the image of the university, (2) augment and allocate the scarce economic resources of the college or university, and (3) maintain the college or university as a going viable enterprise.

Initially, then, one must appreciate the complexity of the
relationship which the chief administrative officer as an individual shares with the institution as an organization. Within itself it is a difficult responsibility, as in the case with any role of leadership. Yet one must also introduce the factor of institutional - societal relationship. For it is within such context - the purposes, promises, expectations, and beliefs in and for higher education as held by those external to the institution itself - that considerable additional complexity is introduced. In this light, although writing fifteen years ago, Ronald C. Bauer has correctly reported that "The increasing difficulty of administrative tasks in colleges and universities must also be seen in relation to the problems higher education is facing. Institutions, no less than individuals, are in the grip of unsettled world conditions characterized by international tensions, threats to freedom, and the menace of war. Economic disturbances, social pressures, and political uncertainties weigh heavily on all academic enterprises."¹³ Morris Keeton mirrors these unsettled conditions when he comments that "The president feels helpless to get ahead with the task of the university because the trustees, the faculty, the students, the alumni, and the public are hopelessly at odds. Everybody is disenfranchised."¹⁴

Members of society so often seem to view higher education as they view their children: Bursting with pride over accomplishments one moment, angered and embarrassed over failures the next. And like parents, society unknowingly reflects itself in viewing such a mirror. Glenn Charles Law has remarked that "It is the relativity of education to the current needs in society that complicates the role of higher
learning. . . The weaknesses in society therefore manifest themselves in the condition of the institutions of higher learning."\textsuperscript{15} Millett contends that higher education is under attack from two points of view:

(1) "Those who question the idea of social growth and progress, and
(2) those who expect knowledge to offer sure solutions to social ills and who suspect failure of efforts or alienation of loyalty when higher education admits its limitations."\textsuperscript{16} Clark Kerr remarks that "The external view is that the university is radical; the internal reality is that it is conservative. The internal illusion is that it is a law unto itself; the external reality is that it is governed by history."\textsuperscript{17} Robert Lee Osmunson in 1970 cited the nine major objectives of higher education as reflected by forty inaugural addresses by public and private college and university presidents during the period 1860 - 1967. This internal view indicated the nine to be citizenship, cultural training, individual development, involvement in community service, knowledge transmission, leadership training, moral and religious training, research, and the attainment of those ideals unique to the institution - the "spirit of place."\textsuperscript{18} What each says in a somewhat different way would seem to be the uncertainty with which the goals of higher education are viewed both from within and without. And within these uncertainties comes the great difficulty in achieving goals which never seem to achieve full definition, which never seem to attain complete fulfillment. And within these uncertainties the president must offer administrative leadership.

There is little question that the university or college of today is far-removed from the quiet, ivy-covered institution of alumni
dreams. While there are those who would contend that higher education must become more fully involved in the life of society to fulfill its role, one cannot view institutional involvement in government research, teacher training for central cities, organizational centers for political activism, or the advancement of pure knowledge without sensing such increased involvement. Yet at the same time that the institution reaches out it also seems to retreat within itself. The sense of community that once was exemplified by compulsory chapel, pep rallies, and time-honored campus traditions seems to have become obsolete. John W. Gardner attributes this passing to several factors - a spectacular rise in the academic professions, the strong ties of constituents to external parts, and the nature of highly organized modern societies to be destructive of local communities.\(^{19}\) The question seeking answer overall would seem to be a determination of the degree of inward versus outward involvement. For the institution has from all appearances made the decision to go both directions yet in its complicity is uncertain how far to go. Louis B. Mayhew, commenting on the power of higher education, contends that the institution has not gone outward to the degree that it possibly should as a result of hesitancy on its own part. For he says that "It has the power and the instruments to point out what emerging problems are likely to be and how they might be solved, and then actually participate in their solution. That this does not happen frequently is because of the unwillingness of those in the university to use its power rather than because it lacks it."\(^{20}\) This hesitation would seem to contribute substantially to difficulties encountered by the president in goal-directed leadership. This
perceptual difference in institutional style is possibly best represented by the writings of two well-qualified university leaders, Clark Kerr and Nathan Pusey. In his series of lectures and resultant book, *The Uses of the University*, Kerr places emphasis on the institution and its ability to serve society. On the other hand, and while admitting the service role, Pusey in *The Age of the Scholar* concerns himself primarily with the institution as it serves the growth and development of the individual.21 Both points of view have considerable credibility and present the acting administrator with wide diversity as he seeks to lead his own institution in the direction that it seeks.

Yet relations which the institution shares with society, and those shared by the individual with the institution, are not static, and are active within a milieu which is constantly changing. If problems and circumstance remained constant, control of variables would be less difficult. Yet change introduces ever-increasing variables, and the chief administrative officer is concerned not only with his influence in the individual - institutional - societal continuum, but must likewise concern himself with the problems which face higher education.

The background of the problem, then, is complex and multifaceted. It includes a decreasing tenure length among American college presidents, what would seem to be a large number of men leaving the presidency to enter other areas of endeavor, the integral and/or closely related nature of the presidential and institutional role both in internal and external relationships, and the rapidly changing role of both individual and institution.
Statement of the Problem

In its basic form, the problem is a circumstance in which approximately half of those persons leaving the academic presidency do so for reason of resignation, i.e. move from the presidency into alternative forms of professional endeavor. This situation would seem to point with some urgency to possible motivating and/or influential factors behind such actions. It has become axiomatic that the academic presidency carries with it difficult responsibilities. Yet the wasting of such human potential through resignation becomes a concern not only of functional efficiency and organization but moral and ethical responsibility.

The problem is best stated by Logan Wilson when he comments that "Despite the fact that nobody has either to go into academic administration or to stay in it, I doubt that there will be a dearth of available candidates. Our growing problem is more likely to be the unwillingness of outstanding men and women to subject themselves to the increased rigors and decreased rewards that may be in prospect." Goodrich C. White compliments those remarks when he says 'I found myself inescapably reminded of Malcolm in Macbeth as he said of Duncan, 'nothing in his life became him like the leaving it,' and devising a paraphrase 'Nothing in the presidency satisfies so much as leaving it.'

The problem, then, is relatively simple: A seemingly excessive number of college presidents leaving their positions for reasons of resignation. The solution is considerably more complex. Yet it would
seem that until such time that specific problems are isolated and solutions achieved, individuals will continue to leave the presidential office, wasting the academic leadership potential of well-trained and experienced individuals, providing operational discontinuity for the institutions affected.

Definition of Terms

**Presidential resignation**: A request to the board of control by the incumbent chief administrative officer of an institution of higher learning to be released from duties, responsibilities, position, and office. Not included in the definition are those terminations for reason of retirement, for reason to accept another college presidency, or reported to have been requested by the board of control to submit resignation.

Assumptions

Certain premises must be assumed as a basic foundation upon which to build new knowledge. It will be shown later that considerable study has been made of the presidency in areas other than that proposed, but which lends itself as a foundation for this project. Based on such reading, the following assumptions are made:

1. The academic presidential role has become increasingly complex with the passage of time.

   One cannot read the history of American higher education without
obtaining a distinct impression of increasing complexity both within the institutionalization of higher education as well as the roles within the institution. While early American college presidents had the several roles of teaching, administering, counseling, etc., their tasks appear to be more those of wide diversity rather than complexity; i.e. many tasks yet, with some exception, not of a specialized nature. The modern American president has attained, for lack of a better word, a cosmopolitan orientation; an individual whose involvement must be diverse as well as specialized. Growing enrollments, federal participation, fiscal support, accreditation standards, constituency involvement, enlargement of research - all contribute to a complexity not experienced in former times.

2. The tenure length of college and university presidents has steadily decreased, with resignation to enter other fields of endeavor playing a significant role in presidential termination.

Studies cited earlier in the chapter indicate that college and university presidents have had increasingly shorter lengths of tenure in recent years than was the case a decade or so ago. Likewise, figures indicated that somewhere around one half of those persons leaving the presidency leave to enter other areas of endeavor - teaching, or business or foundation involvement. Only about ten percent leaving the presidency of one institution choose to accept the president of another college or university.

3. The individual who has resigned from the academic presidency is in a position to indicate certain relevant reasons for resignation of the role.
Although he is not the only source of information, the individual who has filled the presidential role is in a unique position to reflect on those factors within his own circumstance which led to his decision to terminate. The primary concern of this study deals in great measure with reasons cited by specific individuals for their departure from the presidency. For unless one has "been there," it would be seemingly impossible to understand and to project all ramifications and variables which are considered in making the decision. Such projections of former presidents will be understandably somewhat subjective. One does not completely involve himself in a position and then base all actions merely on objective data. Yet the comments of the person who has worked and lived the role for a period of time must be considered if total understanding is to be attained for presidential termination.

4. Determination of such reasons will be of considerable assistance in reassessing and reevaluating the presidential role.

This study is premised on a hope that either particular aspects of the presidency may be changed to promote conditions encouraging greater tenure length among persons active in the role, or to gain greater understanding of reasons which would indicate preference for maintenance of current conditions. It may well be that the final conclusion will state that things are as they should be - that the presidency must of necessity be for terms of approximately five to ten years; that persons entering the role accept that fact and operate within those constraints. Yet it would seem that no specific study has made genuine effort to dissect the presidential role, analyze each part, make
appropriate modifications, reassemble it, and then discern if it properly fits back into place. It may well be that it will. On the other hand it may be that it fits not at all and other parts must instead be disassembled and modified.

These assumptions, then, would seem to be basic to the study and basic to the research which will follow.

Sources of Data

The study began with an extensive survey of available literature by and about college and university presidents. While a number of books on the subject were read, the major thrust of the reading was that found in periodical literature. As cited previously, the tenure length of college presidents has changed considerably in the past ten year period, leading one to assume that it is factors of recent origin which account for the changes. While books offer basic foundations, it is felt that topics of more recency, immediacy, and urgency are those found within the periodical literature. This assumption proved to be correct as one read both sources for it was by and large that readings in School and Society, Liberal Education, Journal of Higher Education, Junior College Journal, etc. offered more contemporary views of problem areas and concerns within the presidency than did those of the textbook nature.

Having completed the survey of literature, the next concern was that of synthesizing the reading into form and structure as a vehicle with which to obtain response from former college and university
presidents. This vehicle found expression in terms of a five point questionnaire which seemingly encompassed all areas of the presidential role. The instrument basically requested response by resigned presidents of these five factors (role expectations, general administration, internal relations, external relations, and employment alternative) as they related to the decision the individual had made to leave the presidency.

Limitations of the Study

A study dealing with human relationships and organizational variables is admittedly complex. Thus one begins with a knowledge that each and every variable cannot be controlled, nor can it be assumed with complete confidence that it has been included. The study can only hope to select major factors and place them in proper interrelationship with each other.

The study is also limited somewhat by method and approach in knowing whether or not the "true" reasons, if those can ever be known, are those stated in the questionnaire response. In those areas where the resignation was precipitated by a deteriorating relationship between board and president and which brought the board's request for resignation, did the president admit such impasse, or were other reasons cited, e.g. opportunity for new employment? This uncertainty as to "true reason" would seem to be a limitation of the study.

Finally, any study of this nature achieves the conclusion that it is only the beginning and could be improved with additional time and
money. Yet there must come a time when closure is made. Such is the limitation of any endeavor.

Significance of the Study

There is little question that the complexity of the presidential office and the larger number of presidential resignations as reflected by shortened tenure has become an area of increased concern in the past several years. Yet generally the role becomes more complex and the tenure shorter. It would seem to be the proper time to give serious attention to specific causal factors and solutions for correction. For until such time that the aspects of presidential termination are recognized and understood, and solutions found, individuals will continue to leave the presidency to seek other forms of involvement.

This study makes an effort to correct the circumstance and to answer some basic questions about presidential termination, specifically as reflected by former academic presidents. There needs to be additional effort in related areas of factors which influence presidential tenure, e.g. the role of boards of control, the place and role of higher education in society, the effects of socio-political factors on the university. Yet there must be a beginning, and although this study would be presumptuous to assume a position of leadership, it would in fact contend to be among initial attempts in specific consideration of the problem.
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3 Ibid., p. 407.


10 Peter Sammartino, The President of a Small College (Rutherford, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson College Press, 1954)


13 Corson, Governance of Colleges, p. 11.


A survey of recent literature finds little written on specific factors of presidential resignation. While there would appear to be voluminous material on causal factor theories, hypotheses, and educated guesses regarding such resignation, there has been no definitive study to the writer's knowledge which deals with the topic in a manner similar to this work. Robert M. Hutchins, former chancellor of the University of Chicago, in his well-known article entitled "The Administrator," reflects on the lack of such study, particularly as it might have been written both by men in a position to write of administration as well as those with talent to do so. He comments, "Nor did any of them (Hawthorne, Arnold, Trollope, and Mill) do any important thinking about the end of their administrative activity. There is little published evidence that any administrative officer has done so since Marcus Aurelius."¹

A considerable amount has been written about the presidency itself, some of which is relevant to this study in gaining a more thorough understanding of that role. There have been studies of where presidents come from, what has been their training, measurements of their
effectiveness, at what ages they leave the position, and as cited previously, where they go upon leaving.

Possibly the best point to begin the consideration of such literature are the origins from which college and university presidents come, a topic which has been considered by John H. Carmichael. This study concerned itself with the origin and mobility of junior college presidents, using as a comparative factor those individuals who held top-level business positions. In comparing the occupation of the paternal grandfather of the two groups, it appeared more likely that the business executive's grandfather held business ownership or professional status than did the junior college president's. And in comparison of father's occupations, it was more likely that the business executive's father held ownership of a business or himself was a major business executive, while it was more likely that the junior college president's father was a professional man, white collar worker, or farmer.

Even more recently, Michael R. Ferrari has published a study entitled Profiles of American College Presidents, the result of a doctoral dissertation written at Michigan State University. Ferrari's study, however, was an investigation of 760 American college and university presidents regarding a vast number of normative factors. One of these, similar to Carmichael's, was the occupation of the academic president's father. This study would indicate the four year college president to be the product of a somewhat higher social class background than that of the junior college president, yet statistical comparisons of the two studies are not possible due to research
The results of the two studies are compared in Table 1.

### TABLE 1

**OCCUPATIONS OF BUSINESS EXECUTIVES' AND JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS' PATERNAL GRANDFATHER AND FATHER, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS' FATHER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Carmichael(^a)</th>
<th>Ferrari(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Exec. %</td>
<td>Jr. Coll. Pres. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grd father</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Major(^c)) Bus. Exec.</td>
<td>5 26</td>
<td>0 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>10 15</td>
<td>6 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Owner</td>
<td>25 26</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar Worker</td>
<td>5 8</td>
<td>4 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk Salesman</td>
<td>d d</td>
<td>d d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>20 15</td>
<td>25 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>35 10</td>
<td>63 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>d d</td>
<td>d d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>100 100</td>
<td>100 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^c\)Carmichael's terminology: "Major Business Executive" Ferrari: "Business Executive."

\(^d\)Did not use category.

Studying career mobility, Carmichael found that the "average" junior college president entered the profession at age twenty-four,
came to the institution at which he currently served as president at age forty-one, assumed the presidency at forty-five, had held presidential office for four years, was currently fifty-three years old, and had taken twenty-one years from entry into the profession to attain his current position. Statistics for the major business executive were basically the same with the exception of two areas: The age at which the current organization was entered (age thirty for the executive), and the number of years in the present organization (twenty-four for the executive, seven for the junior college president).

This tendency for major business executives to enter and remain with the same company at an earlier age and for a greater number of years respectively as compared with the junior college president is shown in Table 2.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Bus. Exec. %</th>
<th>Jr. Coll. Pres. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Carmichael, "Origin and Mobility," p. 32.
The business executive, then, had worked for an average of two organizations in his career while the average junior college president had worked for four.

Ferrari found the college and university president to be approximately the same age as the junior college president, 52.9 years to 53 years, respectively, yet found the tenure length of the college and university executive to be considerably longer, 7.8 years compared with 4.

These statistics tell us some interesting things about the presidency. (1) The junior college president is more likely to come from "humble" backgrounds, with greater chance that father and grandfather were employed as farmers, laborers, or white collar workers than was the case with his counterpart in business, and that the college and university president too came from such backgrounds yet possibly of somewhat higher class. (2) That instead of identifying himself early with one specific institution, the junior college president tends to move from one institution to another in his career progression rather than moving up through the hierarchy of the educational institution as was the case with the business executive as he moved through the ranks of his organization. Within this light, mobility would appear to be an important trait to remember as one views the presidency.

In 1969 Guy W. Tunnicliffe and John A. Ingram undertook a study to answer the questions "Who used to be the president?" "Who is he today?" and "What is his trend?" Their study of 935 presidents concerned itself primarily with the academic background of the president, his field of specialization, and the position from which he entered the presidency.
First, it was found that although there had been marked changes, there were no statistically significant changes in the fields of specialization from which the current presidents and their predecessors came. In the findings of Table 3 it can be noted that there is a slight increase in the number of persons coming from the social sciences, a slight decrease in those coming from professional areas (law, medicine).

**TABLE 3**

**FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION FROM WHICH PRESENT AND PAST ACADEMIC PRESIDENTS COME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speciality</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>+30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>464</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A similar study by Francis P. King published two years prior, although broken down into eighteen specialty areas rather than five, basically supports the findings of Tunnicliffe and Ingram.

The studies cited have also considered the degree level attained by the institutional presidents and are outlined in Table 4, Tunnicliffe and Ingram for both present and predecessor, King and Ferrari for incumbent.
TABLE 4
HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED BY PAST AND PRESENT
ACADEMIC PRESIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Tunnicliffe&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>King&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Ferrari&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. A.</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Tunnicliffe and Ingram, "College President," p. 191.
<sup>b</sup>Francis P. King, "Presidents' Profile," Liberal Education, October, 1967, p. 403.
<sup>c</sup>Ferrari, Profiles, p. 6.

Tunnicliffe and Ingram found a noticeable increase in the number of individuals holding the earned doctorate when compared with the predecessor, a resultant decrease among those holding the Master's and professional degree. There would appear to be relative consistency between the three studies on the percentage holding each individual degree among those persons active in the presidency within the past few years.

Dependent upon the source, the percentage of individuals holding the earned doctorate at specific types of institutions may be determined. As illustrated in Table 5, there is some disagreement between sources, the difference possibly coming as the result of sampling techniques utilized.
TABLE 5
PERCENTAGE OF ACADEMIC PRESIDENTS HOLDING THE EARNED DOCTORATE BY INSTITUTIONAL CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Tunnicliffe&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>King&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Universities</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Colleges</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Universities</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Institutions</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Colleges</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church-Related Institutions</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Tunnicliffe and Ingram, "College President," p. 191.
<sup>b</sup>King, "Presidents' Profile," p. 403.
<sup>c</sup>Did not use category.

Ferrari's considerations also included the types of institutions granting degrees to college and university presidents. His findings indicated that the majority of Bachelor's degrees earned by academic presidents were obtained from private colleges, the largest number of Master's degrees from private universities, as was the case with earned doctorates. His total findings are found in Table 6.

In considering the positions held immediately preceding the presidency, the largest percentage would appear to come from college administrative posts, either academic or nonacademic. The findings of two such studies are illustrated in Table 7.

William A. Harper, utilizing materials gathered from a workshop for junior college presidents in 1968, cited the three most common
TABLE 6
TYPES OF INSTITUTION FROM WHICH PRESIDENTIAL DEGREES WERE EARNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>Private College</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private University</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public College</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public University</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technological Institute</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>Private College</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private University</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public College</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public University</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technological Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's Degree</td>
<td>Private University</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public University</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aFerrari, Profiles, p. 6.

routes for ascendancy to the two year college presidency to be: (1) Public school teaching and administration, (2) university teaching and administration, and (3) up through the junior college ranks.6
TABLE 7
POSITIONS HELD IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING THE ACADEMIC PRESIDENCY BY PERCENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Position Held</th>
<th>Tunnicliffe(^a)</th>
<th>Ferrari(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Administration, Academic</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Administration, Nonacademic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Professorship</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Tunnicliffe and Ingram, "College President," p. 193.

\(^b\)Ferrari, Profiles, p. 6.

Finally, at what age do college presidents leave their jobs? In the AAC - TIAA study cited previously, the median age for termination was sixty-two for public college and university presidents, fifty-nine for private. The eventual involvement of the individual leaving the presidency is of course a prime determinant in his/her age at the time of departure. Those accepting another college presidency do so at an average age of forty-nine, those assuming teaching positions at fifty-four, those accepting positions with business or a foundation at fifty-three. The presidents who retire from the presidency do so at an average age of sixty-six and those who die while in office are of an average age of sixty-five.
In summary, then, to the questions regarding areas of specialization, levels of degree attainment, positions from which college presidents come, and ages at which presidents leave office, the following generalizations can be made based on existing research. First, the greatest number of presidents come to their positions from backgrounds of liberal arts, social sciences, and education. Second, there is a trend for the current chief administrative officer to hold the earned doctorate, with the most recent studies indicating about seventy-two percent for the average. Third, there is reason to believe that increasing numbers of current college presidents are coming from academic and non-academic college administration and government positions than was formerly the case. Summarizing their work, Tunnicliffe and Ingram indicate "The study left little doubt that this is the age of the professional administrator." Fourth, those persons leaving the college presidency to assume new college presidencies, professorships, or positions with business or foundations do so when they are in their late forties or early fifties.

What makes an effective college president? A study of this matter was commissioned in 1967 by the New York State Board of Regents and completed by the Educational Testing Service utilizing a sample of 180 college and university presidents in New York state. A number of traits were eventually associated with the president considered to be more effective in his role than were others. Results showed the more effective president worked more hours, spent more time in work off the campus, seemed concerned with the internal affairs of the institution, spent more time in planning with subordinate administrators, had
administrative subordinates reporting directly to him, utilized efficient administrative procedures, was concerned with the educational program and curriculum, recognized the influence of students, had liberal attitudes toward academic freedom, was more likely to have held an academic position at some former date - as a dean or department head, had a voice in alumni affairs, had regular and definitely organized contact with parents of students, perceived influences on their institutions from local government, was usually involved in fund raising, and finally was concerned with affairs external to the institution.\^\textsuperscript{9}

Upon reading the results of the study as presented in this dissertation while in draft form, a college president friend of the writer commented, "What does he do in his spare time?" One does not question the complexity of the role having read the above qualifications. But the foregoing is prologue. The writer's concern in reviewing the literature was that of finding some organizational form with which to approach the task at hand. It seemed that there was need of constructing a taxonomy within the framework of which the matter of presidential functioning could be considered. It had need of being both specific and general, of great breadth yet brief. Structures of others, some of which are considered in Chapter 1, were considered. Yet in the final analysis, a structure capitalizing on those yet suited specifically to the research goal was the only answer. The following considerations are thus both literature review yet more importantly bases of structure for the study itself, and supportive material for aspects of the research design.

It would seem that the presidency can be considered within a
four-fold context, although it is granted that each overlaps the other in varying degree. These four are the role expectations of the presidency, those areas of general administration with which the president deals, those interactions within the university community (internal relationships), and those relations which are external to the geographic center of the university.

**Role Expectations**

Peter Sammartino, former president of Fairleigh Dickinson College tells the story of a young man who soon after graduating from college became an elementary school principal. The work was hectic, he labored many evenings, and seldom slept well as he mulled over his problems. As a result he received a professional promotion to be the high school principal. In this position he was faced with inadequate budgets, had a large group of unhappy students, and an equally large group of unhappy teachers. Yet based on his success he was selected as president of a small college, a position which had a hornet's nest of unhappy situations, and one in which he worked harder than anyone possibly could imagine. And then one day he died and went to Hell. But the change had been so gradual, comments President Sammartino, that he never knew the difference.

With the possible exception of stories about deans, similar stories about the impossible demands of administration are most frequently told about college presidents. President Ruthven, for twenty-nine years the president of the University of Michigan, faced
the situation stoically when he commented, "Don't let it bother you. You didn't expect to be loved, did you?"\(^{11}\)

Just how impossible are the demands placed upon the presidential role? Consider briefly the definitions given by persons who know the position first-hand:

Clark Kerr: "A friend of the students, a colleague of the faculty, a good fellow with the alumni, a sound administrator with the trustees, a good speaker with the public, an astute bargainer with the foundations and the federal agencies, a politician with the state legislature, a friend of industry, agriculture, and labor, a persuasive diplomat with donors, a champion of education generally, a supporter of the professions (particularly law and medicine), a spokesman for the press, a scholar in his own right, a public servant at the state and national levels, a devotee of opera and football equally, a decent human being, a good husband and father, (and) an active member of the church."\(^{12}\)

Glen Charles Law: "The modern presidential office calls for a man of multitudinous abilities. He is supposed to be a scholar, a professional educator, a politician, a leader, a doer, a don'ter, a businessman, a manager, a diplomat, a salesman, a fund raiser, a good speaker, a writer, a public relations expert, a traveler, an executive, and a persuader who has indefatigable energy, ideals, personal charm, and amiability, as well as religiosity and broad-minded attitudes."\(^{13}\)

A group of junior college presidents attending an American Association of Junior Colleges' workshop: Intellectual leader, a good manager of people, knowledge of how and when to make decisions, ability
to delegate, knowledgeable about his institution, alert to innovation,
and, along with the institution, the first to respond to change in
society.

John J. Corson: "The task of college and university leadership is
that of utilizing human, financial, physical, and spiritual resources
to fashion an educational institution that persistently accepts new
methods and programs but insists exactly upon enduring values. That
task, especially in the university, is infinitely more difficult than
the task of leadership in the more authoritarian, more monolithic busi-
ness firm, governmental agency, or military unit."

Logan Wilson: "Responsible leadership demands sensitivity as well
as hardness, however, and it will be a misfortune for higher education
if thick skins ever become prime qualifications for top posts." Later
in his article he comments, "Only the Holy Trinity could match the
qualifications set forth by most institutions in their searches for
academic presidents."

With such criteria it is little wonder that the academic presidency
is generally considered a difficult job to fill. Yet not only would the
position seem to be a difficult one to fill, it is likewise a demanding
one for the person selected. The previous statistics mentioned relative
to the rapidly decreasing length of tenure tend to indicate that for
some reason or other the position is being vacated with greater rapidity
than was the case ten years ago. Numerous authors have reflected on
reasons which they feel to be relevant.

William W. Brickman, writing in School and Society, notes that
"An increasing number of university presidents are resigning due to
increasing pressures from students, legislatures, alumni, faculty, and the community. In individual cases there are specific reasons for the early resignation or dismissal of an institutional executive. In the aggregate there has developed a lowered morale that has made administrative longevity a relative rarity."\(^{18}\) Robert M. Hyde comments that "...as the complexities and hazards of the presidency have multiplied, the number of qualified persons interested in the office has declined in geometric proportion."\(^{19}\) Douglas M. Knight, a former college president (Lawrence College and Duke University) and now a vice-president of the Radio Corporation of America, indicates that the number of vacant presidential positions is "too high a figure, and the reason for it lies in the stresses of the job."\(^{20}\) Law cites the increasing diversity and bureaucratization of the position as being a major contributing factor when he says that "It can be seen immediately that the duties of the office of president expanded until the president could no longer stay in touch with everything that was going on. Coherence and direction with a highly personal touch gave way under a variously degreeed bureaucratized operation. The effect is not unlike the scurrying of a mouse on a treadmill. The difference is that the human counterpart tumbling in the cage of administrative organization is replaced quite often, usually every four years."\(^{21}\) F. L. Wormald blames institutional factors - finance, organizational structures, largeness - for presidential mortality as he contends that "Serious and sympathetic observers of American higher education in recent years have noted with concern that it is becoming steadily harder for the college or university president to fulfill his traditional role as
leader of a community of scholars. Swelling enrollments, proliferating programs, mounting costs, and the increasingly complex administrative machinery that all these factors combine to require, have tended to drive the executive heads of educational institutions into giving more and more of their attention to ways and means and less and less to the aims of the whole operation. "Law probably best sums up the complexities and frustrations of the basic considerations which seem to underlie the academic presidency when he says that "Only men with abundant resources last for considerable lengths of time. It is an office that exhausts abilities, initiative, and ingenuity." In the final analysis, it will probably be as Hutchins indicates: "The administrator...will find that the strain is chiefly upon his character rather than his mind."

The recent literature thus pictures the role of the academic president as complex, beset with pressures and demands, diverse, somewhat lonely, and one of varying constituent expectation. This does not necessarily place the presidential position among those of hopelessness; all positions of responsibility possess such traits in different degree. Yet it does place the presidency among positions of challenge and great difficulty.

General Administration

The second area of construct within which to consider both the individual and role of the academic president are those responsibilities in general administration. The major problem within presidential
administration would seem to be that of the leader - manager dichotomy. While the commonly accepted view of the president is that of institutional leader, practice and experience would tend to indicate otherwise. Millett comments that "The power invested in administration is frequently exaggerated;... [for] to be acceptable to the academic community and to realize its actual purpose [it] must be considered a limited power." He continues that "The academic community as an organizational structure is a system of shared power." At yet another point he states "I am personally disposed to believe that many situations of conflict which arise in an academic community are fundamentally conflicts about hierarchical relationships. The faculty member does not consider himself a subordinate of administration, of either the president or the board of trustees. Any attempt to introduce policies or practices which suggest a role of subordination for the president on the one hand and a role of subordination for the professor on the other hand will almost inevitably produce conflict." The dichotomy is reiterated in an article by Samuel Moore, interestingly entitled "Leaders are Leavers." Mr. Moore says that "Paradoxically, it seems that presidents are chosen to lead, only to find that once ascended it becomes incumbent upon them to administer." How does the president spend his time in the work of administration? Several studies have been completed of this area and shed interesting light on the emphasis given specific responsibilities by the presidential officer. In a limited study completed by Corson, two major university presidents were found to devote forty percent of their time to financial matters, twenty percent to public and alumni relations,
eighteen percent to educational matters, twelve percent to problems with physical facilities, and ten percent to general administration.  A more complete study was that of Herbert J. Walberg and published in 1969 under the title "The Academic President: Colleague, Administrator, or Spokesman?" The purpose of the study, which included 180 college and university presidents, was that of finding out how college presidents actually spent their time, with whom they spent it, and on what kinds of problems. The time groupings were then divided into four major categories, and were, in order of time devoted to them, Administrative, External, Collegial, and Individual. Administrative involvement was found to consume 35.6% of the president's time, with subcategories (followed in parenthesis by percent of time involved) being administrative planning with subordinates (13.5), administrative planning alone (9.6), reviewing and analyzing reports (5.5), administrative planning with trustees (4.1), and authorizing and approving expenditures (2.9). Involvement with external administration took 31.4% of the president's schedule, with subcategories being fund raising activities (8.5), correspondence (6.7), preparation and delivery of speeches (5.0), meeting with outsiders on college affairs (4.0), official entertainment (3.8), and meeting with outsiders on non-college related affairs (3.4). The third category, collegial involvement, consumed 22.7% of the chief executive's workload. Subcategories were informal interaction with faculty (6.7), meetings with students (5.6), working with faculty on curriculum (5.1), counseling with faculty on personal problems (3.1), and teaching (2.2). The last grouping, individual involvement, took 10.1% of the time and included private thought and reflection (5.3),
and writing, study, and scholarly work (4,8).  

How much time does the president spend on the job each week? Although no known figures exist, there is little question that it does not fit among the category of nine-to-five, five day-a-week positions. One college president has recommended a fifty-five hour week, indicating that "...if he is conscientious, he will rarely be able to put in fewer hours and there is danger that he may burn himself out by putting in many more hours." He recommends five - nine hour days, two evening meetings of three hours each, and four hours on the weekend. This same president also notes that "No job is important enough, no institution should be selfish enough to require its chief executive to sacrifice him home life." In fairness to the writer, it should be added that the above was written by a small college president in 1954. It can be assumed that the contemporary college president would revel in the luxury of such a schedule.

The relationship which the president shares with the board of control is among the most unique relationships found within American organizational structure. For the president serves at the pleasure of the board, relating with it directly yet also relating toward the faculty and students, placing him in a unique role of mediation. It is possibly the disparity between the life-styles and value structures of the board as compared with the members of the faculty that make the relationship the difficult one that it is. For boards of control have in the majority been historically membered by persons of industrial and business orientation. It was Committee T of the American Association of University Professors which half a century ago stated that "Boards
of trustees are composed chiefly of members of the vested interests and the professions - bankers, manufacturers, commercial magnates, lawyers, physicians, and clergymen. Scott Nearing had reported several years before that four-fifths of the total number of trustees came from nine occupations, seven of them business or industrially oriented. These occupations, as categorized by Nearing, were merchant, manufacturer, capitalist, corporation official, banker, doctor, lawyer, educator, and minister. Ten years later Nearing's findings were reinforced by George S. Counts in his study of the social control of public education as he found that thirty-nine percent were proprietors, forty-one percent professional persons.

In 1936 Earl J. McGrath sought to find the occupations of board members in fifteen private colleges and five state institutions at ten year intervals from 1860-1930, and to present the trends during that seventy year period. Within the private institutions he found that members of the clergy decreased in the percentage of representation on boards of control from thirty-nine percent in 1860 to seven percent in 1930. Businessmen, exclusive of bankers, increased during this period of time from twenty-three percent to thirty-two percent; bankers from five to twenty percent. Within the state institutions for the same period of time he found the percentage of businessmen (twenty-four) remaining the same, an increase in bankers from four to thirteen percent, and a decline in the number of farmers from fifteen to nine percent.

In a Ph.D. thesis which has become lost (possibly a positive alternative for even a larger number of theses), Evans Clark reviewed the occupations of board members of seven private and twenty-two state
institutions and found bankers, financiers, manufacturers, merchants,
public utility officers, publishers, and lawyers composing fifty-six
percent of the membership on private boards, sixty-eight percent of the
public.37

Comparison with these historical precedents for board membership
has been made possible by the most recent and comprehensive study of
trustees made by the Educational Testing Service of 5,000 members of
college and university governing boards in the late 1960's. The trustee
at this point in time was found to be generally white, Protestant,
in his fifties, well educated, and financially secure - more than half
reported annual incomes in excess of $30,000. It was their general be-
lief that college attendance is a privilege and that it should be
extended to all, but that it is not a right. They saw the faculty's
role to be purely academic - adding or dropping courses or degree pro-
grams or determining admission requirements. The majority did not feel
that the faculty should have major authority in selecting their aca-
demic dean, selecting honorary degree recipients, or in deciding tenure
or faculty leave policies.38 It is in the mediation of what would ap-
ppear to be two antithetical points of view in which the president
finds challenge.

Additional findings of the ETS study which are of interest as one
views the board of control - presidential - faculty relationship are as
follows: Sixty-seven percent of the 5,000 trustees included in the
study agreed that the faculty should have a right to express their own
opinions, seventy percent felt that all campus speakers should be
cleared by the administration, fifty percent felt that students punished
by civil authorities should also be disciplined by the college, fifty-three percent felt that faculty members should be required to sign loyalty oaths, forty percent felt that the administration should control the contents of the student newspaper, and sixty-six percent agreed that disadvantaged students should be admitted if they have college potential but do not meet the normal admissions requirements. 39 Thus, while there are signs of liberalizations, one can speak with some certainty in placing boards of control among conservative bodies. It was noted by the study that trustees of selective, private institutions were more likely to be willing to share authority while those of non-selective schools, particularly junior colleges, adhered to a stricter decision-making process.

Presidential decision-making is unique for it varies in its power with the context in which it occurs. Corson notes that the degree of latitude of presidential prerogative in decision-making increases from very little in educational programming, to somewhat more in student life, and most in areas of finance, physical facilities, and public relations. 40 After relating the story of Abraham Lincoln and his Cabinet in which Mr. Lincoln was reported to have said, "Well, gentlemen, there are seven nays and one aye, and the ayes have it," Douglas Knight has commented "That anecdote indicates what administration is all about. It isn't tyranny, for every administrator listens honestly to his advisors, but eventually one person has to make up his mind."41 Although the interpretation at first may sound hard-line, upon further examination it emerges with more truth than falsehood. For even within the context of democratic decision-making there must eventually be
the final point of decision, and it is often the president with whom it lies. The thoughts and ideas of such writers as Argyris, McGregor, and Likert continue to find operational expression within the university community and the president finds it increasingly important to modify his own style of leadership to compliment that structure.\(^4^3\)

Increased community involvement is not without problems. Blanche Davis Blanke, professor of Political Science at Hunter College, has written in the *American Association of University Professor's Bulletin* that "Any naive campus-radical (faculty of student) knows that he can count on instant and broad support if he takes up a cudgel against the university's 'bureaucracy' or against its 'administration.' \(...\) I wish to submit that what is being challenged in some colleges (with the sympathetic approval of many who are being misled by this slogan) is not a monolithic, unfeeling behemoth (the popular notion of bureaucracy), but rather the dedicated, and sometimes exemplary, embodiment of the most cherished American ideal - democracy." She continues, "The attributes and strengths of the democratic process should be well known to Americans. I do not intend here to repeat them. I only wish to put the matter squarely before the concerned public. The more you increase participation, committee life, decentralization of responsibilities, free-flowing debate, and voting as a decision-making mechanism, the more you will probably decrease speed, economy, coherence, and certainty in the solution of social problems. Those students and faculty who believe you can have both sets of values in full portion deceive themselves."\(^4^4\)

In this light of democratic operation, William Tolley Pearson has
been frank in his appraisal when he writes, "The problem today is that every group wants influence and power but without responsibility. Power without responsibility is the new name of the game. When the damage is done, those who did it are no longer around. And thus we come full-circle to a circumstance in which higher education undertakes systems of greater community participation yet does not fully understand the implications of such operation.

Some question whether or not the college president comes to his job fully prepared in administrative technique. Previous statistics of this survey would indicate that he is increasingly coming from areas of administrative experience, which would seem to be favorable. Yet many find themselves in a circumstance explained by David Knapp when he says that if the college president "has learned anything in the past five years it is that everyone else is more expert than he." Other authors make note of the circumstance also. Algo Henderson remarks that "Inadequately prepared presidents assume too much detailed decision-making responsibility, become serious bottlenecks, and use authoritarian methods." Such actions in an environment of increasingly democratic method becomes particularly hindering. Knapp enlarges on the point when he remarks that "relatively few presidents seem to believe that a prime function of the academic executive is the early identification and development of potential administrative talent." It would seem that, if these authors are correct, disservice is done to education when presidents come to the position with insufficient administrative expertise or without sufficient knowledge of the administrative involvement of the position. Moore remarks that "Few great institutions of
higher education have 'gone to school' on the experiences of the past. They have sought out leader after leader for the presidency, only to have him withdraw upon threat of suffocation with administrative tasks." Again, the theme of inadequate preparation, inadequate perception. David Knapp seems to sum up the situation when he writes that "All available evidence indicates that in keeping with academic folklore, the best administrator is still thought to be the 'compleat amateur', an individual who comes to his post without prior knowledge of or preparation for the tasks at hand, and most certainly without ambition to be an administrator. Indeed, the spirit of amateurism permeates the academic organization from top to bottom." And it would seem that in this period of time, or in any period, higher education cannot afford amateurism.

Several writers have considered constructive alternatives to this dilemma. Some view the position as a dual role - the leader-manager concept with which this section began. Moore, mentioned previously, is one of these writers and would see the primary administrative role of the university to be both leader (planning, innovating, changing) and administrator (operational). This is what we would term a leader-manager team which as a unit both originates (leader) and then implements (manager) policy. He feels that "Leaders are social poets. And administrators are their critics. Matthew Arnold said that the poet is the highest form of creative man but that the critic is also a creative person since he selects the best ideas of the poet. The dialogue between poet and critic, leader and administrator, may make the university presidency more attractive as a career for the leader."
Leaders will find their way to the mainstream of the time. The tragedy lies in their having to leave the university presidency to find it."

Others see solution not in altered structure but in the selection criteria for the position as it exists. In other words, accepting the presidency for what it is and seeking the individual whose training, experience, and personal characteristics fit that role. Julien Foster is one of these authors. He writes that "The central thesis, then, has been that administrators should be chosen for their expertise, not for their estimated capacity to wield authority. They should be able to guide the course of events because that is what they are good at, not because they possess certain titles. The offices they hold should be valued for the access they give to the decision-making process and for the supporting resources they provide, not for the supposed superiority they confer. Authority which can seldom, if ever, be used is a handicap, not a reserve of power. Administrators working in a democratic system should willingly abandon this kind of authority, so that they can enjoy a corresponding increase in power." This statement reflects the thought expressed so well by Woody Guthrie as he sings "The times they are a 'changin'," for we indeed seem to be moving from what Rensis Likert defines as the exploitive authoritarian system toward the group participative system of management. Richard C. Richardson illustrates that changing concept when he writes that "...we must understand that the role of the administrator is drastically changed if we accept the hypothesis that authority is delegated upward rather than flowing downward. If we compound this conclusion by assuming that increasingly the decision-making in our institutions of higher education will be the
result of group action rather than the omniscience of a single individual, then it becomes obvious that the punch bowl theory of authority [one in which authority in varying degrees is ladled out to others with sufficient amounts being ladled out so as to make the bowl empty] is not only obsolete but that it is downright dangerous."

What is required then it would seem is almost a combination of change in structure and selection. Current structure must be modified somewhat to meet the changing management concept. As Richardson would say, "The normal line-staff organizational pattern is excellent for coordination, however is ineffectual for solving problems," or Millett when he writes that "I do not believe that the concept of hierarchy is a realistic representation of the interpersonal relationships which exist within a college or university."

In summary, writers admit that circumstances have changed. Yet the question that has not seen answer is the most effective means by which variables may be altered to meet the changing circumstance.

The general areas of administration with which the president deals, then, are those of many facets. His functioning occurs in a dichotomous state of leader-manager, of scholarly involvement and non-involvement. His power is one of varying degree and is often over-exaggerated for his operation is within a community rather than hierarchical structure. Many perceive the need for change, yet uncertainty exists on whether that need is one of perception or of structure.

Internal Relations
The third unit of the construct within which to understand the role of the academic president is that of the relations which he shares with other individuals of the immediate academic community - faculty, administrative staff, and student body. Within this context the variables are complex at best. Edmund E. Day, former president of Cornell, wrote: "One of the most widely prevalent disorders of academic life in America is an antipathy toward administrative officers on the part of professional staff...Factors of distrust, suspicion, and fear are almost certain to be present. The cumulative effect of tensions of this sort may be to put the sufferer completely out of commission. This can happen to institutions just as it does to individuals." There are those within the institution who would negate the role of the administrator, claiming his function to be superfluous. This claim is not new. Possibly among the most articulate and vitriolic was Thorstein Veblen, writing at the beginning of the current century. John R. Seeley of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, has written much more recently in a parallel to the American Revolution that "What is called the 'administration' is the alien government's (the board's) governor and his aides. The first problem is to get them out - so that those left and legitimately interested can form a government to give effect under right and properly legislated laws to the common will for the common good. Thus - and only thus - will it turn out that the common good of the college is the common good of the nation of education, and of teachers and taught alike. Even those ejected - the present occupying powers - will benefit in the end, as Great Britain eventually did from American independence. It is 1776 in academic history." Seeley
continues, "But a democratic - representative and responsible - government of, by, and for the people of the university is a different matter, and all that can save the college, if anything now can. The 'people' of the university are the teachers and students; administrators and board members are no more people of the university than King George III was a person or his commanders people of the United States." Although possibly extreme in their expression, it is with the inclusion of such factors that the context of internal relationships function.

The effective point of leadership is a difficult one for the president to determine and maintain. As Robert M. Hutchins points out on the one hand, "...he will seldom be seriously disliked if he does nothing." Yet on the other extreme, forceful leadership can result in comments similar to one made to John Corson by an anonymous president, "A faculty seeks you out to serve as president because you have ideas and then 'cuts your throat' if you venture to promote the adoption of such ideas." The fact seems to be increasingly clear that a major factor of presidential responsibility among internal relationships, that of educational leadership, is one of decreasing concern for the administrative leader. When mentioning the time devoted to specific responsibilities cited previously, Corson notes that they "depict the university president as an executive concerned predominately with financial matters, public relations, physical facilities, and other administrative affairs. They picture the university president as spending less than one fifth of his time working on educational matters and keeping in touch with his faculty or with his students."  

Within this light he continues, "...he is seldom either the
author of big, new ideas about the educational program or the stimulus that evokes such ideas from others, nor is he often permitted to participate in the give and take of faculty discussion of educational program proposals. There are college and university presidents who are in fact the educational leaders in their institutions; their number is small. Goodrich C. White reinforces this point when he writes in The Education of the Administrator, "Difficult as it may be, I am convinced through experience that curricular and other specifically educational reforms must come from the faculty and that any plans to such ends the administrator may wish to make effective must run, painfully at times, the gauntlet of prolonged faculty discussion and debate." The chord is struck again when President Stokes states that ". . . in recent years the factor of educational distinction has declined while factors of personality, management skills, and successful experience in business and administration have increased in importance. This fact reflects the gradual transformation of the college president from an intellectual leader into a manager, skilled in administration, a broker in personal and public relations." Thus comes an important realization in the understanding of internal relationships: The indefinite role of the president in educational decision-making, particularly as it relates to his relations with the faculty.

One must remember that the administrative role has evolved from the faculty role and many times the status of that evolutionary process is not fully defined. Corson remarks that "On the one hand, college and university presidents complain about the limitations placed upon their exercise of executive discretion by the power of the faculty. On the
other hand, some faculty members complain that their status is no longer substantial, nor as dignified. Or as Frederick D. Wilhelmsen reports, the "alienated professor... finds himself in a hideously ambivalent situation wherein his ancient rights have withered under the clinical efficiency of a university which has ceased to be a republic of learning and which has largely become an employer of technicians and specialists." The difficult factor, again, is the achievement of that relationship between direction and guidance.

Yet relationships with faculty are not singular among internal variables. Important too are the relationships with fellow administrators for upon them must the president place great dependence. Mentioned previously were complications arising from too great or too little sharing of authority and responsibility. Law indicates that "The president who tries to run a college or university by himself is full of false hopes indeed. He is going to need the help of other administrative officers. And the trick is to seek good men. After they are found, the president should reflect his own personal security and his confidence in his administrators to let them do his work." Implied here is the building of an administrative team, yet frequently that team has been built by a former administrator and one comes to "quarterback" a team on which only the president is the new member. Stokes has noted that "a difficult problem is the relationship between new president and former administrative staff, usually at the vice-presidential level." Although little has been written on such relationships, their importance cannot be overlooked.

The third group with which the president interrelates internally
is the student body. Texts of five to ten year's age reflect increasing distance between president and students, yet more recent writings indicate at least increasing contact. In his approach the college student of 1971 presents an extremely active variable which was known yet not experienced by administrative leadership of former years. Stoke's comment defines him well: "The American student invades the realm of ideas as his pioneer ancestors took possession of the country - as if no one had ever been there before." While this has been true of every student generation it seems even more true of the current one. For with tactics of confrontation and demands of urgency, the student of the 1970's brings the president into direct and immediate dialogue on problems of institutional and societal concern. There is possibly some comfort in the writings of Aristotle, and that all presidents might find some solace in his treatise "On Young People." For he writes "They have exalted notions because they have not yet been humbled by life or learned its necessary limitations; moreover their hopeful disposition makes them think themselves equal to great things - and that means having exalted notions. They would always rather do noble deeds than useful ones; their lives are regulated more by moral feelings than by reasoning - all their mistakes are in the direction of doing things excessively and vehemently. They overdo everything - they love too much, hate too much, and the same with everything else." Yet with writings which have stood the test of some 2,000 and more years to comfort us, it appears that possibly this student generation is among the most exalted, noble, and vehement that higher education has experienced. And too frequently, much like parents, higher education is uncertain of
its actions as it faces and is faced by the younger generation.

In this regard Lindley J. Stiles has written that "Student disruptions have angered many and charges and counter-charges are made. Yet nothing appears to be done about it. ... What professors and administrators hate to admit - and the public may not comprehend - is that one major reason they cannot stand against rebellious students is that they are unable to stand together themselves." These abilities, Stiles indicates, result from internal battles for institutional control, differing opinions between "pure" and "applied" disciplines, publish or perish concerns which "represent policies thrust by certain research-oriented scholars on their faculty colleagues," difficulty in waiting for the length of time true due process calls for, and social-political differences between faculty groups.70

While many approaches are suggested, no clear consensus can be seen to solve the problems which face the campus community. Alvin B. Quall has pointed out that "The administration which responds too quickly and too completely to student demands may find that it has sacrificed long-range stability for a quick answer to a current problem."71 Warren Barr Knox's reaction is reflected when he writes "May I further suggest (at the risk of oversimplification) that the president is a person; the student is a person; and that any personal relationships with students are beyond the point of being merely desirable - rather, that they are now essential."72 Kingman Brewster, Jr. has placed even different light on the subject when he indicates that he is "convinced that representation is not the clue to university improvement, indeed that if carried too far it could lead to disaster. Rather, I am convinced
now that accountability is what we should be striving for."73

President Brewster enlarges his premise of accountability on several assumptions. First, "The majority [of students] is not sufficiently interested in devoting their time and attention to the running of the university to make it likely that 'participatory democracy' will be truly democratic." Second, "...that most students would rather have the policies of the university directed by the faculty and administration than by their classmates."74 Brewster founds his argument on the statement "...I think that the institution will do a better job and be more likely to make bold decisions swiftly and decisively if ultimate responsibility for its direction is focused sharply on the shoulders of people who are devoting their personal energies and risking their professional reputations, full time, for the best years of their lives, for the quality of the institution - whether as committeemen, department chairmen, deans, officers, provosts, or presidents."75

Thus, while direction is apparent, consensus is not.

Probably one of the most difficult perspectives for the university and college president to maintain within his internal operation is the fact that he is a leader of primarily an educational organization and not of business orientation, rather than the other way around. While it may be true, as White proposes, "That most college presidents have to forego all claims to scholarly competence in the strict sense - if they ever had any,"76 it must also be true that although separated he cannot be divorced from the primary emphasis of learning with which higher education deals. About twelve or fourteen years ago the Association of American Colleges initiated the Pugwash Experiment which,
in the words of its directors," was directed toward the solution of a personal problem; the problem of the college administrator who, under pressure of practical affairs, has become so divorced from scholarship that he is unable to furnish leadership for a community whose essential business is learning." Thus it was that week-long discussions of the great books were established for presidents and deans of member (AAC) colleges, initially at Pugwash, the summer home of industrialist Cyrus Eaton, and later at other locations. The purpose was best explained by Richard D. Weigle, president of St. John's College: "The key figure in any institution is the president. He must understand clearly both ends and means. He must be personally convinced of the efficacy of the liberal arts of his own institution. Being college presidents themselves, the members of the Commission were peculiarly aware how far their administrative duties removed them from the intellectual activity and academic growth. They felt a need for replenishing their own mental resources if they were to provide the kind of positive and vigorous educational leadership which the day appeared to demand." Yet each president cannot participate in such an experiment, yet must hold as imperative his involvement in the educational enterprise.

Much like the uncertainty in other areas previously cited, e.g. role definition, student involvement, etc., varying points of view exist for effective operation of the internal structure. Lacognata suggests election of the president as well as all administrative officers from within the institution for specified periods of time. Algo Henderson recommends an organizational model which "engages all constituencies in the process of communication and decision-making."
James T. Hamilton writes of a "forum in which students, faculty, and administrators can exchange ideas. These are but suggestive.

In any event, the institution must continue to recognize the importance of its internal operation. For as John W. Gardner has so aptly written, "If the college or university is to preserve its character as a community and forge for itself a distinctive identity and role in the vast clutter of scholarly, scientific, and instructional activities that will characterize our evolving, technological society, it will have to have a considerable measure of internal coherence and morale. And that means that trustees, administration, faculty, and students are going to have to admit that they are all part of one community - distasteful as that may be to some of them - and they are going to have to ask what they can do individually or collaboratively to preserve the integrity and coherence of that community and to regain command of its future."

Literature by and about the academic president stresses the importance of internal relationships. Included are the relationships with faculty, the leadership offered and accepted or rejected in educational programming, and the effectiveness of mutual cooperation in institutional goal achievement. Issues of similar concern are the working relationships with administrative staff, upon whom a great measure of administrative success rests. And of seemingly increasing importance within the literature are interactions with students and the role which they play in institutional governance.

External Relations
Although it obviously plays an important role and consumes what might seem an inordinate amount of time in the life of the academic president, the topic of relationships with external constituencies takes comparatively little space within the general literature on the presidency. Henry Harmon remarks that "The most important and most neglected aspect of the work of the president's office is the interpretation of the purposes, program, and problem of American collegiate education. Two factors contribute to our neglect." First, it is not tangibly pressing, and second, we are reluctant to "talk shop." He continues, "The future realization of America's hope for education lies, in large way, in our ability to interpret its current position to the people of this country."83

He is quite correct. Yet it would appear that the president so very often becomes so involved with putting out the brush fires that he has no time to fight the major blaze. Among such conflagrations are the alumni and their personal need to know that they are still a part of alma mater, parents and their need to know that the university exercises certain controls over their children, and the general public in their need to know that subversive elements have not completely taken control of higher education. And in the meantime the major task of conveying institutional purpose languishes by the wayside.

The college presidency is a universal position. If one is dissatisfied with a manufactured product one writes to the complaint department, or if particularly irate to the vice president. If one has been given poor service, the department manager is contacted. Not so in the college setting. For if one has a complaint or is dissatisfied,
one does not go to the complaint department, the department manager, or the vice president. One immediately sees, calls, or writes the president. In this regard, Harmon has written that "...the recognition that the public so generously gives the office demands much in return from the president under the guise of public relations."\(^{34}\) Or as Corson has said, "The president is inevitably the spokesman for the institution" - in all matters.\(^{35}\)

Among the most important off-campus concerns of the academic administrator is the great need to raise sufficient funds to keep the institution financially solvent. In some instances such need becomes an obsession in a hand-to-mouth existence experienced by too many institutions. It has been written that "If Aesop were writing his fables today, he would not choose pouring water in a basket as a symbol of futility; he would choose a college president trying to find enough money for his institution."\(^{36}\) And in the words of a college president, "I have concentrated so much on raising money that I no longer have anything to say."\(^{37}\)

Although comparatively little is written on the president's relationship with external bodies, specifically with alumni, parents, and the general community as they relate with higher education, they are none-the-less important. Of concern to the president are his conveyance of institutional purpose and understanding, of his role as general spokesman, fund raiser, and arbiter. He operates within the environment of a multiviewed constituency at a time when the university has become increasingly socially and politically active. Such circumstance increases the complexity within which the president functions,
and adds significantly to the already intricate nature of the presidential task.
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CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of the study was a determination of those factors which prompted academic presidential resignation, specifically as reflected by individuals who had until recently held the role and then had chosen to involve themselves in other forms of endeavor. The research methodology included five phases: (1) Review of literature, (2) Questionnaire composition, (3) Selection of sample, (4) Establishment of the data gathering procedure, and (5) Response analysis.

Review of Literature

The chapter which precedes this is a summation of the findings within recent literature of those writings by and about the academic president. This phase was undertaken for two basic reasons. The first was a familiarization with current readings on the topic as well as a means of determining whether or not a study such as this would contribute to existing knowledge or would in fact be a duplication of other efforts. As indicated previously, it became clear that writings similar to the approach proposed were not found, although writings of a theoretical and hypothetical nature were available with some degree of regularity. The second reason was possibly the more important, for its
purpose, although somewhat more abstract than the first, was that of gaining a basic understanding of the presidential role - its responsibilities, duties, functions, and concerns. It was felt that unless this understanding was attained, the project itself could not be undertaken with a complete degree of personal and professional integrity.

The purpose in attaining an understanding of presidential functioning was the need to adopt a construct within which to approach the research problem. While approaching the resignees with the singular question "Why did you resign?" may have been an alternative course of action, it was neither methodologically sound, nor was it ethically fair. While it was possibly the one question for which an answer was desired, the quality of answer which may have been derived would have been questionable.

The presidential office has been considered by many in differing constructs. Some approach consideration from a constituent base, e.g. relations with faculty, students, and board of control, while others utilize a time consumption base, e.g. what amount of the presidential day is spent on this task or that task. Still others use responsibility areas as a framework, e.g. business affairs, academic affairs, and university relations. Some authors have utilized an administrative theory approach as they consider the operation of the presidential office, e.g. planning, decision-making, organizing, and directing. Yet another means of construct is that of operational decision areas, e.g. educational and research program, financial affairs, and physical development.

But in the final analysis it became evident that only a taxonomy
built exclusively for the project itself would be best-suited to the research goal. Thus, on the basis of the literature survey, the construct utilized in the organization of Chapter II became the guideline by which the goal was achieved.

**Questionnaire Composition**

Utilizing the concepts and considerations attained through the literature survey, a five area taxonomy took form. These areas were (1) role expectations, (2) general administration, (3) internal relations, (4) external relations, and (5) employment alternative. Each question consisted of four or five sentences or phrases which were meant to represent activities or circumstances applicable to the major topic, with each section finding closure in a sentence asking which, if any, of the factors listed, or ones similar, played a significant role in their decision to leave the presidency.

The questions themselves went through a number of drafts. The near-final draft was presented to two acting college presidents, two college vice presidents (academic affairs and student affairs), and two professors of Educational Administration for critical comment. A number of very helpful criticisms and corrections were obtained and were incorporated in a final draft, which in turn became the printed questionnaire. The questions were each printed individually on five sheets of executive size paper (7½" x 10¾"), followed by a sixth page of normative data (number of years in the presidency, earned degrees, position prior to and succeeding the presidency, etc.). A space of approximately
six by six inches was thus provided below each question for an essay response, with instructions that the reply could be of one or two sentences, could fill the space provided (approximately 350 words), or could be continued on the reverse side. A sample of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

The final draft found the following questions asked of each individual:

1. Role Expectations: There would seem to be certain considerations which are basic to the presidency. The president alone must retain responsibility for achieving the overall goal of institutional purpose; it is a somewhat lonely role and seemingly one of many acquaintances but few friends. The position is viewed differently by each constituency, each having its own role definition and behavioral expectations. Consideration too must be made of the change agent role held in an environment which often resists change, yet requesting such leadership from a position which is viewed with some mistrust but knows no tenure.

Such examples are merely suggestive in asking which, if any, similar role expectations were significant in your decision to leave the presidential office?

2. General Administration: Certain responsibilities are uniquely those of the president and no one else. Possibly most important is the relationship shared with the board of control, serving at their pleasure while at the same time serving a mediating role between board, faculty, students, and in certain circumstances the state legislature. The democratic process must be promoted in an atmosphere which often encourages haste and urgency, operating within a community structure of organization rather than hierarchy. The president must function with limited power, making decisions in an environment of great diversity and differing circumstance. While faced with unceasing routine, time must be found for innovation and planning.

Again, such items serve only as examples of tasks within general administration and act as basic guidelines in
asking which, if any, played a role of some note in your action to leave?

3. Internal Relations: Important to the president are relationships with faculty - protection of academic freedom, the manner in which faculty leadership is assumed, the finesse of involvement in program development, and the individual approach to the circumstance which would move the president away from the educational center of higher education. Important too are relations with administrative staff, often men and women not of one's own choosing yet upon whom there must be great dependence. Likewise of concern are relationships with students who often feel rightful neglect.

Within such taxonomy how would you reflect upon internal relationships as you view the factors which brought about your resignation request?

4. External Relations: Although physically removed from the campus, external constituent factors present a concern as immediate as those physically present. Included individually or organizationally are parents, alumni, the public in general, and legal and extra-legal bodies, each holding some degree of vested interest. Complicating relations with external constituencies, particularly in recent years, has been the increasing social and political role played by colleges and universities. Finally, the academic president finds himself to be the primary spokesman, public relations agent, and fund raiser for the institution.

Within the confines of this definition, how did your relationship with external bodies affect or influence your final decision to resign the presidential office?

5. Employment Alternative: It is difficult to measure positive and negative forces in employment change - what percentage of the decision was the demand within yourself to leave, what percentage to accept a new and inviting offer. On occasion even pending unemployment is a positive alternative. Factors of primary consideration are location, associates, family needs, salary, opportunity for professional and personal growth and development, relief from administrative fatigue, etc.
Which factors similar to these were important to you as you left the presidency and assumed new responsibilities?

Selection of the Sample

It was the concern of the study to include among the sample those individuals who had served in the presidential role, had left the position to enter other roles, and had made the transition recently enough to have fresh memories yet sufficiently long enough to have some degree of retrospect. Thus, in November of 1970, when the sample was chosen, the decision was made to select those individuals who had left the presidential office of an American two or four year college or university during the months of 1969 and the first months of 1970. The eventual criteria became announced resignation appearing in the "Gazette" section of The Chronicle of Higher Education during the 1969 calendar year (Volume III, Number 9, through Volume IV, Number 12). Although other resources were considered, The Chronicle was felt to represent the best single and comprehensive source of presidential termination available. Such selections meant that the individuals in the sample would have been away from the presidential office for periods of from five to twenty-four months, sufficient time it was felt to meet the criteria both of recency and retrospect.

187 academic presidential terminations were announced in the "Gazette" of The Chronicle during the calendar year 1969. Of these, fourteen were executive heads of medical schools, theological schools, and specialized (e.g. music, art) institutions, and thus were
immediately deleted from the sample, leaving a total of 173. Of this group, eighty-seven additional presidents were excluded for the reasons cited in Table 8.

TABLE 8

PRESIDENTIAL TERMINATIONS EXCLUDED FROM SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of 173 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepted another college or university presidency</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died in office</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released from office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining eighty-six individuals, by the definition of resignation cited previously, thus became the sample on which the study was based. It should be noted that the sample is a total population from the research source.

It is difficult to know the complete number of such resignations each year, or what number were omitted from the study because the announcement did not appear in The Chronicle. An examination of the institutional sample from which the individuals came leads one to believe that the sample is representative of American college and university structure, with the possible exception of the number of community and junior college presidents represented. The latter circumstance may well evolve from the unique place which the community college plays in American higher education, relating itself equally to
secondary structures as with collegiate structure.

The sample by various categories is summarized in Table 9.

Data Gathering Procedure

On December 4, 1970, individually typed and addressed letters were sent to the eighty-six individuals in the sample, accompanied by a copy of the six page questionnaire and stamped self-addressed return envelope. The letter indicated the writer's knowledge of their departure from the presidential office and their involvement in a new area of concern. The purpose of the study was briefly stated which included dissertation research on the topic of presidential resignation and the concern not so much of a rank order listing of relevant reasons but more importantly the general thoughts of individuals who had experienced the role. The letter likewise offered the alternative of a personal letter or dictating tape from the respondent should he feel the constraints of the questionnaire too confining. A closing date of January 15, 1971, was indicated for return of the response, giving somewhat in excess of a month for the individual to reply. A sample of the letter may be found in Appendix A.

One problem encountered in the mailing was that of obtaining the current address of the individual. A thorough check of succeeding issues of The Chronicle, and the most recent editions of Who's Who, provided a number. Yet at the time of the mailing, fifty-five of the eighty-six letters (64%) were mailed with annotation "Please Forward" on both the envelope and letterhead, and addressed in care of the Office
TABLE 9

INSTITUTIONS AT WHICH RESPONDENTS SERVED AS PRESIDENT BY VARIOUS CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Institutions (Total = 86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Year/4 Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year institution</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year institution</td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support/Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public university</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public college</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private university</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private college</td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Body</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accreditation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the President at the institution at which they had served. There is
some reason to believe that accurate addresses for the entire sample
would have improved the response percentage for sixty-seven percent of
those addressed directly responded, while fifty-six percent of those to
whom the letters had to be forwarded responded. Some lesson may be
inherent for future researchers faced with a similar problem.

On January 8, 1971, a brief follow-up letter (Appendix B), offset
and individually addressed, was mailed to each non-respondent. There
can be no way in determining what response came as the result of the
follow-up, and what came as the result of the initial January 15 cut-
off.

As of January 22, 1971, fifty-two responses (60.4%) had been re-
ceived, forty-four of which were useable for the purposes of the study
(51.2%). The total response is outlined in Table 10.

Several comments would seem to be in order regarding the response.
It can be assumed that the men of the sample were busy individuals,
e.g. twenty-eight of the forty-four were listed in Who's Who. Yet the
number of responses hand-written or typed (as evidenced by their own
admission or by strike-overs, missed spacing, etc.) gave indication of
personal involvement, twenty-seven of the forty-four being so completed.
While the option of forwarding a dictating tape was included in the
original letter somewhat as an afterthought with the idea that certain
thoughts regarding the subject would not want to be shared with clerical
personnel, only one individual selected the option. Yet that reply
of the entire forty-five minute length of the tape from a respondent
who had left his position under circumstances of stress was in itself
TABLE 10
SUMMATION OF PRESIDENTIAL RESPONSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Useable Responses: (N = 44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed questionnaire</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed questionnaire plus personal letter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal letter</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictating tape and personal letter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy of resignation statement and personal letter</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-useable Responses: (N = 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of death</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter returned, envelope marked:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;College closed&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Address unknown&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined participation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of the country</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of non-receipt or misplacement of materials as a result of follow-up letter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for the writer a complete educational experience. For in voice inflection and hesitation, verbal communication not possible in written response was very evident. At the conclusion of the tape the respondent admitted that his response was the "most forthright, even quasi-public statement" that he had made in the fifteen months since leaving the institution.

In graphic form, the final useable response was that shown in Table
Response Analysis

As responses were received, each was analyzed to determine which factor or factors contributed to the presidential resignation. In some instances there was only one. In others there could be cited at least five specific and/or general areas which had contributed to the resignation request. Each individual response was then entered on a master roster, listed by control number (numbers assigned sequentially as the responses were received), with each control number followed by the resignation reason(s).

After the initial recording was completed, and after the passage of approximately one week, the same process was repeated, utilizing a new roster. Each response was thus read again, and reasons cited for resignation recorded.

Upon completion of the second round, the listings of the second roster were compared with that of the first. Where reasons from both were in complete agreement, they were listed on a third and final roster. When reasons of the first differed from that of the second, the individual response was again reread and a final reconciliation of the two rosters made and reasons in turn entered on the final roster.

In any study dealing with variable factors there is some temptation to resort to finger-counting conclusions. This study was no exception. While it was initially necessary within the research instrument to seek some form of categorical classification, it then became an
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number in Sample</th>
<th>Useable Response</th>
<th>Percent of Total Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Year/4 Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year institution</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year institution</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support/Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public College</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private College</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Body</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accreditation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
almost natural extension to superimpose the same classification system upon the replies. While this could be done to some extent, very few replies were received before it became evident that motivational factors were many in number as well as being significantly interrelated. In few cases was it possible to indicate that one reason, and that reason alone, was the prime determinant in a presidential termination. Rather, the replies were a complex of interacting factors.

The final response was graphically charted in an effort to determine possible patterning, and whether or not greater numbers of presidents listed particular items more than others. In the final analysis twenty-one general motivational areas prompting resignation were isolated and established under the five-point taxonomy. It was not the desire of the researcher to be bound by a frequency distribution limitation. Yet the occurrence of particular items did play a role in the final selection of general areas felt to be of greater import than others. It is the discussion of those general areas, and all others, which represent the body of this research project and comprise the totality of the following chapter.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

The Respondents

The group of former college presidents responding was comprised of forty-four individuals, forty-one male and three female. The average tenure length was 9.2 years, considerably longer than some statistics cited in earlier chapters as average for the college presidency. The period of time, however, would not seem divergent from Ferrari's average of 7.8 years for active college presidents, i.e. not resigned. The group represented 431 years of college presidential experience, either in the position from which the individual had recently resigned or in a previous presidency. The average age of the time of resignation was 54.1 years, comparing favorably with the fifty-three and fifty-four years of age range found by King among those college presidents who had left the presidency to enter other areas of endeavor, specifically business and foundation work and teaching.

Seventy-three percent of the responding ex-presidents held the doctorate as the highest earned degree, while twenty-three percent had the Master's degree, and four percent the baccalaureate degree. Such division, as illustrated in Table 12, would appear to be representative of other similar studies.
TABLE 12
HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED BY ACADEMIC PRESIDENTS
BY PERCENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Ferrari\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>King\textsuperscript{b}</th>
<th>Tunnicliffe\textsuperscript{c}</th>
<th>Alton\textsuperscript{d}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{b}Francis P. King, "Presidents' Profile," Liberal Education, October, 1967, p. 403.

\textsuperscript{c}Guy W. Tunnicliffe and John A. Ingram, "The College President: Who Is He?" Educational Record, Spring, 1969, p. 191.

\textsuperscript{d}This study.

Private institutions were predominant as the location from which all three degrees had been earned, the total being seventy-three percent for the bachelor's, fifty-six percent for master's and fifty-six percent for the doctorate respectively. This break-down too would appear to be within limits as determined, for example, by the Ferrari study, as compared in Table 13.

Academic areas in which degrees had been earned were many and varied, with only one, history, representing more than a small percentage of the total. Earned degrees by major area are found in Table 14.

A comparison of that position held immediately preceding the
TABLE 13
TYPES OF INSTITUTION FROM WHICH PRESIDENTIAL DEGREES WERE EARNED BY PERCENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree/Type</th>
<th>Ferrari</th>
<th>Alton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Institute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Ferrari, Profiles, p. 6.
^This study

presidency with similar studies of active presidents found one interesting difference. A larger percentage of those presidents who had resigned came from college teaching positions to the presidency than was the case with those persons active in the role at the time of previous surveys. With the exception of one or two comments made by the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Area</th>
<th>B.A. (N=44)</th>
<th>M.A. (N=41)</th>
<th>Doctorate (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Admin.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language, Literature</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance Languages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion, Philosophy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Testament</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
presidential group regarding the former role as it related to the presidency, no causal relation was even suggested. Using the Tunnicliffe and Ingram structure cited in Chapter II (page 28), the findings of the three studies are illustrated in Table 15.

**TABLE 15**

**POSITION HELD IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING PRESIDENCY BY PERCENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Ferrari</th>
<th>Tunnicliffe</th>
<th>Alton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College administration, academic</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College administration, nonacademic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College teaching</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and industry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aFerrari, Profiles, p. 6.

*bTunnicliffe and Ingram, "The College President," p. 193.

cThis study.

Although the positions from which the individuals in the group came to the presidency can be considered diverse, the involvement upon leaving the office can be considered even more so, for no less than thirteen general areas can be cited in which the group assumed subsequent involvement. The major areas of subsequent involvement included nonacademic college administration, college teaching, foundation administration, and
positions of governmental leadership. The composite of the forty-four respondents is found in Table 16.

### TABLE 16

**POSITION HELD IMMEDIATELY SUCCEEDING PRESIDENCY**
**BY PERCENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Administration - Nonacademic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Association (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Teaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Officer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Consultant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Administration - Academic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave of Absence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight individuals in the group, after initially involving themselves in one of the above areas, subsequently chose either a new position in the same general area \(N=2\), moved into nonacademic college administration \(N=3\), or college teaching \(N=3\).

Additional institutional and personal data concerning the
ex-presidents responding in this study may be found in Appendices C and D.

This, then, was the "average" individual as he resigned from the college presidency during 1969 and early 1970: Male, average tenure of 9.2 years, fifty-four years of age, holder of the earned doctorate, better than even chance to have earned all three degrees from private institutions, having no one specific discipline in terms of undergraduate or graduate training yet with greater possibility that it may have been in the social sciences, having come to his position from college academic administration or teaching and when leaving the position entering nonacademic college administration, teaching, or foundation or government administration.

**Reasons for Resignation**

Twenty-one general areas were cited as prompting presidential resignation among the group responding. However, within the twenty-one areas can be determined factors which have played more significant roles than have others.

Each response received, as indicated previously, was analyzed to determine basic reasons for resignation. For fourteen members of the group a single factor could be identified as the individual reason responsible for departure from the office. In another eight instances, two factors could be cited. Among the remaining twenty-two individuals three or more factors could be recognized.

For purposes of clarity, all twenty-one areas will be briefly
defined, although definition of much greater depth will result as each is discussed in turn and in more detail. The twenty-one listed within the five-area consideration are:

A. Role Expectations

1. Basic role expectations: The presidential office is viewed by many constituents, the position being hub-like with spokes seeking resolution from many directions. Seldom do the expectations of one constituency, e.g. board of control, duplicate those of another, e.g. student body. When such expectations become sufficiently divergent with those held by the president himself, adjustment must be made, which may include termination of the role.

2. Role evolution: The role and responsibility of the presidential office, like the institutional organization within which it functions, is continually changing. Yet that change is unperceptible on occasion to the individuals and organizations who collectively view the presidency.

3. Avoidance of extended tenure: Presidents frequently express concern over the possibility that they may remain in office past that time when their effectiveness as an institutional leader still exists, and thus express the desire to terminate their service prior to such occurrence.

4. Extended tenure: No position, or few it would seem, is of such nature to warrant life-long involvement. While teaching may be life-long, it is broken by promotion, possibly by change in the institution at which one teaches. Thus within the presidency comes that
point where it is only natural to move to other areas of involvement.

5. **Community environment**: Much like the need of particular climates to grow particular types of plants, so there are specific environments which a president feels conducive to his functioning. When these environments become less healthy for one reason or another, the president feels the inability to function properly.

6. **Racial climate**: The college and university does not operate within a social vacuum. Thus it is not surprising that recent changes in American racial thinking have brought similar changes to the perception of the presidential role.

7. **Inability for personal growth**: On occasion the task becomes master of the man and he no longer feels an ability to be his own agent in the personal growth process. This may result from the stifling nature of routine duties or the incessant demands of time involvement. In either event it encourages departure from the role.

8. **Departure from religious role**: In the case of religiously-affiliated institutions, the president often serves both clerical and lay role, in effect a dual expectation. Either because of differing constituent expectations of how those roles should interrelate, or because of the personal desire to terminate the clerical affiliation, both roles must be terminated.

B. **General Administration**

9. **Basic administration**: Certain basic administrative functions are uniquely those of the president and not shared with others. At that point when such tasks become too onerous, and with inability to
delegate them, the decision must be that of endurance or departure.

10. **Objective achievement:** Certain objectives either implicit or explicit are established as each president assumes his office. At that point when the president feels all such objectives have been fulfilled, his sense of accomplishment prompts his consideration of new areas for his involvement, either within the presidency itself or in other areas of endeavor.

11. **Board relationship:** The relationship which he shares with the board of control is unique in American organizational structure, and possibly one of the more important experienced by the president. At that point when stress of an intolerable nature occurs between president and board, continued operation by the president comes into question.

12. **Political/bureaucratic stifling:** In many institutions, more often but not exclusively public, financing and programming are dependent upon political structures. When such bodies exert sanctions and/or control over the institution which the president feels unreasonable and over which he feels that he has limited control, he must live with the situation or remove himself from the role.

C. Internal Relations

13. **Basic internal relations:** Certain relationships within the geographical limitations of the campus are sufficiently interrelated to deny their consideration as relations with specific constituent groups. At various times these relationships achieve such complexity that their resolution can occur only with the alteration of certain internal
variables, which can include resignation of the presidential officer.

14. **Faculty relations**: The unique role which the president enjoys as leader of the faculty at a time when he finds himself increasingly removed from the educational center of higher education presents particular problems. At that point where he feels an inability to serve that role as he perceives it, the matter contributes to a termination decision.

15. **Student involvement**: The changing role of the president is well illustrated by the change in his relationship with students. Certain presidents realize their inability to make this change and leave, encouraging the appointment of an individual better suited to such demands.

D. **External Relations**

16. **Basic external relations**: Similar to basic internal relations, certain relationships geographically external to the institution are sufficiently complex to defy constituent classification. And within the complexity is found reason prompting termination.

17. **Alumni relations**: On occasion the expectations which the alumni hold for the institution generally and the president specifically affect a decision to remain or to depart from the presidential office.

18. **Fund raising**: Usually, but not exclusively, at private institutions the president feels great responsibility for the procurement of funds to continue the operation of the institution. Such responsibility can be demanding in terms of time consumed, but more importantly is often viewed as a sales role antithetical to the educational
leadership role.

E. Employment Alternative

19. **General employment alternative:** The position to which the president moves plays an important part in his decision to leave, although on occasion no such position exists at the time the termination is made. When such a position does present itself to the president it is frequently the primary factor in his decision to leave the presidency and move to new areas of responsibility.

20. **Physical stamina:** It has been implied that the presidential office is a demanding one and there comes that point where the individual for physical and/or emotional reasons feels completely spent and must remove himself from the role to seek relief.

21. **Family needs:** The time-consuming tasks of the presidency understandably make significant in-roads into time available for other responsibilities. One of these areas, and seemingly among the more important extra-presidential responsibilities of the president are those which he feels toward his family. In brief, he leaves the presidency to reactivate the relationships he formerly enjoyed with family members and for which there has been increasingly less time due to presidential demands.

Although effort was made to place each of the twenty-one factors in some relationship of relative importance, as will be explained in the latter part of this chapter, it should again be stressed that the primary purpose of the study was that of obtaining a generalized understanding
of presidential resignation as viewed by the former incumbents. To establish that picture, the presidential response follows.

Presidential Response

Role Expectations

Basic role expectations:

The expectations of the presidential role at this time in history are confused and complex. Higher education itself has experienced rapid change and finds itself in a position of continual self-definition. Administrative modes have been restructured and methods of governance have come under fire both figuratively and literally. The mental pictures that one conjures of college administration in 1961 compared with that of 1971 illustrates the decade's change. Yet with an average tenure of somewhat over nine years, the respondents administered colleges and universities over this period of change. (Note: As all responses were received in confidence, presidents are identified only by control number, institutional and personal characteristics of which may be found in Appendices C and D.)

The role I had to play as president was precisely what I expected except in one respect: In the past several years irrationality and emotionalism drove out reason and objectivity and hospitality for varying viewpoints on our campuses. Administration became a cops and robbers game with faculty egging on students. Confrontations, black studies, sit-ins, obscenities, anti-everything campus newspapers are not my cup of tea - particularly when faculties on the one hand could not agree on administrative policies and on the other would not be sufficiently responsive to some legitimate student needs (i.e. grading,
course content and requirements, attendance, advising).

(14)

Current expectations are reflected by others regarding the demands placed upon the presidency.

There are clear and present dangers in any invitation to write about the college and university presidency. I spent sixteen years at the job and know well its emotional charge - positive beyond reason at times and negative beyond toleration at others. Any normal person is put on the defensive by the abuse to which presidents are subjected these days - by everyone from the Vice President of the United States to the thoughtless student or self-centered faculty member. (25)

It would appear that the real and imagined powers of the presidency are central to the problem of role expectations. The role is viewed externally, and often by those entering the position, in less than realistic terms. And while the dreams remain for those external, the active president meets them face to face, sometimes realistically, sometimes with complete frustration. Those who assume the role with realistic expectations feel greater ability to cope than do those who assume such responsibility with somewhat romantic notions. This concept is expressed well by two presidents of the sample.

There is little doubt that the college presidency carries with it many negative factors, including the profound frustration of not being able, except under rarest of circumstances, to play an innovative role in the improvement of learning. Equally, the gap between legal power and real power continues to widen and constitutes a serious ambiguity in the president's effectiveness. I share, too, the view of many of my colleagues to the effect that "a lot of the fun" has gone out of the job. On the other hand, anyone who undertakes the position with unrealistic expectations is likely to be merely an additional statistic in the divorce rate - domestic and/or professional. (48)
The academic presidency was a much more lonely position than I ever realized it could be. I had always felt that my role as a classroom professor and the relationship with my peers could be transferred to the chief executive office. When the title of President was placed before my name, walls were erected immediately. It was almost as if I had become another person with a totally different set of values. I had the same goals, the same dreams, and the aspirations and yet a certain sense of suspicion surrounded the administrative office. Perhaps I was too idealistic, but I honestly felt that a creative atmosphere could be established throughout the entire college community. I came to realize that this could not be because of the suspicions and pre-conceived ideas which individuals had about such an office. (38)

Unsettled campus conditions of late have made the task of role definition increasingly difficult. And this circumstance is compounded for the individual who assumes the undefined role. For he is left to fulfill a position for which there are few if any written guidelines, with those that do exist subject to the question of constituent bodies. This change in administrative operation in a context of change is well expressed by the former president of a small, quality liberal arts college.

In times of stress it is inevitable that definitions of roles will be tested. That for the presidency was never clear to most interested parties, and during the test of recent times it has been strained if not shattered. During my years as president (1963-69) the expectations of me changed considerably.

At the present time, there does not seem to be agreement in most colleges and universities on what the President should do or be. My advice to search committees is that they try to gain agreement on what faculty, trustees, alumni organizations, and perhaps student organizations expect before they attempt to invite someone to take the responsibility.

It seems that the question is who should determine university policy. The Trustees did when I first arrived at [Institution]; the only exceptions were those strictly academic matters where the Trustees gave the faculty the initiative but continued to review their decisions. When
the Trustees took initiative for the determination of university policy, the president inevitably gave leadership to the Board. The transition during my years at [institution] was from the initiative of the Board to a contest between Board and Faculty. (33)

The indefinite nature of the role is dramatically illustrated by the writing of a president who at the beginning of a fifteen year tenure commented:

The expectations of others when I took the presidency have never been made known to me! The college had 92 students at the time, was deeply in debt, and I assume that I was elected because no one else wanted the job. I later found in searching out files that some fifty other persons had been candidate before I was consider- ed. (15)

While there is lack of both definition and/or lack of understanding regarding role expectations, there is likewise a keen understanding of the perceived role, and this too contributes to termination decisions. In other words, it is both misunderstanding as well as understanding which contributes to the problem. This understanding, and the frustration which it incubated, was possibly best expressed by a community college president as he reflected on the roles which he was forced to play.

The role of innovator - the system had to change; we had the vision and the courage to change it; yet the old conditioning and constipated bureaucracy killed us off.

The role of the perpetual 50% loser. I am not equipped by conditioning, training, or impulse to accept that everything - everything - one does will antagonize about 50% of the constituency - every time. One has to accept it and move. I couldn't.

Success as a negative factor. When militants asked if they could demonstrate for me, help me by ripping off someone who was "giving me trouble," because they needed visibility among their peers - I got that sick feeling
that either I or they missed the whole point. (47)

It would thus appear that both a lack of specific role definitions as well as an inability to operate within the confines that do exist contribute in a significant manner to departure from the presidential role. Few presidents gave strong indication that the situation was without hope. Yet there is reason to believe that there is need to seek a greater clarification of the role which would include the establishment of comprehensive and realistic written position descriptions. Likewise, there should be a continuing educational process both internally and externally as to what constitutes successful fulfillment of the role. Yet most importantly it would seem is the need to establish significant levels of realism regarding the job, both for those who enter it as well as for those who work with it. These contentions are best stated by a former state university president:

I thoroughly enjoyed being a president and believe that if one understands the job before he takes it, even during these trying times, good men will be attracted to the presidency. However, higher education has been terribly derelict in not developing a system to help identify potential candidates for Boards of Trustees who, for the most part, are abysmally ignorant of what is required. (14)

Role evolution:

Much within the expectations of the presidency implies change and evolution, and it would seem to be of some significance to warrant its being individually considered as a causal factor in presidential termination. The evolution has been both relatively gradual and non-sensitive,
e.g., the demands which require increasing time involvement, yet has also been extreme and sobering. In terms of time involvement a junior college president remarked:

I was always - and increasingly - mindful of the demands of one's time in [administration] - rather vexing to one who originally went into the academic world for, among other things, the ample vacation and summer time. This was of some importance in my adhering to a determination to retire in spite of the temptation of staying in a position that paid well, was creative, and where I enjoyed the company of good companions. (8)

Yet the change can be drastic as exemplified by the thoughts of a president on those role expectations for which he felt responsibility:

The expectancies were met well enough. It was the unexpected which fractured me: I had no idea I would be involved in, and certainly had no training for:

1. carrying a gun
2. riot control
3. interpreting statutes re: evidence, citizens' arrest, narcotics, etc.
4. a communication network which based its viability in using rumors to keep things cool, listening to students as the main source of real ideas, ignoring many faculty voices, etc.
5. using a college to save a town from burning (47)

There is little question that administrative style must evolve to meet the changing time. Among those presidents able to meet that change there is continued service. Yet in certain circumstances it becomes understandably impossible to not only alter ones administrative style yet more importantly convey that change to all constituencies. On occasion there must come the decision that the climate in which one functions has become inhospitable, and rather than change style one selects the alternative of departure. Among the sample this circumstance was best
represented and conveyed by a president of seventeen year's service when
in his statement of resignation he wrote:

Confronted today with the final impasse, I must relinquish my post to another man, possibly one of different temperament. The [city] and its great [institution] deserve a future which it had been my hope to realize more fully. But when the forces of angry rebellion and stern repression clash, the irrepressible conflict is joined. A man of peace, a reconciler, a man of compassion must stand aside for a time and await the moment when sanity returns and brotherhood based on justice becomes a possibility. (23)

Seventy-two hours later he had left office.

The evolutionary nature of the presidency is not always the result of factors external to the role itself, but is also bound by the inability of the individual himself to portray a personal change as institutional change occurs. Students of organizational management continually point to the life process of an institutional body and its need for different leadership at differing times. Often that leadership change is represented in terms of new personnel rather than the adaptation of current personnel to changing circumstance. At times this change is intentional, at others unintentional. One chief administrative officer reflected on his own ability in this area when he wrote:

In the formative years of my developing institution, i.e. especially during the first five years of my presidency - it was necessary to exert a strong centralized control of almost every aspect of the college. I enjoyed the understanding and assistance of almost every faculty member and staff member with minimal concern for the central role of my office. As I gradually relinquished the central role I discovered that I had provided too comfortably for several members of the faculty and had failed to impress their own responsibilities and opportunities on them. Realization of the dependence which I had inadvertently fostered was a factor in my decision to leave
the presidency, since I neither felt capable nor was I inclined to retain the original role that had been, but was no longer, so significant. (24)

Possibly the most useful lesson to be learned from an acceptance of the evolutionary nature of the presidential office is the need to think of the presidency in terms of institutional developmental units. Some make swift and rapid change, others proceed with greater hesitancy. Generally American higher education has in the past decade moved from a construction phase - the enlargement of faculties, enrollments, and facilities - to one of increased interpersonal awareness. Many presidents have had the ability to adapt to this change, others have not, yet should not be apologetic because of the inability. A former Big Ten president reflected on this situation quite well when he replied:

By temperament I am a somewhat restless person who likes to build and develop institutions, and I am not strong on patience in dealing with faculty and student problems, though I have tried to discipline myself to be tolerably patient. I believe that the qualifications of the presidency have changed significantly within the past five years, and there will be less emphasis on "building," and more emphasis on human relations. I believe that the newer presidents must be of a somewhat different temperament, and have somewhat different objectives from those of the generation I represent. I believe that the recent turnover of presidents is due to this change in the qualifications for the position, and many of those of my generation have realized that their style does not conform to present and future needs. I feel very strongly that a marked change has occurred, and that the turnover of presidents is, in the long run, very desirable. I have observed three young presidents who have just come on board [in colleges associated with the one at which the respondent currently serves], all of whom are about thirty-five years of age, who represent the new generation. I think these men are going to provide superb leadership for the new era - leadership that would be far superior to what I could offer.

I personally think that much of the currently fashionable
talk about the impossibility of the president's role and the like misses the point. The point, it seems to me, is that significant changes are occurring in our society and in our universities, and the new types of skills and administrative styles are needed. I predict that a new generation of college presidents will arise who are different from those of my generation, as we were different from presidents of fifty years ago. (22)

The consensus would seem to be that this change has in fact occurred, or as one president remarked:

The folklore of the presidency has changed very slowly, while the fact has altered with breathless speed. (25)

And in light of this change, there needs to be revised thinking that the presidency itself must be viewed in terms of four or six or eight year units, coming to the position with specialized abilities for which the institution currently has need but which will in all probability not have continuing need after a relatively short period of time.

Presidents themselves must change their expectations of the job. . . . There needs to be understanding that it is a position of limited tenure. (25)

Some of us - trained in the "no" mode of 1948 administration - have no function in the system a-building. We should get out. A lot of faculty bullship about academic freedom, tenure, disciplines, etc., has no place in building real human beings. I didn't have the guts - or the legal prerogative - to fire a lot of people who were o.k. people, but whom I wouldn't let near my kids in a classroom.

This is a time for creative people - by and large, people in education are not creative people (and I was lucky to have many "freaks" who were good teachers and beautiful human beings). We need to look for different kinds of people to assume teaching roles - most of our present administrators are scared, hung-up, and mediocre. (47)
The implications which role evolution would seem to have for the presidency are these: First, it is necessary to have a realistic understanding of current institutional need and to both select an individual to meet those needs as well as an assurance on the part of the person selected that he possesses the abilities to meet the need, i.e. a two-way concern by both selector and selectee. Second, one must be aware of the change process both institutionally and individually. One must understand that the institution will change and there will be that point when the incumbent no longer feels able to meet institutional needs. Yet there must also be understanding that the individual leading the institution can change, and does not remain static in a changing institutional environment. Finally, there is need to view the presidency as a term of office, not unlike that of elected political office. The term of office will vary considerably with institution and individual. Yet there must be understanding that presidential success need not be measured in length of tenure, but more importantly by the manner in which the institution was able to develop during the individual's term of office. It may well be that greater service is offered an institution through the brief tenures of several successive presidents than the long term of one individual.

Avoidance of extended tenure:

The implications inherent in thinking of the presidency in terms of developmental units of institutional growth and for specified or shortened periods of time lead directly to a primary reason cited by the
presidential sample for leaving their positions. This factor, that of avoiding extended tenure, was cited only once as the individual cause for termination, yet found considerable prevalence as one of several contributory factors. If able to summarize this concern in a single sentence, it would find expression in the desire by the presidential officer to leave the institution prior to that time when his effectiveness has been exhausted.

There would appear to be agreement within the presidential group that a period in office of five to ten years is the most desirable. Periods shorter than that do not permit significant achievement; periods longer generally find the leadership becoming ineffectual. This concept was expressed extremely well by a president whose training had been in management and had an earned doctorate from the Harvard Business School. He commented:

When I accepted the presidency, I told the trustees that I expected to stay not less than five nor more than ten years. As a student of management, I believed this was a time span advantageous to both the institution and to the individual alike for reasons I shall not enumerate. I also had no desire to use [institution] as a stepping stone to some other presidency. The job of president is exciting and in many respects self-fulfilling. I resigned with regret - but have not for a single moment regretted the decision. I was becoming tired, very angry, very concerned about education's shortcomings, short-tempered, humorless - trapped by a job and by my constituency. I had to break free to regain freedom and my own self-respect. At age 50 life looks different to you than when you are writing a dissertation! The psychological reasons for resignations are difficult to identify and explain but probably are more compelling than anything else and help to explain "fatigue." As a post-script I am feeling more like a human being again and will be back in the brawl soon. (14)

The theme was reiterated by others:
I told the Trustees of [institution], when they invited me to become their tenth President in November of 1959, that I would accept but that I would not stay in the job longer than ten years. I do not believe in long presidencies for any academic institution, especially not for a small college. (30)

When I came to [institution] in 1960 I set for myself ten years as the outside limit of my tenure in presidential office. I have always felt that a president makes his major contribution within his first ten years. Although there are some tasks that remain to be done, after ten years it is better that a board of trustees select a new man, one who can bring new ideas and suggest different educational paths for a university as called for in a day of dynamic social change.

I have the feeling that in the future there won't be many who stay on in one of these demanding positions for as much as ten years. (46)

In his letter of resignation, the same president reflected somewhat humorously:

For some time I have been the senior state university president in [geographical area of the country]. I have already held office longer than the national norm. If I may indulge in some humor currently prevalent among my presidential colleagues: "It is a good idea to quit before one falls farther behind." (46)

There were those who viewed the presidential term in even briefer periods than that of a decade. One remarked that his resignation was due, among other things, to a:

Belief 4 years as President is about right. (19)

Or the president who reflected on the time involvement of the position saying:

I know of no solution, except reasonable tenure (5 - 10
Although expressed implicitly by the above presidents, the concept of specific goal achievement, assuming the presidency to attain certain ends, and then leaving immediately was alluded to by a president who remained for three and a half years before returning to college teaching from whence he had come. His thoughts are best representative of the concept previously presented which viewed institutional growth units. He commented:

I figured that, like a hard-driving corporation executive, I should plan to work three to six years, and it took three and a half years to get the major tasks done. Incidentally, I have a very strong suspicion that we would get better presidencies and more satisfaction across the board if this were the image of the presidency rather than that of a pastor of a church that settles in for twenty-five or thirty years and collects moths.

In any case, although I know and appreciate some money raisers and builders who have stayed longer periods of time, I think that this is more a realistic understanding of what the president means to do working 365 days a year, 24 hours a day, and that it's better for him and for the institution if he doesn't wear out his welcome or - alternatively - move so slowly that nothing much happens. (17)

A number of presidents assumed the concept of avoiding long tenure in observations of their colleagues in the presidency, an observation which led them to believe that it is possible to remain in the presidency for a period that is longer than that which is beneficial to both the individual and the institution.

I suppose I was partly motivated by the desire to get the hell out while I was still ahead in the ball game, it having been my opportunity to observe some of my presidential associates in this part of the country stay in
too long for their good, or the college's good. (8)

. . . I had observed while teaching and attending graduate school that there is a tendency for college administrators at all levels to "retire in office." Once their immediate goals are accomplished and the honeymoon is over they are willing to quit fighting for the good of their own institution, and begin to relax. I saw departments, colleges, and entire universities, gain academic ascendancy only to begin a slow painful and senseless return to mediocrity. My faculty heard me say, after five years, I would not stay beyond ten. I surmised, and so it turned out, that the daily battles begin to become trivial and burdensome. (32)

The avoidance of extended tenure is a relative thing in terms of years in office, although the predominant number would view the phenomenon to occur sometime around the tenth year of office. Yet such avoidance was also evident in the resignation of the president within the sample with the longest tenure, twenty-eight years. For the avoidance of lengthened tenure is based on the concern that one remains beyond that point of usefulness to the institution. Thus it was in his case, as he commented on several reasons for his departure:

The first one was that after my long incumbency it was already evident that there was beginning to be interest in the routines to replace me when I retired. Years earlier the Board had set the date of my retirement at the end of the academic year in which I attained the age of 70, or no later than July 1, 1973. I had watched some of my colleagues in other institutions resist retiring and often remained in the community or on the campus retarding progress and change, and I had decided years earlier that if I lived long enough to retire voluntarily I would move from the University presidency at [institution] into some activity that would take me away from [city in which institution is located] for a minimum of two years. (21)

The feeling and concern by the presidential group citing the
avoidance of extended tenure as contributory to their resignation is
aptly summarized by one member of the group.

Then why did I quit? I enclose my letter of resignation, giving my board of trustees a year's leadtime to find a successor. The letter speaks for itself. I personally am a small "d" democrat; I believe the institutions deserve a change in leadership. While the new man may not do as well as his predecessor (and my friends like to feed me that line), it is very possible that he may do better. At least he will move in new directions, possibly have better rapport with a changed undergraduate and graduate student community. He can proceed untrammeled by past decisions that were not one-hundred percent popular, because he is not responsible for them. There is such a thing as staying too long; I have a horror when I think of that possibility. It was nice to get out as I did while you are still ahead.

Physically a presidency is a wearing assignment. As time goes by some of the joy runs out. One is on call 24 hours a day, seven days a week, although his actual working hours are of course less than that. After ten years he has gone through ten commencements, ten opening convocations, several student sit-ins, annual legislative hearings and executive budget presentations. Things begin to get repetitive, and one finds himself wondering whether he is losing his enthusiasm. While the same themes one has to pronounce may sound new to listeners, the president begins to find them obnoxious. (46)

The need of the president to avoid that circumstance in which he feels that his usefulness has been served must be considered as a very real contributor to presidential resignation. Possibly we have too frequently equated success with continued incumbency. But in light of presidential comments we should perhaps consider the academic presidency as a term of office, consensus seeing that term as a minimum of five but no longer than ten years. Likewise we should view that term as an institutional building block, complete within itself, yet an integral part of the previous structure and a foundation upon which subsequent addition
can be made.

Extended tenure:

The presidency, unlike certain professorial, management, and supervisory positions, is unique in the upward extension of the chronological age that is considered the time for official retirement. Although five members of the sample were age sixty-five or older, none were required to leave their positions because of specific age requirements; in fact, they would have been excluded from the sample had there been such requirement for their's would have been termination by retirement rather than resignation. All five upon leaving office became involved in full time alternative employment.

Although implicit, the generalized concept of age sixty-five as being a terminal point for employment plays an important role in the termination decision of those individuals who reach the age while active in the presidency. This almost unwritten understanding was expressed by one president when she commented:

With the emphasis on age 65 as retirement age, I felt I should retire at that age. I gave the Board of Trustees over one year's notice and was encouraged to complete a twelfth year in office, retiring at age 67. I continued in office because my health is excellent and I found satisfaction in completing certain objectives I wanted to accomplish. (9)

As was the case of a president discussed under the concern of those presidents avoiding extended tenure, agreements reached many years prior to their attainment of age sixty-five being termination in the several
year period around that age. As was the case of one:

The situation in my case was that I was appointed President of the University in the Spring of 1953; and at that time my understanding with the then-Chairman of the Trustees, Mr. [name], and his associates on the Board was that I would continue in the office of President at our mutual pleasure but not beyond the age at which I would wish to retire from the position, which was set at the time at 67. In consequence, having become 67 in the year 1970, I resigned from the office of President of [institution] on the first of September of that year, which was a convenient time for the new President, Dr. [name] to take over the responsibilities of the office. (27)

A variation of the pattern of extended tenure combines, as did the above case, age in excess of sixty-five plus a considerably above average length of time in the presidential chair. The two combine it seems to quite naturally bring sufficient reason to request release from the responsibilities of the presidency. The requests come in an atmosphere of success and regret, yet with an almost automatic degree of expectation. Two cases in point, both men being sixty-seven or older and with eighteen or more years in the presidency, are:

I was never unhappy with my role at [institution]. I was a product of the institution and was on its payroll continuously for more than 40 years, the last 28 as its president. (21)

I retired from the presidency of [institution] at the age of 72 after 18 years of service in that capacity. My tenure was pleasant throughout with no problems beyond those contained in our changing times and common to almost all institutions of higher education. (16)

But the matter of extended tenure does not necessarily need to be equated with age sixty-five. It may also occur in the forties and fifties when one has spent a considerable length of time in the presidency.
and feels either for individual or institutional good, or both, that departure from the office is the wisest course of action. A president who by age fifty-eight had served fifteen years as president felt the need for change, and was thus able over a period of several years to make a transition from the presidency.

As I commented on the main page, I really did not resign. However, I believed over several years that I should bow out. Some six years before I did so, I asked the board to consider the matter of a successor, and from that retreat we began to look for acceptable young leaders in the church and education. We brought in my successor who served two years under me before assuming full leadership. There has been no disagreement and tensions, as far as I know, between me and the board, or between him and me. (15)

And there is simply that matter of wanting change after involvement for an extended period of time. One cannot question the motives of the president who wrote:

I had served 17 years in my position of president, had moved the college to a new campus and had built the buildings essential at that time. I was ready for a change. (3)

Extended tenure either as expressed implicitly in reaching a particular age in life or having served in the presidency for a period of time far in excess of that considered "average", or both, would seem to be one of the most automatic reasons for presidential resignation. There can be no positive suggestion for change. There can be only admiration that both individual and institution have enjoyed continued and profitable relationship for such a length of time. The only point of reservation might well be assurance that the relationship was such for the entire period.
Possibly one of the most interesting of contributory factors to presidential resignation is that of the community environment. Such an environment can be generally described as the quality within the working and functioning relationship among all college-related constituencies. It is, in effect, the degree of health in the climate within which the president functions. Basic to the health of the climate is the understanding which individuals of the community have for each other, both singularly and in groups. While it is not necessary that there be agreement between constituents, it is extremely important that there be tolerance, respect, and some measure of understanding. The segmentalization and polarization which has occurred on our campuses in recent years has not made positive contribution to this climate and has in fact done much to tear it asunder. The need for such climate was first brought to the writer’s attention by the president of a state university, and was echoed by a number of subsequent replies.

One key point in the dynamics of organization is not brought out in your questions or my answers. A good executive must be given an opportunity to dream and to take a few chances. When deprived of such an opportunity, either because of the system of governance, a carping press, or unreasonable demands on one's time (as was the case during the spring of 1970), the executive will become disenchanted with his job. At the time of my resignation such a situation had not occurred but I saw all the danger signals. (14)

As has been previously stressed, the university does not function in a social vacuum and thus is subject to the pressures and demands of a society which is often at odds with itself. These circumstances have
contributed to the deterioration of community which has not been helpful to the president in his consensus-seeking or mediating role.

The frustrations spawned by a society which has inverted its values and reversed its priorities, putting war ahead of human well-being and preferring privilege to justice - these frustrations have pushed the on-coming college generation into an activism which over-reaches immediately attainable goals. The resulting strains on the academic community are evident throughout the nation and at [institution]. (23)

Some very important aspects of the community environment, however, are the relationships within the institution, and the affect which they have on the president's ability to function as community leader. Again, while agreement is not required, tolerance is. And when tolerance and understanding become the short suit, the chief administrative officer finds himself in basically a hostile climate.

One sometimes seems to be acquiring a bitter attitude toward seemingly ungrateful students and faculty. He must not expect to be popular, but one can count on the fingers of one hand the persons who will bolster him up in moments of loneliness and fund-raising travail. If you can't stand the heat you should get out of the kitchen we all know, so we go into these jobs with our eyes open. But after awhile one begins to wear down under the simplistic attacks and demands of students and faculty who have little understanding of the outside public and legislative and alumni conceptions of what is right for the University. As the man in the middle the university president has much in common with the mayor, the governor, or the United State president; today these jobs are "impossible" in the sense of winning a popularity award over any extended period of time. (46)

There is agreement on the difficulty, almost inability, to achieve an interaction between constituents in which each recognizes and appreciates the role and function which the other holds within the community. And the president finds himself, sometimes painfully, to indeed be "the
man in the middle." The frustration which results from the many attempts to promote such interaction becomes a significant factor for when asked what part the matter played in his resignation one president responded:

Very-very important factor. Limitations of time for committee meetings and personal conferences which could well make communication and understanding possible is basic. Lack of experienced and professional personnel in small college situations adds to the problem. There simply isn't enough time to talk with and establish trust and understanding with those who demand a share in the decision-making process. (41)

This inability was practically illustrated within the experience of one president in two different arenas and was of some importance in support of his decision to accept other employment when offered. The first was that of the understanding between the student body and the community in general, the second that of the faculty with the community at large. As he explained the situation:

With the students we developed another means of expression that worked well. The conventional kind of student senate had grown tired, and both students and faculty could see that the actions of students in this forum were meaningless. Accordingly the entire student government was reorganized so that a new body, representing both students and faculty, became responsible for social legislation on the campus; actions of the new Community Council were subject to presidential veto. This group provided a suitable place for debate. The limitation, of course, was that students saw no reason not to eliminate rules on student conduct, and they failed to see that the community in which [Institution] seeks to exist would not tolerate the complete elimination of decorum. When I left, this situation had not been resolved; indeed, I doubt that it is now.

[Institution] was a unique institution in that its financial success came largely from the immediate geographic surroundings; we never gained much support outside of
This meant that those who lived near us would look closely at what we did to determine whether we continued to merit generosity.

The faculty knew this and resented it. They sought to establish [institution] as a school with national support, even though other neighboring schools with such a broad base of interest did not get along so well financially as we did. An "instant development" program was a responsibility of the president that the faculty sought to impose. We did make a start to increase interest in the [institution's] needs, and this program was modestly successful. But no alumni program can be built overnight. And it is difficult to draw national support without the assistance of key alumni in distant cities. (33)

Understanding and trust are thus key factors in the attainment of a positive community environment. Yet the inability to attain those goals develops a sense of hopelessness on the part of the president which on occasion gives him strong encouragement to seek new involvement. For the president finds himself not unlike the pre-school teacher on a field trip to a meadow, spending inordinate amounts of time bringing wanderers back to the group and somehow never finding time to deal with the business at hand. Or as one president responded:

The frustration which arises from giving one's self to an institution of higher learning, being a buffer between younger faculty persons who know no sense of loyalty or devotion, whose words and actions often make academic attainment a matter of dubious worth, and the often conservative trustee who has little understanding of and less appreciation for academic freedom, but shares a deep sense of loyalty for the college, is an experience which illustrates the problem. Multiply this communication and comprehension gap to include the hippie type student and the older - much older donor; The churchman - sincere, sacrificial and highly motivated versus the student oriented dean who feels that open dorms will solve all his problems - etc. - the list is longer than this page. (41)

Means by which to attain a positively functioning community
environment are at best difficult for their basis lies in many variables which include the society as a whole and the constituents of the university. There is need, it would seem, to find opportunity for continuing community interaction, for face-to-face contact, for extensive sharing of ideas and plans, for the attainment of those exclusive traits of trust, understanding, and respect. And it is the near-impossible responsibility of the presidential officer to initiate such interaction. His failure to do so prompts the development of an environment which will in turn prompt his thought to remove himself from a climate in which it has become unhealthy to function.

Racial climate:

Four of the forty-four terminations in the group had as causal factors those issues related to race. Two could be considered of a relatively non-critical nature, i.e. not within the total context of confrontation, yet the other two were those of extreme pressures on the incumbent to leave office, which in both cases was either the immediate or subsequent case.

One case categorized as non-critical occurred within the confines of a white president leaving a predominately black college with an awareness that a Negro president would better serve the role at that particular developmental time within the institution. This change was not unlike those terminations which occurred within the context of avoiding extending tenure, of serving the institution beyond that point where leadership was becoming ineffective. Having held the presidency
for eight and one half years, and having achieved particular objectives, 
the president stated:

. . .when I took over the position as President, the re-
gional and national climate was in favor of integration. 
The black consciousness movement had not really taken 
hold, and the significance of a black president was not 
entirely apparent. By 1967, it was already quite clear 
that it would be helpful in the next phase of the col-
lege's development for a black person to be president 
of [institution]. This view was not shared by everyone, 
but it contributed to my decision to resign, along with 
the statement I have made above that the college had 
gone through a significant era in the 1960's, and that 
new leadership would be helpful for the next phase of 
its development. (31)

Previously cited under the evolution of the presidential role as a 
causal factor was an individual who left the presidency a matter of 
hours after making formal announcement of his termination. If one rea-
son could be cited for his termination it would be neither that of role 
evolution, nor that of a changing racial climate, but that of political 
and bureaucratic stifling, to be considered at length in future pages. 
Yet a very real part of the resignation centered around racial factors 
which were an integral part of the urban university at which he served. 
These areas were discussed within his resignation statement as he wrote:

I could have wished that the pace of institutional change 
had kept ahead of rising expectations born of the success-
es of the civil rights movement, and that there had been a 
little more patience or compassion mixed with the justifi-
able rising anger of the poor and black. But institutional 
inertia did not yield fast enough and the pressures of long-
deferred hope left no room for careful and considered action. 
(23)

Once again is reiterated the intimacy with which higher education 
relates to the society of which it is a part.
The most interesting response of the forty-four for the writer came in the form of a dictating tape which, when transcribed, became six single-spaced typewritten pages relating the particularly critical circumstances racial in nature which brought the end to the respondent's term of office. The presidency itself was two years in length, one year in planning and establishing the institution, the second year in actual operation. Excerpts from the letter speak for themselves:

I was not only the ill-selected white president of a black institution but I was also the first president.

The race issue so completely overpowered all other considerations in the [institution] presidency that the type of administrative concepts and theories upon which your five questions are based may have little or no meaning.

The beginning of the end really came in the first major faculty convocation as we called it in mid-June in 1968. At this point there were about forty of the 120 faculty positions unfilled and a resolution was enacted requiring, at least that was the way it was put, the administration to insure that all of the remaining forty faculty positions went to blacks. The first seventy or eighty faculty positions filled at that time were about equally divided between blacks and whites. This was the beginning of what eventually became a wide-spread practice of non-rational and unconventional faculty hiring. This resolution probably was given more credence by the administration and the Board than it should have been, and upon reflection it would not have been given anywhere as much attention as it received.

In the autumn of the second year, the first year of operation with students, the academic vice president of the institution, a black, presented a paper to the annual convention of a national higher education association outlining the conditions of the institution, or in the words of the president, "revealed the true internal conditions of the college in a very forthright way." He continued:
The reaction to [the academic vice president's] address was vehement and rapid. The students were appalled that such a negative description would be publically made of their College. The radical student government group were very critical of the address and especially the fact that it had been made by a black person regarding conditions at a college which was predominately ninety-four percent black. My own reaction was one of weakness. I see now upon reflection [the academic vice president] hoped that I would immediately express my complete confirmation of the many changes made in his address. Instead, I took a more conciliatory role, attempting to bring the many arguing constituencies together within the College. But as they said in the 1964 Republic presidential campaign, in my heart I knew that [the academic vice president] was exactly right.

The faculty wanted the expressions in the address countered, but were really not willing to do anything to improve the conditions which [the academic vice president] described, and many of the deplorable conditions regarding faculty recruitment especially were very much in the hands of the faculty leadership. They asked me to deliver a State of the College address in mid-January which would receive wide circulation throughout the community...and this I agreed to do. The State of the College address emphasized the successes we had had in overcoming in only fifteen months many problems in starting a college from complete scratch. The statistics were impressive, the passages regarding facilities and funding were positive, and probably both laudatory and true, but they masked the internal horrible growing cancer which had settled in the lifeblood of the College.

Approximately one month later the president distributed to a non-public meeting of the board of control a memorandum entitled "The Real State of the College," as distinguished from the mid-January address which he "by inference labeled 'The Unreal State of the College.'"

The principal contents of this real state of the college memo were two prevailing conditions. First was the total "blackening" of the college, as I put it. Now this means that faculty appointments were no longer being made on merit but only race. It meant that curriculum decisions regarding the selection of course titles and content were being based on non-rational and totally racial criteria. This was being done with the sanction of the faculty, and was in an area which was largely out of the
control of the administration, despite [the academic vice
president's] valiant attempts to turn the situation a-
round to some extent.

The other big problem which was intricately related was
the general movement away from rational organizational
lines. With the strong salary schedule that we had been
able to secure as part of our funding efforts in the
planning year, we had been able to attract several very
distinguished faculty members. But the machinations of
the faculty leadership were such that these people were
denied any effective voice in the development of the
educational program. There have been recent writings in
administration which speak of "meritocracy," and we were
actually operating a non-meritocracy in which it seemed
that the persons with the least merit were entrusted to
make the important decisions. We reached a point where
full professors, white and black, with many, many years
of collegiate experience were relegated to complete im-
potence, while radical, inexperienced persons who had
been high school teachers the year before were placed in
charge. One is reminded of the line in one of Tom Leher's
records which he comments that he likes the Army because
it "does not discriminate on the basis of race, color,
creed, or ability." Our condition was that we did dis-

There is of course much more that could be said. This
forty-five minute tape is the most forthright, even quasi-
public statement that I have made regarding the conditions
at the college despite many requests for articles and mono-
graphs regarding the experience. (45)

There is little that the writer can do to enlarge upon or underline
those factors which prompted the termination.

The matter of race and the current racial climate affects the large
majority of college presidents today, some to the point of causing res-
ignation. The idea of black presidents to serve predominately black
institutions has considerable merit. White presidents of institutions
which are in the majority black have need of particular skills and sen-
sitivities in dealing with problems unique to such a college or univer-
sity. But on the whole, the matter of racial climate as it affects the
presidency is no less complex than the same climate as it affects all spheres of life within the United States. To solve that concern would find solution to one of the primary sociological problems facing the nation.

Inability for personal growth:

Strange as it may seem, a role which is generally seen as complex and demanding is left by some because of its routine nature and limited challenges. While such occurrences are infrequent, the contexts in which they occur are understandably just that. The matter of limited challenge was cited by a two year college president when he stated:

[Institution] is a junior college owned by the [religious denomination] for the primary purpose of beginning the college education of those who want to be pastors and teachers in the [denomination]. It also included a liberal arts curriculum for those who had other vocational goals in mind. The total enrollment, however, was about 200, and I saw no real possibility for me to increase the enrollment of either church-vocation students or others.

Since the challenges seemed minimal in that position, I accepted [another position]. I moved to the new position for greater stimulation and personal growth. (18)

It is not, however, the limited challenges of the position that are of most concern, rather the effect which the demands of the jobs have on the personal lives of the incumbents, specifically the inability for one to have significant control over the ordering of ones priorities. After citing what he felt to be some routine aspects of the position, another private two year college president cited as one of several reasons contributing to his resignation:
Wanted more freedom to schedule my own life and activities.

Plain desire to try the world as it is - not the isolated clam bake that most private and many public universities have become.

[I was] a bit disenchanted with the old platitudes, the opportunism, the old vote-taking routines of most college presidents, the ones who got fired posing as authorities, to wit Clark Kerr. (19)

The demands of the office in terms of specific time involvement present very real barriers to those whose interests have previously been and continue to be individually oriented research. Such was the case of the president within the sample who spent the shortest period of time in the presidency (one year), realizing upon completion of the period that the demands of the presidential position did not permit him the type of personal fulfillment which he desired. In reflecting upon the position, he stated:

The discipline of the job requires large amounts of time for external relationships. The pressure is there and when an individual is oriented toward research or private studies he usually has difficulty in keeping his external relationships in focus and in balance. Being disected by the demands of external publics prevented me from having time to do private reading and research and was a factor in resigning to enter the employment of a private foundation.

The. . . [lack of] opportunities for personal growth and development were a major consideration in my resignation. (35)

The presidency can thus stifle an individual in two extreme ways. The first is that of being insufficiently challenging to such a degree that the individual feels his abilities are not being used to the extent to which they could be. The second is the demand of time far in
excess of that which the individual is willing to devote and still enable himself to have the time for involvement in areas which have previously held meaning for his life. In either instance, personal growth does not occur and the president chooses the alternative of leaving the office.

Departure from religious order

The role expectations of the college president usually occur within a secular context, and are based primarily on an educational foundation. However, in certain circumstances the administrative leader of a church-related institution finds himself serving a dual function of both spiritual and educational leader of the community. In some regard, then, the individual serves a dual role and thus increases the chance that expectations of his total role will experience conflict. This circumstance occurred twice within the sample, and was in both instances the case of Roman Catholic clergy finding an inability to continue their religious role, and finding that both roles must be forsaken. The procedure of leaving the religious and educational role simultaneously would appear to be commonly accepted, i.e. that it is the natural thing to do when leaving the religious role. As one who left the Roman Catholic brotherhood simply stated:

My main reason for leaving the presidency of [institution] is that I made a decision to withdraw from the religious life. (40)

Although somewhat more complex, the second, a priest, indicated:
The only role expectation significant in my leaving the presidency was extraneous to the presidency, i.e. at the time I was a Roman Catholic priest and expected to project that role first, to protect ecclesiastical interests first and, in general, to pursue the academic freely but secondarily.

Actually, the decision to leave was entirely mine. I announced it at the peak of my popularity and at the climax of a number of swift achievements. It was a real shock to the board and various constituencies though I had no desire to shock. I just wanted out of a pseudo-clerical role. (12)

Again, though occurring infrequently, the dual nature of the clerical - administrative leader role and the differing natures of the two should be considered within the context in which it occurs, the religiously affiliated institution, as a unique causal factor in presidential termination.

One cannot leave a consideration of presidential role expectations without reflecting on specific supportive comments by individuals of the sample. The comments which have preceded in general indicate the presidency to be a difficult position to fill, yet the general assumption can be made that the large majority of the group would choose the same course of action if theirs was the opportunity to do it over again. These assumptions are based on the following comments, the first two by former presidents of Big Ten institutions:

My two resignations as president were in no sense motivated by frustration or unhappiness in the positions. As anyone knows, the role of president is a taxing one, and there are times of discouragement. But on the whole I found the job rewarding and interesting. I would not change things very much if I had it to do over again. The fact that I have become involved a third time suggests that I do not consider the position to be a hopeless one. (22)
I could only respond that I thoroughly enjoyed the opportunity to be President of [institution], that the University was very generous and understanding, and treated me very well every step of the way. (21)

I think I would conclude by saying that on the whole I enjoyed the job of president very much. It is a many faceted position, and I like variety. It is also a somewhat lonely position as far as becoming well acquainted with people is concerned. Our best and closest friends from our [institution] days include only a few people from the faculty and administration, a few trustees and a few townspeople. I suspect we will keep in touch with these individuals as long as we live. (29)

I did not leave the presidency because I was dissatisfied in any way, or thought it was too difficult an assignment in this day and age. (26)

I have delayed in answering your questionnaire because it is difficult and time consuming to develop the nuances of a response. Much of the purport of your questions is to the effect that the presidency is a "bad" or "unrewarding" job. Peter Drucker in his book The Effective Executive calls it an impossible job. Frankly, I enjoyed my ten year stint, although I have no desire to continue for another ten years. The rewards far exceed the moments of disaffection. In a dynamic institution like this University in the last ten years the exhilaration of physical growth and faculty improvement would be impossible to match in any other undertaking. (46)

General Administration

Basic administration:

The almost singular problem of a general nature reflected by presidents as they administer their institutions in a period of changing governance is the matter of democratic decision-making and the
uncertainty at which point on the democratic - authoritarian scale is most effective for their particular institution. There is consensus that community government is a part of the picture, and the ability or inability to adapt to such procedures is difficult for both incumbent and constituents. Such concern cannot be considered a major factor in termination for it was determined to be a contributing factor in only three cases, and then only as one of several others. Yet it does find general expression throughout the sample as a matter of increasing interest in a changing presidential style. It is interesting to note the difference between those presidents who have experienced tenure of more than average length and their perception of the part they have played in a community government and those perceptions of presidents of more recent selection. A president of ten year's duration expressed this administrative concern in terms of delegating authority, and a certain inability to know at which point and to what extent presidential authority exists.

To a certain extent these [general administrative] factors played a part. You just cannot delegate all functions and, when you find that it is impossible to fulfill them all, there is only one alternative - to resign. (?)

Those who have seen the trend, and have lived through the change, reflect a former need for an administrative authority yet likewise foresee a need for newer styles. A president whose resignation came primarily because of extended tenure (eighteen years) and older age (seventytwo), commented:

Because of pending age retirement perhaps I was
considerably less restive under incursions with administrative authority by faculty and students than might otherwise have been the case.

At the same time I had to admit that my incumbency was pretty authoritarian in philosophy. Be it good or bad I was able to lead a program of aggressive college development at [institution]. I was greatly pleased, and rewarded, by this and, I believe, this was more widely shared than perhaps I shall ever know. I do think that the "trials and tribulations" of the college presidency is over-played. (16)

While there exists presidential concern over the ability or inability to adapt to a changing leadership style, the concern would appear to be more outwardly directed than inward. In brief, the concern is that of educating those of the community in the most effective means of joint responsibility and leadership. At times this process is most rewarding, and the concept of shared authority finds perfect balance. Yet at other times the counter-posing elements exist in a state of imbalance, to the concern and distress of the chief administrative officer. Both circumstances, balance and imbalance, my exist within the same institution.

Basically the internal relationships became increasingly more gratifying during the last years of my tenure and almost created an obligation on my part to a few fine individual administrators making the decision to leave difficult. Thus I had a president's office made up of four vice presidents, anyone of whom could act directly in my name and frequently did. This spared me a lot of detail.

On the other hand had I stayed my compulsion for ever greater progress and effectiveness would have necessitated some difficult firings. Also some lower level administrators were taking advantage of my decentralized type of administration and I would have had to pull in the reins - something which temperamentally would have been difficult. (14)

The increasing need for democratic structure was underlined by the
president who took exception to the example of the questionnaire when he responded:

"The president alone..." I doubt that this is true in many institutions today. As a matter of fact such an autocratic concept is surely anachronistic. We need structure for thoroughly democratic approaches to the achievement for institutional goals. (12)

The concern of the administrative leader with the developing abilities of the university community to both encourage community government yet also profitably participate was the response of several presidents. That concern centered around the difficulty with which constituent bodies gained an understanding of the methods and purposes of democratic functions.

I surely functioned for 7 of my 8 years as a "strong" president. I don't feel I was arbitrary but we moved—prodigiously for a school of our size. This filled many troops with awe and they found going "democratic" hard. I kept encouraging this. Response was clumsy. (6)

I practiced democracy to my utmost. It was often interpreted as indecision (waiting for the interminable faculty decision makers). The students were far better at decisions than the faculty. We had the full treatment of committees and democratic organization. I exercised my veto on some occasions and it gave me satisfaction. One must "test" the presidential "chair" now and then and an appropriate issue is welcome to find out where one stands. (49)

Yet on occasion the community-centered decision process within itself becomes an authoritarian center and in effect a dictatorship by group. This occurred within the sample in an institution which had been newly-founded, and which by the middle of the second year of
operation had in existence such a power base. Writing of the situation the former president wrote:

My fellow staff members and I reflecting over the events of our last year with [institution] (virtually all of my fellow administrators left at the same time I did), marked the beginning of the end of our service to the College to be establishment of what was called the Interim College Committee, or the ICC as we called it, which was a multi-constituent and theoretically advisory committee consisting of delegates of faculty, administration, students, student services, and library staff, and classified staff. A major segment of the power of the administration was given to this body and a somewhat larger segment was later usurped by that body. Eventually we reached a point where most of the decisions which emerged regarding college characteristics and operation were not the really best judgment of the president and the remainder of the administration, and this was the principal cause of our departure. (45)

The concerns of general administration, then, revolve around the community decision-making process, and level and degree of involvement on the part of both president and constituencies. This involvement was considered at length by one president as it affected the general administration of the institution. In viewing the presidency he wrote:

Comparison with any major political figure is obvious. . . .A man is elected to political office precisely because his constituents disagree with one another about major policies and the means of carrying them out. He is then sustained in his office because of this conflict in his constituency, and during his term of office it is almost impossible to remove him. . . .The university president on the other hand is expected to satisfy all his constituencies no matter how deeply they are at war with each other. He does not have the protection of a set term of office and he cannot count on the structure of a "loyal opposition" to depersonalize the conflicts with which he must live. In contrast to a major office-holder the university president is exposed, without party or organized support.

Later, in considering how the presidency has changed, the same
president remarked:

Presidents themselves must change their expectations of the job. . . .There needs to be understanding that it so a position of limited tenure [and] . . .a clear acceptance of conflict as the central fact in the president's life.

But this serves only as background for his comments on how he would view the matter of administrative structure, and the general administrative process:

As presidents change their expectations of the job, so must they change its structure.

There is only one answer, I believe. Not only must there be able and adequate staff help for the president, but the position itself must be divided so that there are at least two people to share the overall responsibility for the institution.

What we need (and the titles are unimportant) is a structure which puts the senior member of the administration in a strong place inside the governing board, and puts the chief operating officer in an equally strong spot within the daily operating structure of the university. (25)

The concern for issues of basic administration is not strong among reasons for presidential termination. However, there is more than a casual concern over the means of implementing community government both on the part of the president as well as the constituencies. The point of balance which such structure finds is important to the effective functioning of the institution. Yet, as shown among the responses of the sample, this balance often finds itself more closely placed to one constituent than another. Also brought to light by presidential comment was the unique administrative role of the president as compared with political office, and a need to consider new ideas and concepts
regarding administrative structure.

Objective achievement:

Among the most important factors contributing to presidential termination is that which has been defined as objective achievement. Such achievement may be expressed in different ways yet it finds expression either implicitly or explicitly in the chief administrative officer's conceptualization that what he has set out to do for the institution has been accomplished, his personal and professional goals have been attained, and his contribution to the institution has been of notable worth and significance. Interestingly enough it was not cited in any case as a singular factor, but found expression more often among several factors. The achievement of such goals would seem to bring a feeling of closure to the presidency, with continued service in the role being somewhat anticlimactic. This expression of achievement came in varying ways, either generally or specifically. Generally it was expressed as:

I simply knew that for my own personal growth, and possibly for the long run good of the university, I should leave. Much of what I had set out to do had been done. (14)

It was my opinion at the end of my period at [institution] that I had done what I could do, and that it was time for someone else with fresh ideas and new energies to take over. (22)

No time factor can be superimposed on objective achievement. Seldom does it seem that in a certain period of time so many goals can be attained, and that at the termination of the period with goals
accomplished or not the president leaves office. For it would seem that there is a tendency of the president to remain in office until such time that he feels within himself that the objectives which either he estab-
lished or which he assumed have been finalized.

My 12 years were double the average for presidents. It took me twice as long to carry out my administrative plan - which I did before I left. (49)

Speaking of his desire to move his Roman Catholic institution to greater lay participation, a priest remarked in the same vein:

It took nearly six years to effect a new board even on a trial basis. At that point I resigned, tired, but confident that the wheels could not be turned back. (12)

It is thus a matter of first reaching the goal, and then termina-
tion. A great deal of integrity can be sensed in this approach, for it would seem that an unwritten code exists which denies the president the alternative of departure until that time when he feels his objectives achieved and the need of new objectives for the institution as represent-
ed in new presidential leadership.

On occasion objectives are planned in advance, and upon their com-
pletion termination is automatic. This is in contrast to the review of accomplishments in retrospect and the subsequent realization that signif-
icient contribution has been made. Such advance planning is obvious in the following remarks:

I had long determined to withdraw from the presidency at age 55, which time would coincide with the cycle of re-
accreditation and completion of several buildings and a successful fund drive. (8)
This decision [to resign] was made partially last fall when I determined that I would take this action either this year or next, depending upon the progress toward top-priority university objectives with which my colleagues and I were involved. Through the hard work of these colleagues and with the cooperation of many friends, practically all of these objectives have become, or soon will become, realities. (2)

I think I should say why I took the post at [institution] and left when I did, since both events proceeded according to schedule. I was urged by my bishop and by the college board to help them reorganize the college. There had been no legal charter for over half a century and the curriculum was almost as old. They were wise enough to realize that change was needed, and I moved in with a hard-hitting program in the course of which we got a new legal charter which "secularized" the college as far as connection with the denomination was concerned, developed a totally new curriculum, and had approved by the Trustees a faculty constitution which devolved to the faculty a number of major decision areas which were previously held by the Board. (17)

More prevalent it would seem is the circumstance in which objective achievement is more an after-the-fact realization than being a planned objective. In brief, prior to such accomplishment, the president does not consider the factor as a possible catalyst in the terminat'ion decision. Yet upon its being an accomplished fact, it plays an obvious role as a contributing factor. It is an important aspect of the presidential comments which follow:

So, with goals accomplished and while coach of a winning team I looked outside of Academe for new worlds to conquer. I'm delighted I did. (32)

Enjoyed this [external relationship] role. Started a major fund raising, friend raising program, which was quite successful. Let the university's accomplishments, especially in art, music, and environmental design, speak for themselves; so never worried about PR as such or our image.(14)
I had the rare opportunity to participate in the building of a great university and continuously had the support of the faculty, the students, the alumni, and generally the Trustees. (21)

I was president of a predominately Negro (Black) college for eight and one half years. In that period of time, the college tripled in size, added many white and foreign students, turned to co-education, added many new buildings to its facilities, completely revised its academic program, and developed in many other worthwhile ways. It was my feeling that I had a very fruitful experience in a changing era, and that I should turn the reins over to someone else to keep the momentum going for the next phase of the college's development. (31)

With respect to the raising of capital funds, I did not feel I could say in the [final] report that the $1 million per year raised during my administration was considerably larger than had ever been raised in the past. The same can be said for the [institution] fund, the annual fund raising effort of the institution. Finally, there was some serious public relations problems with various elements in the community when I arrived. These were largely liquidated during my tenure, and [the institution's] reputation in its immediate community has never been better. (29)

In a sense, it was the "external bodies" that sealed it. When our college, in my last two years, was assured of an unusual and favorable relationship with county and state (Guaranteeing financial stability and low tuition while retaining independent status) I felt I had accomplished the coup de grace. If this had still been pending I would have postponed my leaving. (8)

The entire picture [of alumni concern] changed as one after another of academic and financial goals were reached, debt retired, long-range accreditation established, millions of dollars put into endowment and new buildings. Recognition and honor came to the school, and they were proud. (15)

Each circumstance in a little different way expresses a feeling of satisfaction on the part of the president that his administration has added something of significance to the institution. And thus when
combined with one or more factors - availability of another position, physical exhaustion, etc. - the feeling of objective achievement often finalizes the termination decision.

Board relationship:

As previously cited, the relationship which the president shares with the board of control is unique in American organizational structure. Generally speaking in terms of presidential termination the relationship can be viewed as a positive one, for although it is a contributing factor, it is not a prime determinant. In fact, several comments of a very positive nature came from individuals within the sample.

【Institution】is an independent institution whose governing board of prominent business men and educators I found to be as understanding and compassionate as any other constituency with which I dealt. Indeed the so-called "generation gap" (another over-publicized matter) and the alleged cultural gap between college faculties and the American business community could exist only in the most limited degree if a solid acquaintanceship is sustained. (16)

My relationship with board of control and other groups with decision making power were most cordial. (18)

No problem here, either. Private college boards are much less susceptible to vested interest, political, athletic pressures. I had experience in both public and private colleges and life was much simpler in the private sector and board relationships were pleasant yet at times more subject to general apathy - the let George do it approach usually. (19)

Like comments of positive nature, there were likewise comments of somewhat reserved and conditional nature. Boards of control, similar
to other social organizations, move through periods of strength and weakness, and the several comments of reservation dealt with boards which, in the opinion of the president, were moving from times of former strength. In neither case were these factors for the presidential termination; simply reflections on the effectiveness of their respective boards.

Our Board of Regents, in my judgment deteriorated in caliber, and tended toward bureaucracy in my last few years. I found it annoying and time consuming - without benefits. (32)

I had a good nine man board (2 being women) which was most supportive and understanding - again until a year or so ago. Polarization began to develop although I had already resigned at this point.

Governing boards can be without doubt a deadening influence, especially if they become divided. Then a president does become lonely in a significant way, less free to act and to plan and take chances. If I were still a president at [institution], I believe I could no longer work with what was once a better than average board. (14)

Finally, there come those circumstances in which the presidential - board relationship is one of basic inability to function together in an effective manner, and the most expedient manner of resolution short of complete change in board membership is presidential resignation. The primary cause of this break-down in relationship would appear to come from an inability on the part of the board both individually and collectively to assume the role which is perceived for them by the president. In such instances the president feels an incursion on his areas of right and responsibility, with the board taking an overly active part in the operation and administration of the institution rather than the
basic policy-making responsibility which is theirs.

It is interesting to note that the three presidencies brought to termination in part as a result of board relationships were all relatively new institutions, all three instances in which the individual was serving as the first president of the college. There would thus seem to be both an initial involvement of a board of control which is of such a directive nature as to affect presidential functioning, and evidently a subsequent educative process for the board as evidenced by its lack of citation among presidencies of established institutions.

The colleges themselves were quite different - a relatively small community college, an urban public college, and a private liberal arts institution. Yet the common factor cited was, again, the failure of the board to play the role perceived by the president.

From the community college:

The general administrative duties were very enjoyable, but with an all-new board and inexperienced in any type of professional or public school experience. They wanted to "run" the college. They were not far-sighted to allow the administration to bring innovations with the academic goals of the college.

[My departure was thus to gain] relief from. . .an uncooperative Board (4 out of 6 members). (34)

From the urban public college:

I always operated as though I did alone to retain responsibility for achieving the overall goal of institutional purpose. . . Of course this responsibility was shared with the Board of Trustees and perhaps intervention on the part of the Board in areas of decision-making which should have remained with me, possibly including the academic vice president, was a serious issue. (45)
From the private liberal arts college:

Probably the major reason why I left the presidency was the Board of Trustees. The Trustees as a group had no experience as policy-makers and in many ways meddled in administrative procedures rather than being in a position of setting guidelines and letting the administration operate. The Board was totally "local" in character, had very little understanding about the college operation, and while in many ways had given birth to the idea of a liberal arts institution they could not step aside nor support the total college operation. There was an unwillingness to expand the Board or replace non-participants on the Board with people outside of the community. Thus, the Board became inbred and could not develop and grow into the type of controlling body which the institution must have.

I feel great progress was made in all areas with all our constituents except with the Board of Trustees. This was most frustrating since I almost had the feeling that there was an unwillingness to learn about their role. (38)

The relationship with the board of control is thus not generally a prime determinant in presidential termination. However, in particular circumstances, specifically in the case of developing institutions, it can be a factor of major consideration. The problem which would seem to be foremost is an educational process which would move the board from administrative involvement to policy-level participation. And it is the inability of the president to have the board immediately perceive and accept the policy rather than operational role that brings about conflict and chance of presidential termination.

Political and bureaucratic stifling:

In the case of state supported institutions, the factor of politics and bureaucracy become active as a terminal point around which conflict
can result. On occasion this conflict reaches the point of intolerability, and the incumbent president finds the most viable alternative to be that of resignation. Such stifling is usually not intrainstitutional, but is more likely to occur in relationships with state-level forces. The hindering nature of these forces may be of differing types - philosophical, budgetary, programming. Yet their effect is the same: A conceptualization on the part of the president that his leadership abilities have been significantly altered by factors over which he has little control. As he viewed the effects of state control on his institution, one former state university president commented:

Relationships with the state board of regents were less satisfactory as some of the more capable members resigned. The regents were too political, too afraid to think big, so they helped put a damper on higher education that make change and innovation increasingly difficult.

The leveling off of state subsidies was inevitable, however, and was a factor in my deciding to resign. I did not wish to be a party to the dilution of educational quality so painfully enhanced in recent years. (14)

The effect which a state-level board had on his own board of control and institution was a primary factor in the resignation of one state college president. He related the circumstance as follows:

Role expectations were significant in my decision to leave the presidency - primarily because the Board of Control had gradually assumed different goals for the college than they had when I was first employed. These changes were in part the result of the development of a commission on higher education in the State, to which the members of the Board were reacting defensively. I found it increasingly difficult as time went on to adapt to the goals of the institution as they developed under these circumstances.

Despite the changes in goals referred to, I retained
the support of the Board throughout my term. Strictly speaking, therefore, I was quite free of administrative problems. Increasing bureaucratic influences in the State, however, clearly indicated the imminent possibility of my over-stepping the delicate line of acceptable representation of the Board, and led to my realizing the advantage and satisfaction of "quitting while I was ahead."

My strongest reason for leaving was the result of my complete failure (I felt) in relating to the Commission on Higher Education - a newcomer on the scene in my state. The Commission seemed unnecessarily involved with trivia and oblivious to its major role that was singularly needed - that of coordinating the programs in higher education on a state-wide basis. It revealed weaknesses and not strengths; it kept the members of my Board of Control on the defensive; and I was not quiet with respect to its obvious failures and deficiencies. (24)

In both instances the president felt himself at odds with the organizational representation of higher education at the state level. His inability to make significant change, and in some regard his inability to make any change whatsoever, led to his resignation decision. It should be noted that in both cases, the state boards of control were relatively new creations, i.e. established within the past decade. Whether or not there is some relationship in a similar circumstance which appeared among relatively new institutional boards of control previously cited, i.e. the tendency for the board to involve itself with administrative rather than policy matters, offers the possibility of future study.

While political and bureaucratic stifling may result from organizational forces, it may likewise result from the actions of specific and identifiable individuals. While such individuals do not produce the total environmental conditions bringing about resignation, their actions
within the existing environment are sufficient to make significant con-
tribution to the termination decision. Such was the case of a state
governor in the resignation of a southern university president. In cit-
ing his reasons for resignation, the individual stated:

Political harassment. . .when I integrated the [institution] played a major part in my decision to leave. I
stayed until [the Governor] was out of government and an
enlightened [name] had become Governor, and I thought I
had won my battle. Even though [former Governor] has
returned as Governor, he will not be able to affect the
university because of the competent faculty and students.

A case mentioned earlier in the study under the subject of presi-
dential role evolution, had as its primary cause of termination the fac-
tor of political and bureaucratic stifling. For in this instance the
termination came as the result of both state-level organizational forces,
as well as the actions of one individual. In forwarding a copy of his
formal resignation statement, the individual also sent a personal letter
with the following comments:

Caught between the back-lash and the black-lash, I endeav-
ored through reason and persuasion under heavy pressures
(psychological and confrontationist) to resolve the prob-
lems peaceably. Three weeks of round-the-clock negotia-
tions had reached within 48 hours of affirmative resolu-
tion, when a mayoral candidate filed injunctive papers
which forced the reopening of the college and terminated
the negotiations. Classes reopened and violent fighting
between races ensued. After an interval of a day, college
reopened again, with police coverage - then closed again
because of violence. Again, the mayoral candidate inter-
ceded with injunctive action, making my position untenable.
I removed myself from the college in the hope that, with
one focal point of controversy removed, the college might
have a viable future.

The enclosed statement summarized the situation as I saw
it on the morning of May 9, 1969. The clarity of vision
of that moment has survived subsequent reexamination.

To put the matter bluntly; Neither the Mayor nor the Governor responded to my February efforts to insure an adequate budget, thereby guaranteeing that the aspirations of blacks and Puerto Ricans for college admission would be sharply disappointed. By May of 1969, the pressures of equity resulted in a campus take-over which I almost succeeded in resolving - only to be defeated by a political aspirant who represented the white back-lash in its most venal form.

Excerpts from the resignation statement follow:

May 9, 1969

I have this morning requested the [board of control] to relieve me of my duties and responsibilities as President of [institution] at the earliest possible moment and certainly not later than nine o'clock Monday morning, May 12, 1969.

Last February, when the basic outlines of the probable budget for the coming academic year became clear, I submitted my resignation in protest against an unconscionable deprivation of the [city's] youth. I have watched with dismay at the intervening months have confirmed my fears that no adequate fiscal support would be forthcoming from State and City.

Nevertheless, my purpose had been to see the College through to the end of this academic year. Men and events have made this earlier separation necessary.

My own frustrations as a reconciler of differences and a catalyst for constructive change have become increasingly difficult to carry out. And with the intrusion of politically motivated outside forces in recent days, it has become impossible to carry on the process of reason and persuasion. (23)

Political and bureaucratic stifling of the presidential office may occur organizationally or individually. Yet the effect which they have is the same: An inability of the chief administrative officer to operate with the degree of freedom which he feels necessary for the proper functioning of an institution of higher education.
Internal Relations

Basic internal relations:

The general areas of internal relationships, and those which follow - external relations, represent the two areas of consideration which held the least degree of concern among the presidential group as causal factors of presidential termination. The interrelatedness of all areas, however, does not make such indicated lack of concern a clear case, i.e. factors of internal and external natures are integral parts of factors categorized elsewhere. Yet as specific causal factors, they do not play a major role.

Basic relations are those within the university which include president, faculty, administration, staff, and students, and are of such an interrelated nature as to prevent their categorization under one of the specific constituency headings.

There is no one predominant pattern of concern among the basic internal relations of a college or university, although if one can be cited it would center around trust and the ability to have confidence in the exact positions of constituencies. This results from a number of factors, although the inability to experience extended periods of time in interaction would seem to be primary; the opportunity to learn of others through continuing contact and interpersonal relationships. Although it did not contribute to his resignation - few comments which follow are those of presidents for whom internal relations were a causal factor - one president wrote:
Internal relationships are matters of great sensitivity. Usually the most critical human relations area is the matter of trust. The president often has difficulty relating to groups other than through individuals. This is necessary because of the limited time but often misunderstandings occur and the trust is not established. (35)

While delegation of authority, the decentralization of operation, is often considered to be a positive means of bringing groups of individuals into closer working relationships with one another, there are factors which must be considered within that effort to increase trust and confidence through increased contact and communication. This point was made by a member of the sample in the following way:

My relationship with faculty was good and in general stayed remarkably that way. I found as I delegated power, however, that many of the men I chose as vice-presidents really didn't have the confidence of the faculty or students. They lacked prudence and damaged the "regime." (6)

This inability, in some regard the lack of opportunity, for relations which build trust may be both professional as well as personal.

The example [of the questionnaire] failed to distinguish between professional and personal relationships, a distinction which is a matter of concern to some presidents - and indeed to some presidents' wives. If either feels the need for intimate friendship with administration and faculty, he is likely to find himself ultimately disappointed, if not emmittened.

Survival depends upon a rather early recognition that no campus group will feel that it is commanding a sufficient amount of the president's time and attention. In the absence of any organized opposition, however, I should question that the realist would find these criticisms a cause for resignation. (48)

For the most part there was in fact no organized opposition. Yet the limited circumstances in which internal relationships bring about
resignation can be very real and very frustrating for those who do experience them. One, a Roman Catholic Brother cited earlier as having left the presidency when at the same time leaving his religious order, was forced to comment:

However, since I left the Brothers and the presidency I have received five offers of college presidencies and I have refused all five of them. Obviously I have no desire to return to the pressures of life which befall one who is trying to steer the collegiate ship through the Scylla of the faculty and the Charybdis of the student body. I feel that my own talents and knowledge could better be served in a more personal way in other capacities. (40)

Trust, confidence, working relationships - all are words or phrases which characterize the concern among those within the institution. Failure to achieve such characteristics is difficult for all who find themselves within the college community, with resultant discouragement. One interesting comment which aptly summarizes this situation came from a state college president:

...for the last few years I have not worked to sell the institution so much to people outside as to the people within the college community. (44)

Those relations which involve all constituents of the geographic campus are not prominent among termination causal factors. While they are of concern, they cannot be considered as aspects of pressure upon the presidential office to the degree that a considerably larger number of motivating factors would appear to be.

Faculty relations:
The concerns of resigned presidents as they experienced interaction with their faculty can be categorized under three areas: Institutional leadership, academic freedom, and professional responsibility.

The first of these concerns, that of institutional leadership, centers itself on the basic question of power, and resolving the question of who shall head the institution - faculty or administration. This matter of leadership as an either-or situation is obviously an oversimplification, for neither heads the institution unqualifiedly. There is of course no definitive line which separates such leadership, and the line itself varies from institution to institution and with individual presidents and faculty bodies. Yet when that line as it is perceived by one or the other is violated, reaction occurs. In possibly the clearest case of faculty - presidential difference within the sample, the former incumbent wrote:

Thank you for your recent letter. I think that I can answer your request rather briefly. Everything went well with my presidency except one thing. I ran into a group of entrenched senior faculty members who, I discovered, had essentially been running the institution for some time. A power struggle eventually ensued, and I had to decide whether to stay on, slug it out and probably damage the institution or whether to withdraw, (giving the institution a year's notice), and let another individual try again. I elected the latter and left the institution with mutually good feelings on the part of everyone except perhaps a few die-hard faculty opponents. (29)

The board of control variable as a leadership factor can also be introduced to complicate matters, and was by a president who felt that the "contest between Board and Faculty" over a determination of who should determine university policy as it affected his leadership role contributed in no small measure to his final decision to leave.
If the Faculty is willing to follow the President's leadership, at least some of the time, then this contest between board and faculty can be diminished. When the faculty does not follow the president, for whatever the reasons, then it is nearly impossible for the institution to make progress. Thus the key to a dynamic program is the leadership the faculty will follow; if it is leadership with which the board will concur, then the university can begin to master some of its problems.

We had a good example of this need for faculty to follow the kind of policy upon which the board would insist. During a confrontation with a large group of students the administration building was occupied during my presidency. We had a faculty regulation against the disruption of normal university activities; but I feared that on a significant test of that policy the faculty would not seek enforcement without a thorough discussion of the event. Accordingly I sent out the order that no one seek to enter the occupied building and thus test prematurely the faculty policy. Within hours we held a faculty meeting, a long one, during which we discussed the occupation thoroughly. Finally the faculty voted by a rather decisive vote that those who continued to occupy the building were in violation of a university rule. Before the meeting could adjourn, the occupation had ended. Students realized that there was no point in trying to battle a unified faculty.

But not as often as we needed did the faculty agree to follow my leadership. Frankly I could have attracted much more faculty support if I had disregarded some of the factors in our total situation that I considered crucial. (These since have become much more evident: Costs that outrun income, and a revolt by the community against university permissiveness) (33)

At that point, then, when faculty move to a point inside the perceived line of presidential authority and functioning, and remain in occupation, the president may alter his line, or he may endeavor to move the faculty. When neither occurs, or cannot occur, it is likely that the president will tender his resignation.

The second area of concern is that of academic freedom, and although no termination could be traced directly to such disagreement or its definition, definite points of view were reflected, both positive
and negative.

Academic freedom is obviously a pretty loose term. Yet I think we had a lot of it at [institution] simply because it was almost never abused by our own faculty, a number of whom had some national reputations or were specialists in their own fields. (16)

A perpetual effort must be made to interpret the difference between academic freedom and mere liberty. It is often an excuse for incompetence, indecency, and skull duggery of students. The freedom "bit" is for students, administrators, and faculty. No one has an exclusive on freedom. To operate a class in the teaching of "freedom" using tyrannical methods is the height of obscenity. (49)

The matter of academic freedom is closely allied with the third presidential concern in his relationships with faculty, and that is the matter of professional responsibility. An area which would seem to appear and reappear in the context of increased community participation is the coincident of responsibility, the lack of which on the part of faculty came under presidential fire. To begin, the comments on internal relationships by a junior college president:

No real problems here in the areas of faculty and student participation and relationships. Felt some disgust at all the academic freedom and tenure from the vocal faculty and no real interest in the idea that faculty responsibility was needed too. (19)

Or that of a community college president:

The attitude of the faculty in general was excellent, but the few who wanted more administrative power, without obligation, made the job very unpleasant. (34)

It was, however, the comments of a liberal arts college president, followed by that of a large state university president, which brought
the topic of concern for faculty responsibility to the brightest light.

Even in the responsibilities that are uniquely the president's, faculty support is essential. Actually in the evolution of the university, faculty originally had all the responsibility for administration; they gave this to administrative officers when they realized that one could not teach and do extensive administrative tasks as well.

The present university is crippled because faculty seek to do the important administrative work in many cases (since they believe that it is not enough to have a hand in setting policy).

No university will work smoothly and efficiently until the faculty are willing to let the present administration do the jobs for which they were appointed. This is not to say that the administration is right and the faculty wrong. It is rather that each must work together for the good of the university, and to do so each must see that something more than limited self-interest must govern action. (33)

While it had no bearing on my decision to retire, the current faculty move to participate in administrative decisions through committees on every policy subject and key personnel appointment, without doing appropriate homework, has serious potentialities for harm. Committees never seem to face up to the hard decisions. Administrators find their hands increasingly tied by the need for faculty clearances. I fear a loss of leadership and of ability to make gutsy decisions. While I have always felt that a university president's prime role was to interpret the faculty and campus to the trustees and the public, rather than the reverse, we are rapidly coming to a time when arrogant campus intellectuals engage in a variety of garish activities which alienate public financial support. We can't have it both ways. If we wish to have academic freedom and indulge in criticism of the social order, and this is our role, we had better not embark upon university backed reform of the social order. Individuals may, but the institution must not. Many faculty do not understand this. (46)

Institutional leadership, academic freedom, and professional responsibility are thus the three primary concerns which academic presidents reflect concern in their relationships with members of the faculty. The
area itself does not contribute significantly to termination decisions. However, it does elicit a surprising amount of comment from those who have left the presidency and find themselves in position to reflect upon the experience.

Student involvement:

In a period of time when the student has come to be a more significant part of institutional governance, the influence which his presence has on the campus might appear to play a part in presidential termination. While it does to some extent, it does not play the role that might be expected. Three presidencies among the forty-four could be considered as having come to termination in part by student pressure, although in no case did it play a more important role than being one of three reasons cited for a particular resignation.

There is some indication of regret that relationships with student constituents cannot consume more time than they do in the presidential day.

I felt saddened a bit that as the college enlarged I did not - could not - know the students as well. . . (8)

Internal relationships were really good. By the time I resigned, practically every major administrator was my own appointee and, fortunately, I always got on well with the faculty. Students I really knew less well than I wanted, but the relationship was good. (12)

Particular effort must be made on the part of the president, it would seem, to provide opportunity for student contact. Only two
presidents cited specific structure for student relationship, although others may well have had similar opportunities yet did not mention them.

As for the students, I always had the policy of open office hours every Monday morning for students only to come without appointment to talk about anything they wanted to. That while I felt we might be led too far in student consultation or what the curriculum should be, still there should be no limitation on our knowing how they felt about their academic treatment. (16)

I visited dorms room to room two nights a week and taught 150 freshmen every term during my presidency three times a week. (6)

It might be noted that the latter president was a Roman Catholic priest, somewhat more able to utilize such visitation time in lieu of "family time" required by his non-celibate colleagues.

The need for vehicles through which student needs can be heard came to light in the comments of several presidents, vehicles that are needed for all constituents. As he reflected on the achievements of his administration, one president noted the one primary area in which he felt his work had been left unfinished:

The only major job which was left undone was getting a conscious student leadership, but I'm not sure this has been done anywhere yet. We got a student constitution, but the general habit of students when they are impatient is to think that to revert to a committee of the whole procedures, to vive voce democracy, is the best way to proceed. This is the romantic misunderstanding of the situation: The problem with the students across the country is powerlessness, and they desperately need the channels and structures to effect some of their concerns. (17)

But the foregoing are comments of presidents simply reflecting student - presidential relationships; their possibilities and difficulties.
Of primary consideration are those relationships which brought about presidential termination. The first case was that of being almost a myriad of factors which brought about resignation, more specifically one of seven cited factors, the largest number within the sample. This circumstance occurred in the same setting of that cited previously in which racial factors relative to faculty hiring and organizational structure played key contributing roles. But as students were related:

The second major event leading to my demise at the College was the election of the radical student group as the student government association in November, 1968. . . .The total vote was less than twenty percent of the students, and the three slates divided the vote almost equally. Therefore, with only about eight percent of the votes, the radical group took control of the student government and announced an anti-administration platform despite the tenuous underpinnings of our embryo college. . . . (45)

It cannot be claimed that the student government's action was a major factor in the resignation, however it can be considered to have particular significance in bringing the determining factors into play.

The second instance of student-motivated resignation is somewhat immeasurable, for it was part of two factors resulting from one presidential action - the integration of a southern university, mentioned previously. Or in the words of the president:

[Political harassment] and the actions of several hundreds of students when I integrated the institution, played a major part in my decision to leave. (50)

The subsequent ascendancy of another governor to power was sufficient indication for the president to feel that his goals could not be reversed, and thus he left to enter private industry.
The final circumstance, although singular in its presentation, may well be a foretaste of circumstances to come. Only time will be the judge.

The most significant role which I was called upon to play in the latter years of my administration was that of pacifier of students. I do not mean to say that I consider it demeaning to have to pay attention to students. But it is a role which is extremely strenuous, and added to all the other roles of fund raiser, leader of the faculty, mediator with the community, interpreter to the alumni, etc., etc., was a case of the needle's breaking the camel's back. It was more than a needle, however. The new role which a president was called upon to play vis-a-vis students in the sixties means that one had to be ready to talk to students day or night, day and night, hours on end. If one wanted to do a good job, this was imperative. (1)

In playing a role in only three terminations within the sample, student relationships cannot be considered a major factor of presidential resignation. Yet there is reason to believe that, given an opportunity to continue on the current path, student activism and organization may well play a more predominant role in such causation in the coming decade.

External Relations

Basic external relations:

If it were not for the topic of fund raising, the general area of external relations could for all intents and purposes be excluded from consideration as a motivating factor for presidential termination. Of the twenty-one factors isolated by this study, those of basic external and alumni relations ranked twentieth and twenty-first respectively when
considered by weighted rank. This does not imply that such relations do not concern the academic executive, for they do, as will be illustrated. Yet generally speaking, the comments received were favorable.

Once again, relationships outside of the institution were excellent. As a new institution our major involvement was with the community, and community relationships were very fine. I would say that this had no influence on my final decision. (38)

Working with the students, the legislature, the alumni, the public, and the academic world outside of the campus was always a pleasure. (32)

The external bodies did not enter into my resignation. They were well informed about the college and I felt like the "image" of the college was definitely raised during my five years as Dean (under the Superintendent of Schools) and two years as President under a separate county board.

The public was most cooperative in helping the college raise money to build a new campus. They saw the need. (34)

Although I was many times restive under the external controls over my freedom of action as the chief executive on campus, I should say that one of my many regrets in leaving the presidency was having to sever relationships with some of the constituencies mentioned in your brief analysis. (48)

No real problems in these areas for external support was real sincere, productive, and quite understanding. (19)

Our external constituents were extremely complex - officially, Board of Trustees, City Council, Board of Trustees of [state], Central Administrative Office, Board of Regents, State Legislature - for example.

We handled all with discretion and success. An admirable group of people. (49)

The external relations of the University with the community, the State, and the world left little to be desired. (12)
These, then, are not necessarily comments regarding a problem area, at least not for those individuals making them. However, for a very few the area is one of significant concern, and may well be one of increasing concern for all presidents as legislative and donor support begins to wane as there has been indication of its tendency to do, while at the same time requesting increased accountability. This reaction was underscored by a private college president as he wrote on the matter of external demands.

Increasingly difficult. The change from 1963 - 1968 in scope of external demands beyond adequate description. One could spend full time on any one of the many tasks and not do the job adequately.

Each "public" increasingly demanding and less appreciative of service rendered. (Understanding would be a better word than appreciative. I used appreciate in that sense.) (41)

This external pressure was restated by another private college executive officer:

The college administrator is often busy merging the interest and disinterest of diverse publics. These vary from better prospective students to aged alumni. The community, the federal government, donors, potential donors, and many others. His decisions affect several publics. His power is more diluted by publics he must please than by his governing board which is usually glad to hand him the decision making role. (35)

The total frustration of viewing external constituents was most bluntly expressed by a community college president, quoted before in other areas in a similar frank response:

I was exasperated by:
1. Impotence of police, FBI, Treasury agents, Bureau of Narcotics Control, City Hall, Kiwanis, etc. Nobody including Panthers, Minutemen, La Raza, has a program of answers or strategy which includes the school as I know it.

2. Racism of unions, employers, and people generally.

3. Gap between segments of the same populations - old and young, Panthers and U.S., separatists and integrationists, men and women, etc. (47)

Factors external to the institution are the concern of each college and university and president. The level of frustration which they at times promote may seem unrealistic. Yet as factors which weigh upon the president to such an extent that they bring about a resignation request cannot be considered as more than minimal.

Alumni relations:

Probably a month fails to go by when a college president does not encounter within some context the negative criticism of a former student of the institution, known upon his departure as an alumni. There may well be those presidents who would cherish a circumstance in which the contact was but once a month. Yet even in their seeming constancy for the president, such relationships are not of the variety to bring presidential termination. In only one instance, and that one itself of only minor import, was the factor of alumni pressure the causal factor.

With so few comments about alumni, and the relationship shared, it is difficult to establish any pattern of concerns. Those that were made centered about the alumni's concern for the institution - for its reputation, for its continued educational program, and for the social quality -
the life style - of current students. The first is not nearly as diffi-
cult as the second and third, for as the social structure changes so do
institutions within.

One president, who assumed his position at a low point in institu-
tional history - depleted enrollment, financial resources, and faculty -
found his problem that of alumni discouragement.

The problem with alumni was embarrassment and discourage-
ment. Why had their alma mater not forged ahead? Why
was their degree as cheap as it was? (15)

Upon completion of fifteen years in office, the president was in a
position to have significantly changed those aspects which had formerly
been of negative value.

The pattern of alumni development is a long one and not easily con-
structed overnight. In both financial and reputational support, an in-
stitution cannot neglect the alumni constituency as much as a number of
current undergraduates would like to believe. One school which, in the
eyes of the president did, prompted the comment:

The years when [institution] disregarded its alumni cost
us considerably during my presidency. The start I made
on alumni development will assist other presidents in a
decade or two from now, but they could not be expected
to assist immediately. (33)

Yet the overriding problem, the general concern, is best summed up
by a current foundation officer, formerly president of a small liberal
arts college:

I would have to add however that the relationship to the
alumni was an increasingly difficult one. They want the
institution to remain as it was when they went to school,
and of course this is impossible if any educational institution is to remain relevant. (1)

The problem of alumni relations has the attention of the college and university president in the early 1970's, and poses administrative problems for him. However, none presented within the sample are of such serious consideration as to prompt his resignation from office in more than a very minimal way.

Fund raising:

The problems generated by fund raising and the need for operational financing are those often equated with the private college, and the sampled was no exception. Of the five presidents indicating such involvement to be a contributing factor to their resignation, four were the chief administrative officer of private institutions. However, there were indications from public institutions that the matter of fund raising would not necessarily be an exclusive private institutional concern in the coming years.

Fund raising can be an enjoyable experience, with indication of that fact given by several presidents. In brief, they see as a part of their role the need to convey the purposes of their institution, particularly within the context of seeking needed financial support. As one liberal arts college president put the case:

In a college our size the president is indeed intimately related to fund raising. Really I did not feel any particular division of interest between that part of my job and building the college's educational program. After all it is the educational program which one is selling.
And to understand it is the only way to sell it. (16)

And there is little question of its constancy, as reflected by another:

Over the years, it came to be that much of my time had to be given to fund raising. It is said that I never let a day go by without asking for money!

I travelled all over the United States making talks, asking for money, advocating Christian higher education. I averaged about 75 - 100 lectures a year, and up to 120,000 miles a year. (15)

As well as the time consumed:

I felt saddened a bit...that more of my time had to go to the "creamed chicken and peas" circuit - fund raising in an independent college. (8)

And it would seem to be these factors, the seemingly inordinate amount of time consumed, the continuing demand, and the affect which they have on the other responsibilities of the presidency that contribute to resignation. The comments of several who claimed it to be a causal factor are as follows:

The only searing internal problem was the grinding task of fund raising, which I hated. I enjoyed public relations work and education planning but I hated begging for money.

The task of fund raising was so distasteful to me that it was a major factor in my resigning. I will say that I originally accepted the fund-raising role as a part of the presidency. Hence this is one factor (i.e. distaste for) that I have not mentioned until now. (12)

I enjoyed all of the [external] roles except that of fund raiser. (18)
The role of fund raiser and promoter generally removes a college president from an identity as an independent thinker and one interested in scholarship or other academic disciplines. He is quickly typed and canned as a man who always needs more money for his institution. (35)

These men were all private college presidents. Yet on occasion a public president will resign for financially-related reasons. One community college president wrote:

I enjoyed the responsibility for achieving the overall goal for the college - I changed positions mainly because of a lack of financial base to adequately implement the programs needed to reach the overall goal. (34)

This comment introduces a factor which may well bring the public institution to a similar financial circumstance as the private, yet for a somewhat different reason. This reason is the taxpayer and his degree of willingness to support public higher education. In light of campus unrest and current economic conditions, both legislatures and citizens are making their weight known in the role which they play in the direction which education shall take, and such directing is not limited to higher education alone. This financial squeeze was summed up by a large state university president as he looked to the financial future:

In a tax conscious society, growth money for higher education will become increasingly tough to locate. The affluent professor may find things much worse in the future, and certainly the potential surplus of Ph.D.'s in many fields will help the president and his administration in dealing with the professorate in a buyer's rather than a seller's market. (46)

Fund raising, thus, as it influences presidential resignation is for the moment a problem primarily affecting private higher education. It
is a result of the large amount of time consumed, the constancy of its
demand, the affect which these have on other presidential responsibility,
and simply a personal distaste on the part of the president at finding
himself in a sales role. Yet there is some reason to believe that the
problem may become more universal as the chief administrative officers
of public colleges and universities find themselves in a similar sales
role with the primary source of his financial support, the American tax-
payer.

Employment Alternative

General employment alternative:

If there is need of a single most important motivating factor in the
resignation of the academic president it would be that area which has
been defined as the general employment alternative; the opportunity which
is available to the individual president as an alternative to his contin-
ued employment in the presidency. It will be noted that the word "op-
portunity" is used for the word "employment" is in many regards incor-
rect. For the college president it would seem does not have to serious-
ly consider extended unemployment even though his decision to leave is
made prior to a time when he has been offered or has accepted other
work. It will be noted from an early part of this chapter, and from in-
formation within the Appendix, that no member of the sample was unem-
ployed at the time of the survey. The president is thus somewhat unique
for he can realistically think in terms of leaving his position for
other involvement, yet have no specific employment in mind at the time
the decision is made.

It is somewhat ironic that the position of academic leadership may
lead to anonymity. In two cases letters mailed to the institution at
which the individual served as president were returned, one marked "Re-
turn to sender; College closed," the other "Not here; address unknown."
It is somewhat difficult to comprehend that an individual who has pro-
vided institutional leadership can leave an office and for all intents
and purposes completely vanish.

The feeling of personal confidence expressed above, the ability to
leave the position for other employment without having it in hand, would
seem to be inherent in the presidential response, some of which follows:

My decision was 100% my own. I think it took the college
by complete surprise. Nor did any external forces im-
pinge on me. I cannot say that other job offers were
thrown my way. I would like to think of course that this
was because no one knew that I was available. My wife
urged me to make the announcement so that I would receive
job offers and could do a decent job of hunting a new as-
signment. This is exactly what happened. It took me five
months for me to locate the position which I subsequently
accepted. Or perhaps I should say it took me three months
to locate the position, and two months of negotiation to
"close the deal." (1)

The president is now a foundation officer.

You should also understand, as you appraise my answers,
that I resigned at the October, 1969, meeting of the Board
of Trustees with the proviso that I would stay until a suc-
cessor was found. I was in no particular hurry to leave
and had no special job that I wanted to undertake. (14)

He is now involved in university academic administration at the
vice-presidential level.
I had no employment in mind. But without retirement benefits, I knew that I would have to work - and had confidence that the twelve years in office would serve me well as background in any task. (32)

Post presidential involvement now finds him as Executive Vice-President of a well-known textile manufacturing firm.

Actually, I did not expect to accept my present position at the time I retired. The position had not been created and I was unaware that such an agency was to be established. So it had nothing to do with my resignation. It was my plan to expand my consulting service, some of which I had done and liked very much. (8)

Current involvement is that of a position in education with state government.

The position I accepted was in my home town, was a position I had greater qualifications for than most anyone else (my father had been associated with the institution for fifty years), it was a location my wife and I were interested in, and this offer firmed up before a possible offer from a state university did. I had decided to accept the one which first materialized and felt I had something unique for the other institution too. (3)

The job now held is a college vice-president for development.

I did not at the time know what I was going to do. But I was not leaving [institution] in despondency or despair. If the right opening had come my way as the President of another College, where I felt I had something to offer, I should have accepted it gladly, and would do so even now. It just so happened that [organization] was in search of a chief executive officer, they wanted me, it looked like an interesting and challenging job, and I accepted it. (30)

His employment now is Executive Director of a council on foreign relations.
Those comments which precede would seem to come from presidencies in which termination was of a relatively non-critical nature. Yet in several instances within the sample separation came under conditions of stress with the lack of immediate alternative employment serving at least as a consideration.

Your sentence [within the questionnaire] which reads "On occasion even pending unemployment is a positive alternative," strikes very much to home for when I left the college I really had no definite alternative employment. But anything would have been better than continued service under the conditions that prevailed. (45)

His subsequent involvement has been that of an administrative position with a national higher education association.

But the foregoing has been somewhat prologue, for in no instance did the factors which have been cited serve as a motivating factor for resignation. They have been included, however, as an expression of the unique circumstance in which the college president finds himself on the employment market.

The general employment alternative is possibly among the most important factors of presidential resignation because of the fact that as an individual factor it was the single determining cause in a greater number of cases than any other item. In other words, if a single factor, and only one factor, was the contributor to termination, there was better than average chance that it was the employment alternative open to the president.

In terms of categorization, the general employment alternative as a factor of causation can be considered from four viewpoints: (1) Subsequent employment that is "mandatory," i.e. election or appointment to
office, (2) that which seems to offer greater challenge, opportunity for

contribution, and holds considerable professional interest, (3) a re-
quest to return for prior involvement, and without exception that in-
volvement being teaching, and (4) acceptance of employment offering op-
portunity for contribution at a somewhat less sensitive and stressful

level.

The initial view, a "mandatory" change, all came in the case of

religiously affiliated institutions, all Roman Catholic, where the in-
stitutional president is frequently subject to higher authority than his

own professional desire. Thus the reason for termination is singular -

employment alternative - and is almost automatic, as is reflected by the

briefness of the replies received from such circumstances:

In reply to your inquiry, my reason for stepping aside as

President of [institution] was my election to another of-

fice within our own religious community. (39)


Being a clergyman in a church-related University (Roman

Catholic) I was subject to higher church authorities. I

was designated a bishop by the Church and the concomitant

new duties made it necessary for me to resign. (28)

This is my second year in [city] where I fill the position

of Superior in our Generalate. I was requested to come

here (not obliged to come), and accepted the invitation

after nine years in the office of president. (42)

The second category is possibly the most interesting; the result of

weighing the contribution and challenge of the presidency with a specific

position offered as alternative. In brief, it becomes a matter of com-
paring all aspects of two positions to determine in which there is the
greatest opportunity for challenge, contribution, and personal fulfillment
at this particular point in ones life. The decision, understandably, is not an easy one.

In the case of a state college president who was offered the executive position of a national association of higher education, the decision was explained as follows:

My decision to leave the president's office was made purely on the basis of my having been offered a position where I felt I could have some impact on higher education nationally. That is not to say that such an opportunity is unavailable to the college president, but quite obviously it is more possible in my present role as president of [the association]. (48)

A similar offer came to a state university president only in this instance at the state level, yet of such significance that the project in which he involved himself might well serve as a model for the entire country. His somewhat staccato reply, prefaced by "Hurried reply. Sorry! Budget time," would lead one to believe that his involvement is no less intense in the new position than was the case in the presidency.

Historic new position -
Created in my native State -
Lay a pilot plan for the nation in access to higher education -
As Chief Executive Officer of its new statewide governing board (created 1969) - (10)

As indicated previously, the presidency for a few men is a somewhat routine position, limiting in its possibilities, and stifling to personal growth. Therefore it is understandable that other positions would hold greater challenge, and would be sought out. Such was the case with a president who went to the vice presidency of another institution, finding the change more stimulating and rewarding.
Since the challenges seemed minimal in that position, I accepted the position of Vice President for Student Affairs in a [religious denomination] university of 4,000 students. Although the responsibilities are more narrowly limited than the office of the President, the position as a whole seemed to hold greater challenge. (18)

On occasion a position comes literally from out of the blue at a time which is opportune. This was indeed the case with a president who after extended tenure, and a firm date several years hence for retirement, found an opportunity for national service in an area which had to the time of the offer been of particular interest to him. In his words:

When President Nixon offered me the opportunity to become [current position] it came at a time when I had given no thought to such a possibility but because of my interest in [area of current position], it seemed to me to be an opportunity to do two things at the same time. First, an opportunity to try to do something that seemed to me to be of great importance and significance. Beyond that, it provided an opportunity for me to step aside when it was not expected and to permit the University to select a new leader without any concern at all for my personal desires. I proposed to the [institutional] Trustees that they grant me emeritus status on April 1, 1969. Some effort was made to dissuade me but I made it clear that it was not a matter of wanting to be persuaded to remain, that it was my intention to accept the new post provided they would grant me the retirement for which I was eligible.

I did not leave [institution] because of any unhappiness with the University or with the opportunities ahead had I decided to stay for three or four more years, but it seemed to me to be best for the University that I step aside while there was still an opportunity for me to undertake something else that seemed to be worth doing. (21)

It was a similar circumstance, i.e. unsolicited offer at a time when no more than casual thought had been given to leaving the presidency, that brought about the termination of a much younger man, in this case age forty-five as compared with sixty-seven for the situation above.
The offer of a national government post made me consider leaving [institution]. I did so because I have always wanted a chance to work in government; also my dissertation was on a topic in administrative history and this added to my curiosity. The post promised opportunities in education.

Finally I accepted the post because I thought it would be a good change for me and a good one for [institution]. I believe in retrospect that both assumptions were true. It was a good time for me to depart because the faculty, under my prompting, was completing a survey of the entire academic program; also we were coming to our 125th anniversary, a time for a major gift campaign that should be undertaken with new leadership. My new post had some of the same kinds of problems and administrative burdens. The economic advantages were at [institution] rather than in Washington, largely because of the home provided for the president. (33)

Finally, there is the factor of financial remuneration, which when coupled with the preceding factors of challenge, contribution, and interest, would appear to be irresistible in the form of new involvement.

In summary I left the presidency to expand my horizons beyond the limitations of a small community and a small college. I had a great experience for over twelve years and I'll always view it as my richest professional experience. However, when an invitation came to use my expertise in a professional consultant relationship, I took it. An increase of $20,000 income per annum was more than a minor incentive.

As indicated earlier, in my situation a $20,000 per annum increase was just great. I suspect it ran 50 - 50 with a desire to change positions. Actually my change was not a radical one since I am consulting in a phase of education which is very challenging and more interesting to me at this point. Travel, new people, new experience, no financial worries, and many other factors led to the change. I'm delighted with it - but I could not be as effective as I am without the tremendous experience of the twelve plus years at [institution] and elsewhere. (49)

The third sub-point under the general employment alternative topic, the first two being those of "mandatory" change, and the opportunity for
challenge and contribution, is that of the request to return to involvement held previously to the presidency which was, as previously indicated, college teaching. This decision was announced by one in his letter of resignation to the board of control, which read in part:

As indicated to you in our conversation at the July meeting of the Trustees, that at some time I would like to move from my present position to teaching. I am respectfully requesting to return to my duties as a professor.

When "personal reasons" are given for the departure of a college president from his post, it is usually assumed that there are in the background undisclosed reasons and causes. On the contrary, in my case such provocations do not exist. I have simply made a personal choice to plan to continue my professional career in the teaching of science. I have been teaching a modest program in general chemistry over the past five years along with my duties as President, and I look forward to devoting my full attention to teaching and research. (44)

Another, in a similar letter of resignation, wrote:

When I leave the presidency next year I should like to return to my professional field of [academic area] in a faculty position where I can teach and do research. This will also permit closer contact with students which I have missed. (46)

The circumstances of two presidents who returned to teaching are somewhat interesting, for their subsequent involvement was not as originally planned. The first is that of a large university president who left his position to reenter teaching, yet found himself within the year returning to an administrative role:

I then became president of [institution], and it was understood at the outset that my time there would be relatively brief. I had long entertained the hope of returning to my academic field as a professor and scholar before I retired. My intention was to leave the presidency when
I reached age sixty - actually I stayed until I was sixty-one, and then moved to another institution as a professor of economics with the intention of settling here throughout the rest of my career and in retirement as well.

It happened that shortly after my arrival here the president of [institution] resigned, and [associated institutions] were planning some significant administrative reorganization. I was asked to become president, and to assist in this reorganization on a short-term basis. Since then some of the reorganization has taken place. A new position of Chancellor has been created, and I have accepted that position. The duties are in the nature of long-range planning and general leadership for activities of [the associated institutions]. My role is that of elder statesman rather than front-line administrator. (22)

From these comments, then, it would appear that although teaching, or any alternative employment, may initially appear inviting, the pull of the presidency and its challenge remains sufficiently strong to once again involve a former incumbent.

The second instance is one which is not totally unique, the request of a president to move from that office to a faculty position at the same institution, yet is made unique by second thoughts had during a year's leave of absence subsequent to the presidency. It should be noted that the president was not influenced by the possibility of faculty involvement to leave the presidency, but was the case previously cited in which a state board of regents sufficiently altered the character of his own board of control and involved themselves in seeming administrative detail that he chose to leave.

I was not influenced by this [employment alternative] category of factors. In fact, it was my hope that I might complete my active career as a professor at the college and with this in mind I resigned the presidency but retained my professorship while taking a year's leave of absence. My final decision not to return to the college was the result of my observing my successor's
attempting to carry-out the altered goals of the college referred to...above - and concluding that I could not fit into the new model. Even were I to accommodate to "just a professorship," I felt that my constant presence on the campus could easily augment the dissension already focused on the changes above referred to. (24)

Thus in the instances of individuals coming to the presidency from teaching roles, there is indication that upon their departure from the role, and in some instances contributing to the decision, they will once again return to the classroom.

The fourth sub-category in the general employment alternative includes those presidents who chose subsequent involvement on a basis of its being a less critical and less responsible position. In the two instances within the sample it was a case of small liberal arts college presidents becoming directors of development at another small liberal arts college.

At age 54, with 17 years in the presidency, I had to decide to "stay put" another decade, or make the change before age 55. My observation - few openings available after that age (challenging - that is). While I was at it, I decided the Development job was more to my liking; about 1/10 the responsibility, frustrations, and about double the free time, with nearly the same financial rewards. Much more time for family, study, growth, and recreation. I seriously doubt that I could live out my life - even until retirement age at the pace and strain formerly demanded as president of a small college. (41)

[Institution], my alma mater, offered me the opportunity to be involved in the planning and development function at that institution. This provided me with a decision-making role relieving me of the ultimate responsibility for a total institution and made it possible to make a contribution to my alma mater. (38)

In summation, subsequent employment to the presidency as a causal
factor in termination may be of several varieties. It may be of the mandatory nature, as was the case with those Roman Catholic priests and nun elected or appointed to higher office within the Church. Or it may be of the type of involvement which, when compared to the presidential role currently held, seems to offer greater challenge, opportunity for contribution, and holds professional interest. In the instances of those men coming to the leadership role from teaching positions, it may be the desire to return to the classroom. And finally, the alternative might be an opportunity to make continuing contribution to higher education only through somewhat less demanding and time consuming roles. All add up to what would appear to be a major contributor to departure from the presidential role.

Physical stamina:

The demands of the presidency both physically and psychologically have been a recurring theme throughout this paper, and are found with ease in any literature on the academic leader. Yet the foundation for these generalities came to focus in the presidential response to resignation factors: The area of human physical stamina is among the major contributors to presidential termination.

Physical stamina as a major topic covers in fact two phenomenon. The first is the matter of the physical ability to handle the responsibility of the office, the medical aspect. The second is a somewhat nebulous but generally accepted term of administrative fatigue. The two combined were contributing factors in one out of every four resignations
within the sample.

Dealing with the physical aspect is a somewhat more objective matter than that of considering fatigue. Its symptoms were expressed as follows, the first from the resignation statement of a sixty year old president, the second from one age forty. Ages are noted only as indications that advancing age and decreasing physical health to handle the job are not necessarily in direct proportion; in truth, the average age of those leaving in part or in whole for reasons of health was four years younger than the average for the entire sample.

It is my conviction that for its future best interests, [institute] should have at the helm a younger man who, will all of the other necessary attributes, has the physical reserve to provide the vigorous and dynamic leadership which the presidency requires and which [institute] deserves.

For some time I have been dissatisfied with my physical condition and gradually have become convinced that I no longer have what I consider to be the necessary physical stamina. (2)

[The fact that I resigned before having other employment] was done for a variety of reasons which included high blood pressure and a parting of the ways with the local trustees and consequently a feeling of exhaustion after four years of shaping a new institution. I welcomed the opportunity to be in a position of not having all of the responsibilities for an institution. (38)

A Roman Catholic nun left her presidential position primarily for physical reasons, yet with underlying motives, as she explained.

Resignation due to complications following a severe case of Hong Kong flu. Physically unable to execute duties of the office. Preferred to resign rather than place the burden of interim acting-presidency on another nun, since there was no assurance from doctors that I would be able to return to the President's Office within the year. (37)
A president at age sixty-one wrote:

I felt that a younger man whose health was absolutely perfect, and who could get along with a minimum of sleep was the man who could do the better job. (1)

A large university president who was forced to take an enforced sabbatical from the presidency during his term of office due to serious illness reflected:

When you combine crisis management and increasingly desperate financial problems, you very rapidly build a fatigue level which goes beyond tolerable limits for anyone. If presidential tenures were no so rapidly getting shorter, we would lose these men and women through exhaustion and premature death rather than through resignation or removal. (25)

With obvious reluctance, a community college president found himself with limited alternatives in his decision to resign, or as he responded:

Only one - with angina, encephalographic distresses (black-outs), pneumonia, ulcers, chronic prostatitis - my doctor's orders to give up or expire. I had no other job I wanted to go to, no family pressures, no money problems. I was just a skinny guy who didn't have the stamina to stay in an exciting sluging match. (47)

The area of administrative fatigue is far less specific than the individual symptoms or conditions listed above. Yet in its expression it is accepted with the same degree of credibility and understanding as those complaints which may be medically defined. Thus, rather than being medically diagnosed, it is self diagnosed, with the remedy being self-administered - that of termination.

I was tired. My children were all reared and had
finished their undergraduate education, and I felt that I should not "push" myself forever. (15)

The principle reason [for leaving the presidency] was fatigue. After a one year sabbatical, I am now teaching at [institution] and enjoying the experience of meeting the students. (43)

[My reasons for leaving included] relief from administrative fatigue. ... (34)

I also took on almost too much and may have depleted some of my energy. (6)

I agree with your description, but my main reason for resigning was that I had been President for 11 years, following 12 years as Academic Dean in a growing college. It increased from about 400 in 1946 to about 1350 in 1968. The attention to the problems arising from this fact brought me nearly to the point of exhaustion.

I took a year's leave of absence after I resigned and spent most of it resting. There was no other employment to which I aspired. I became a Professor of Philosophy in September, 1970. (7)

This last statement, an indication of having spent an entire year in recuperation from the presidential experience, points with some degree of urgency to the demands of the office. Yet it does not match the poignancy and sense of being overwhelmed as does a final response:

Even now, fifteen months after leaving the college, I do not feel that I am fully relieved from the administrative fatigue which had come over me, but more importantly the emotional desperation which prevailed at the time I left. (45)

With statements such as these, the physical and emotional demands of the presidency are underlined with greater clarity. There can be little question that such demands play an extremely important role in decisions
Family needs:

Although they by no means can be considered a major contributor to presidential resignation, the responsibilities which the chief administrative officer feels for his family find expression among underlying motives. The context in which they occur is of course that of the considerable demands of the office, leaving significantly less time for family involvement than was the case in prior positions. For the most part such changes in personal priorities are accepted by the president, and by his family. Yet at that point where the demands become debilitating to the relationship, the concern appears as a contributory factor. In two of the three instances in which family need played a part in leaving office it was but one of four factors; in the third instance one of three. Thus it is not a singular cause by any means, yet adds sufficient weight to other factors to bring about the decision.

The presidential group by no means were apologetic in letting basically personal reasons beyond their own, i.e. that of the family, influence a basically professional decision. The circumstance was summarized by one president as he listed reasons for assuming other employment:

Family needs simply cannot be fulfilled while serving as Chief Executive of most colleges. (32)

A member of the group who spent less than one year in the position before recognizing demands of the role that he obviously had not
expected, for he removed himself at the end of the year, wrote:

The factors of family needs and opportunities for personal growth and development were a major consideration in my resignation. (35)

And it was the factor of time involvement, specifically that of relations with external constituencies and the need to raise funds, that brought the comment of a third president:

I did not appreciate being away from my family as much as these requirements demanded. (18)

Again, this final factor is not of major import. However, it was of concern to a number of college and university presidents and of sufficient degree in several cases to register as a significant factor in presidential termination.

Factor Measurement

The primary purpose of this study is that of offering a generalized understanding of presidential termination. However, there was also some interest in a more specific understanding, i.e. which of the twenty-one factors cited by the respondents were held to be of greater concern and of more import. It was not the desire of the writer to be bound by statistical data, and all that precedes gives indication of that orientation. Yet that which follows makes some effort, in the context of summary, to place the factors in some relationship of import one with another.

Two methods were utilized to achieve an estimation of those areas
of most concern to the group of individuals leaving the presidency. Understandably, such determinations could not be made on purely statistical grounds. Yet it was felt that some indication of concern could be attained on a pure occurrence basis. As a first method, all responses were charted and the number of times specific reasons were cited was noted. The results, found in Table 17, can be noted to overlap, i.e. some notations may be singular causes of resignation, others may be one of several contributory reasons. Among the sample of forty-four, therefore, 107 factors motivating resignation were cited, or an average of 2.4 reasons per presidential resignation.

Beyond a distribution considering raw numbers of occurrence, a second approach involving an additional weighting factor was introduced giving greater value to a specific factor which was the sole factor in the decision to terminate than to a factor which was one of several. Reasons given for presidential terminations were thus divided into groups determined by the number of specific motivating factors cited by an individual president. In other words, all responses citing one termination factor were placed in the first group, all responses citing two termination factors in the second group, etc. The break-down is found in Table 18.

An arbitrary weight of ten was assigned to a factor when it was the only one given as a reason for resignation. It was assumed that a single factor, when it was the only one given by the respondent, carried more weight than a factor which was given as one of two or more. When more than one factor was given, the following formula was used, which in effect used the number of influencing factors as the denominator and
ten as the nominator.

TABLE 17
RANK ORDER OF TERMINATION FACTORS BY OCCURRENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Termination Factor</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Role Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Avoidance of extended tenure (3)^a</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extended tenure (4)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Basic role expectations (1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Role evolution (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Community environment (5)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inability for personal growth (7)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Racial climate (6)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Departure from religious order (8)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. General Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Objective achievement (10)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Political/bureaucratic stifling (12)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Basic administration (9)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Board relationship (11)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Internal Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student involvement (15)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basic internal relations (13)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Faculty relations (14)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. External Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Fund raising (18)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basic external relations (16)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Alumni relations (17)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Employment Alternative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. General employment alternative (19)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Physical stamina (20)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family needs (21)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Represents number of factors as first presented on pages 85 - 89.
### Table 18

**Termination Factors Grouped by Individual Occurrence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Termination Factor and Frequency</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>One (1) Termination Factor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General employment alternative (19)$^a$</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended tenure (4)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical stamina (20)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of extended tenure (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two (2) Termination Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective achievement (10); Physical stamina (20)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role evol. (2); Pol/bureau. stifling (12)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended tenure (4); Objective achievement (10)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective achievement (10); Faculty relations (14)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial climate (6); Objective achievement (10)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depart. rel. order (8); Basic int. rel. (13)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three (3) Termination Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext. tenure (4); Obj. achieve. (10); Phys. stam. (20)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid. ext. tenure (3); Obj. achieve. (10); Fund raising (18)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid. ext. tenure (3); Obj. achieve. (10); Gen. employ. (19)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid. ext. tenure (3); Obj. achieve. (10); Family need (21)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. achieve. (10); Pol/bur. stifling (12); Stu. involv. (15)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student involv. (15); Alumni rel. (17); Phys. stam. (20)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bas. role expec. (1); Bas. admin. (9); Phys. stam. (20)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board rel. (11); Fund raising (18); Phys. stam. (20)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bas. role expec. (1); Board rel. (11); Phys. stam. (20)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bas. role expec. (1); Role evol. (2); Phys. stam. (20)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid. ext. ten. (3); Inabil. pers. grow. (7); Gen. emp. (19)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role evol. (2); Avoid. ext. tenure (3); Bas. admin. (9)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid. ext. ten. (3); Comm. environ. (5); Gen. employ. (19)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext. tenure (4); Obj. achieve. (10); Gen. employ. (19)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depart. rel. order (8); Obj. achieve. (10); Fund raising (18)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bas. role expec. (1); Comm. environ. (5); Gen. employ. (19)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four (4) Termination Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inabil. pers. growth (7); Fund raising (18); Gen. employ. alt. (19); Family need (21)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inabil. pers. growth (7); Basic external rel. (16); Fund raising (18); Family need (21)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic role expectation (1); Community environ. (5); Faculty relations (14); Gen. employ. alt. (19)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Represents number of factor as first presented on pages 85 - 89.
TABLE 18; TERMINATION FACTORS GROUPED BY INDIVIDUAL OCCURRENCE, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Termination Factor and Frequency</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Five (5) Termination Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic role expec. (1); Avoid. ext. tenure (3); Community environ. (5); Obj. achieve. (10); Pol/bureau. stifling (12)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role evolution (2); Avoid. ext. tenure (3); Extended tenure (4); Obj. achieve. (10); Gen. employ. alt. (19)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six (6) Termination Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seven (7) Termination Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial climate (6); Basic admin. (9); Board rel. (11); Basic int. rel. (13); Student involv. (15); Phys. stamina (20)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Point Value} = \frac{10}{\text{Number of Termination Factors}} \]

An example of computing a specific weighted termination factor (Basic role expectations) is as follows:

a. Listed by four presidents as one of three termination factors

\[ 4 \text{ presidents } \times \frac{10}{3} = 4 \times 3.3 = 13.32 \]

b. Listed by one president as one of four termination factors

\[ 1 \text{ president } \times \frac{10}{4} = 1 \times 2.5 = 2.5 \]

c. Listed by one president as one of five termination factors

\[ 1 \text{ president } \times \frac{10}{5} = 1 \times 2.0 = 2.0 \]

Therefore, \( 13.32 + 2.50 + 2.00 = 17.82 \), and thus is assigned to basic role expectations as its weighted value.
Under circumstances in which all college presidents would resign for the same reason, the total score based on forty-four presidents would of course have been 440. The range of possible weighted scores was therefore 440 to 0.

It is granted that such measurement is at best some tenuous, yet is not represented as an absolute measure. Its purpose is only that of offering a means to compare factors, with the results illustrated in Table 19.

Two measures of presidential concern had now been made, one based on numerical occurrence, the other weighted in relationship to the number of factors involved in individual termination decisions. These two measures, when ranked and compared, particularly among the ten major concerns, show considerable similarity. The rankings are based from highest to lowest number of occurrences (Raw data; see pages 173-174), and from highest to lowest weighted scores (Weighted data; see pages 174-178), and are found in Table 20.

It should be stressed once again that the purpose of the study is general in nature, with the ranking of factors just presented serving only indicative and not absolute purposes. However, combined with the presidential response base which preceded, they offer clearer focus on the general presentation, and bring closure to the data presentation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Termination Factor</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Role Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Extended tenure (4)^a</td>
<td>43.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Avoidance of extended tenure (3)</td>
<td>33.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Role evolution (2)</td>
<td>18.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Basic role expectations (1)</td>
<td>17.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Community environment (5)</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inability for personal growth (7)</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Departure from religious order (8)</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Racial climate (6)</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. General Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Objective achievement (10)</td>
<td>52.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Political/bureaucratic stifling (12)</td>
<td>15.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Basic administration (9)</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Board relationship (11)</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Basic Internal Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student involvement (15)</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty relations (14)</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Basic internal relations (13)</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. External Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Fund raising (18)</td>
<td>14.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basic external relations (16)</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Alumni relations (17)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Employment Alternative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. General employment alternative (19)</td>
<td>103.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Physical stamina (20)</td>
<td>51.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family needs (21)</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aRepresents number of factor as first presented on page 85 - 89.
TABLE 20

TERMINATION FACTORS RANKED BY OCCURRENCE AND BY WEIGHTED SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Raw Data (Occurrence)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Weighted Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General employ. alternative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>General employ. alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Objective achievement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Objective achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Physical stamina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Physical stamina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Avoid. of extended tenure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extended tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extended tenure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Avoid. of extended tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Basic role expectations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Role evolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7^a</td>
<td>Role evolution</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Basic role expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund raising</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pol/bureaucratic stifling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9^a</td>
<td>Community environment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fund raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pol/bureaucratic stifling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Community environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11^a</td>
<td>Inability for per. growth</td>
<td>11^a</td>
<td>Inability for per. growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Departure from rel. order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student involvement</td>
<td>14^a</td>
<td>Basic administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16^a</td>
<td>Racial climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departure from rel. order</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Faculty relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic internal relations</td>
<td>18^a</td>
<td>Racial climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Basic internal relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic external relations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Basic external relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Alumni relations</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Alumni relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Represents rank order tie.
CHAPTER V
SUMMATION AND CONCLUSIONS

The year 1971 finds between two and three hundred colleges and universities in the United States seeking a new president. The services of the incumbent have been terminated for one of several reasons - he has resigned or retired, he has been asked to leave, he has accepted another academic presidency, or he has died while in office. Of the number leaving the presidency, upwards of one half leave to become involved in other areas of endeavor. It was the purpose of this study to consider the motivating factors prompting such resignation as reflected by the individuals who had recently left the presidential role.

The method by which this goal was achieved came first through extensive reading of topics by and about college presidents, seeking in this way to gain a basic understanding of the role and resultingy to find a vehicle through which interaction could occur between researcher and former college presidents. The instrument found expression in an essay-type questionnaire which requested response to five general areas of the presidency. The areas included role expectations, tasks of general administration, relationships with both internal and external factors, and the employment alternative. A sample of the instrument may be found in Appendix A.

Using the "Gazette" section of The Chronicle of Higher Education
for the calendar year 1969 (Volume III, Number 9, through Volume IV, Number 12) 187 presidential terminations were noted. Deletion of those individuals who headed specialized institutions (medical schools, theological seminaries, etc.), accepted another college presidency, died while in office, retired, or were released from office, left eighty-six individuals whose termination of the presidential office by the definition of the study could be considered that of resignation.

On December 4, 1970, individually typed letters, accompanied by the printed questionnaire, were mailed to the eighty-six individuals who until relatively recently had served as administrative head of an American college or university, requesting their assistance in isolating specific factors motivating presidential resignation. By January 22, 1971, fifty-two responses had been received, forty-four of which could be utilized for the purpose of the study.

**Major Findings**

The responses received indicated twenty-one areas which were defined as factors motivating resignation. In the vast majority of the cases it was not one reason that prompted the request for release, but two, three, or even more specific factors; the average number for the forty-four respondents was 2.4 reasons. The picture thus was one of a relatively large number of factors, interrelated in an extremely complex manner.

The twenty-one factors, briefly defined, are as follows:

1. **Basic role expectations**: Those assumptions and expectations by
both president and constituencies regarding the responsibilities and
functions of the presidential office.

2. **Role evolution**: The evolutionary change of presidential respons-
sibility and function due to social and institutional factors.

3. **Avoidance of extended tenure**: A desire to withdraw from the
presidential office prior to that time when leadership ability becomes
ineffective.

4. **Extended tenure**: Retention in the presidential office beyond
that time which is considered "average" and which prompts need for
change.

5. **Community environment**: The climate of support, freedom, and un-
derstanding shared between institutional constituents.

6. **Racial climate**: The dynamics of national and institutional ra-
cial relationships as they affect the administrative leadership role.

7. **Inability for personal growth**: Factors within the presidency
which stifle personal and professional growth and development.

8. **Departure from religious order**: Within certain religiously-
affiliated institutions, the effect which the clerical role has on the
educational role.

9. **Basic administration**: Those tasks of administration which are
unique to the presidential office alone.

10. **Objective achievement**: The attainment of implicit or explicit
institutional, professional, or personal goals.

11. **Board relationship**: The relationship between chief administra-
tive officer and institutional board of control.

12. **Political and bureaucratic stifling**: Extra-institutional
influences of governmental and/or political nature which affect presidential functioning.

13. Basic internal relations: Those interactions with the general campus bodies, sufficiently interrelated to prevent their consideration as specific groups.

14. Faculty relations: The relations shared with the faculty body individually or organizationally.

15. Student involvement: The influence of individual or organized students on the presidential office.

16. Basic external relations: Relations with bodies external to the geographical campus of a generalized and interrelated nature.

17. Alumni relations: The relationship active between president and individual alumni or alumni bodies.

18. Fund raising: The responsibilities for acquiring institutional fiscal support.

19. General employment alternative: The opportunity available as an alternative to continued employment in the presidential office.

20. Physical stamina: Those physical and emotional factors of fatigue which influence presidential termination.

21. Family needs: The demands and responsibilities of family life as they affect the professional presidential demands and responsibility.

It was not the intent of the study to obtain a rank order listing of presidential termination factors from most to least important, for it was felt that such material does not necessarily lend itself to such quantification. Thus the central focus of the research became that of
acquiring a generalized picture as reflected by the comments of those individuals who had served the presidential role and in turn had chosen to leave it for other forms of professional involvement. However, in the final analysis, there must be admission that some factors rose to play more important roles than did others. In using the measures of raw occurrence and weighted factors, some attempt was made to place reasons motivating presidential termination in terms of import in meaningful relationship one with another. Within the context, then, it can be assumed that an academic president will resign his role when:

a. Another position which interests him for personal or professional reasons presents itself (general employment alternative), and

b. he feels the objectives which he and the institution have established have been achieved (objective achievement) and as a result,

c. feels physically and/or emotionally exhausted (physical stamina), and

d. perceives that he has been active in the position longer than the norm (extended tenure), and

e. does not wish to remain active past that point where his effectiveness as an institutional leader begins to wane (avoidance of extended tenure),

f. feels that due to the changing demands of society the role which he entered some years prior is one in which he no longer feels comfortable (role evolution), and thus

g. perceives that his perceptions of the role and the manner in which he fulfills it are not those of his constituencies (role expectations), and
h. has the impression of political and/or bureaucratic stifling which thwart his plans and programs for higher education (political and bureaucratic stifling), and also

i. has become tired of raising funds and securing monies to operate the institution (fund raising), and finally

j. feels certain elements within the total community to be nonsupportive and inhospitable to his freedom of operation (community environment).

This of course attempts to summarize the major findings of a study of some length in somewhat less than one page. Thus it is important as a final summation to deal with all topics at somewhat greater length, drawing from them conclusions which will contribute to a greater understanding of presidential termination.

There are in effect two sets of conclusions and generalizations which can be drawn from the findings of the study. First, there are those which are based on the data collected, and deal with specific and individual topics. Secondly, there are those which are of a generalized nature and result from total impressions.

Specific Conclusions

1. Basic role expectations: There are many indications that the role expectations of the college and university presidency are confused, complex, and in a state of flux both for the president himself and for those groups and individuals who view or work with the chief administrative officer. Few written position descriptions or guidelines exist and
as a result there is a significant degree of inaccurate role perception. The presidential role is possibly made most difficult for those who do not view it in its realistic terms, yet there is reason to believe that for those who approach the role without illusion, it can and is one of the most exciting and fulfilling involvements in which one could become involved.

2. **Role evolution**: Within the past decade, a period equal to the approximate tenure length of the sample, there has been significant change in the presidential role of both gradual and rapid nature. The gradual change has been that of increasing time involvement due to additional responsibilities, and the rapid change in forms of governmental structures, administrative methods, and political powers. Thus it is understandable that some presidents have not found it possible to make the transition. For those able to make the transition, it becomes additionally difficult to project such personal and/or professional change to disparate constituencies. Therefore, in the requirement of a two-step change process, i.e. the first to change, and the second to be able to project the change, the ability to adapt to the role evolution is made doubly difficult for the presidential officer.

3. **Avoidance of extended tenure**: There would seem to be an almost innate fear within the president that he might remain in office past that time when his effectiveness as an institutional leader is at its maximum. Each has experienced a friend or colleague who remained past that point and he is concerned that he too might be guilty. It is consensus that the presidential term should be not less than five nor more than ten years, for significant objectives cannot be achieved in less than the
minimum and there is greater chance that administrative leadership abilities have been spent after the maximum.

4. **Extended tenure**: Two points of reference, that of age sixty-five which is generally accepted as "retirement age", and the average tenure length of the American college and university president, are significant in their contribution to termination. For the president who has passed age sixty-five, although not required by law or regulation to resign, much credence is awarded that particular age as a time to consider termination and the award of the position to a new individual. For those individuals who are still in their forties and fifties and pass the decade mark in the presidential office, particular thought is given to new involvement rather than the consideration of continued and extended involvement.

5. **Community environment**: The expressed need of an opportunity for sufficient personal and professional freedom illustrates the importance of a favorable community environment. Such a climate does not need to be one of complete agreement. It must, however, be based on mutual understanding, tolerance, and respect of one constituent body for all others.

6. **Racial climate**: The uncertainties with which society-at-large approaches race relations is mirrored within the academic community. There is indication of changing perceptions, e.g. resignation of a white president at a predominately black institution to be replaced by a black administrative leader. Yet the major point of indecision it would seem is the point of balance which will be acceptable to all interested parties, which of greatest import to the administrative leader is one with
which he feels is just for all concerned and with which he can function with complete integrity.

7. Inability for personal growth: Presidential termination as it results from the stifling of personal growth is the product of two extreme circumstances. The first was found within relatively small institutions and manifested itself in a condition which could be termed as a lack of challenge for the incumbent; thus he left to seek more challenging involvement. The other was a circumstance in which the demands of the office were so great that insufficient time was left for such personal needs as reading, scholarship, research, and family involvement.

8. Departure from religious role: Within the context of some religiously affiliated institutions, the presidential officer often serves a dual role - that of religious and spiritual leader as well as educational leader. The duality of the role, however, becomes inextricably interwoven, and although resignation of the educational role does not negate the religious, departure from the religious does significantly affect the educational, usually to the extent of automatic termination. Thus when the president of such an institution comes to the decision that he must leave the religious community in which he has assumed clerical responsibility, he likewise understands that he must at the same time leave the academic community in which he has assumed administrative leadership.

9. Basic administration: The motivating factors for resignation in the confines of basic administration revolve around the abilities to achieve true community decision-making capabilities. This occurs either in the admitted weakness of the president to function within such structure, or his inability to educate his constituencies in community-centered
processes. There is likewise a difficulty encountered, when rudimentary processes are achieved, in finding the proper balance which thus makes community government the effective technique that it can be. Initially such means of university governance appear elementary. Yet in truth their realization comes only through the most complex and difficult organizational method possible.

10. **Objective achievement:** A purpose of educational leadership is the achievement of certain institutional goals which have been established either by the administrative leader himself or in conjunction with other constituencies. Such goals are recognized either as those to be achieved, or in retrospect as products of administrative leadership. In either instance - as established goals which have through time been achieved or as objectives viewed upon their completion as being of significance - there results a certain feeling of accomplishment on the part of the president which contributes to a termination decision. In those instances where goals are pre-established, considerable integrity is present for seldom does the president leave his position prior to their accomplishment. Yet in both circumstances, planned and retrospective, the sense of contribution to the institution brings suggested closure to the administrative tenure.

11. **Board Relationship:** The relationship which the president shares with his institutional board of control is unique and frequently positive. Yet upon occasion the role perception which the president holds for the collective board are not fulfilled and conflict results. Interestingly enough, the instances in which such conflict occurred happened at relatively new institutions at which the president was serving at the
first administrative leader of the institution and in which the board of control members for the most part were the original members of that body. Without exception it was their involvement in administrative areas, rather than the policy areas which are commonly the board's area of concern, that prompted termination. In brief, the board saw fit, at least in the mind of the president, to fill two roles - that of policy-making as well as administration. The phenomenon would appear to be that of new institutions and new boards of control as evidenced by its lack of citation among established organizations.

12. Political and bureaucratic stifling: A termination factor more prevalent at publically supported institutions is the matter of political and/or bureaucratic influences over which the president feels that he has minimal control. The form may be that of budgetary non-support, administrative involvement, or political maneuvering. Yet no matter what the form, the president senses that he is not his own man, and that his ability to provide educational leadership is severely altered. Within this context, newly created state boards of control added significantly to the problem through their administrative rather than policy involvement, a reoccurrence of the circumstance detected among new institutional boards.

13. Basic internal relations: Relationships with bodies located geographically on the campus, e.g. faculty, students, and administrative staff, and sufficiently interrelated to deny their consideration as individual bodies seem not to be of great importance in presidential termination. Yet the one matter that seems to find common expression, either as a termination factor or as a general concern, is the great difficulty
and inability to find continuing and continued opportunity for community interaction; the opportunity to build significant levels of trust and confidence on the part of all elements. Such concern finds expression among other factors, e.g. community environment, and community decision-making, yet finds expression in this context as an unfulfilled need for vehicles and time to find such opportunity.

14. Faculty relations: As they relate to termination causal factors, presidential - faculty relations revolve around one major and two minor topics. The primary factor is that of institutional leadership, i.e. who shall lead the institution and be the source of final authority - faculty or administration. Such an either-or alternative is obviously overly simplified, yet represents the extremes of the relationship. The two secondary concerns are those of academic freedom - its definition and at what point it ceases as a freedom and becomes license, and professional responsibility - the use or abuse of faculty privilege as it affects education in general and the institution specifically.

15. Student involvement: Events of the past several years have placed student involvement in institutional governance in new perspective. The resignations which occurred in part due to such involvement resulted primarily from organizational political pressure, yet such occurrence was infrequent. There is indication of increased presidential - student involvement in settings other than confrontational, and regret on the part of the administrative leader that the time might not be greater.

16. Basic external relations: External bodies, e.g. alumni, legislatures, and the community-at-large, as viewed generally and not
specifically, are not termination factors of great concern to the academic president. However, there is indication that the area, particularly as it affects either donor or tax support, will in fact increase somewhat significantly in priority over the next few years. To date, however, it represents an area in which presidents find opportunity for change-of-pace and enjoyment, and represents but a minor factor in its contribution to presidential departure.

17. **Alumni relations**: Although possibly a persistent concern, relations with graduates of the institution do not contribute in any more than a minute way to termination. Such relations center around a concern both unique and somewhat unexplainable which alumni hold for their alma mater, finding resolution in their assurance that the institution has changed - or not changed - in the direction which they see best. Relations resulting merely from graduation are significantly different than those established and built through alumni programs, the latter taking great lengths of time in reaching the point of positive contribution to both alumni and institution.

18. **Fund raising**: The search for institutional operating and capital funds is a presidential concern predominately within the context of the private institution, although there is indication that the circumstance in terms of taxpayer support and legislative apportionment may increasingly place the public institution within the same sector. There is little question regarding its constancy and the inordinate amount of time which it demands. These factors, plus the basic sales role which is felt to be antithetical to the educational leadership role, are basic factors within fund raising which prompt its inclusion among presidential
termination factors.

19. **General employment alternative**: The fact that approximately one half of those presidents leaving office assume responsibility in a different area points to the import which that employment alternative holds. The circumstance in which he finds himself in the employment market is unique, for with both realism and certainty the chief executive can resign his position knowing that subsequent employment will be available even if not in prospect at the time of the announced termination. The selection of new involvement is a procedure of considerable interest to observe, for it places in direct confrontation two opportunities for contribution which must be finally selected on their relative merits. Involvement in new areas comes as the result of four different means: (1) Mandatory, i.e. election or appointment to office, usually within the framework of a religious organization, (2) selection on the basis that the new position holds equal or greater challenge, opportunity for contribution, and professional interest, (3) an opportunity for reinvolvement in a former activity, within the confines of this study that involvement being college teaching, and (4) movement to a position of a less sensitive and stressful nature yet with opportunity for continued contribution to higher education.

20. **Physical stamina**: The demands placed upon the individual who fills the presidential role become evident in symptoms of physical and emotional fatigue, with one of every four resignations within the sample involved at least in part with such a causal factor. Physical stamina manifests itself in one or a combination of two ways - the physical ability to fulfill the requirements of the position and the generally
accepted concept of "administrative fatigue." The first is supported by medical examination, e.g. high blood pressure, ulcers, long and debilitating illness. The second is not as specific in its symptoms or diagnosis, yet shows itself in a feeling by the president that he is completely and totally spent physically and/or emotionally.

21. Family needs: The involvements of the presidency make significant in-roads on the time which is available for family relationships. And as a result is introduced one of the few extra-presidential factors of termination, that of resignation to find such time in other positions of employment. It can be noted that all other factors, with the possible exception of an inability for personal growth, are those related directly to the professional role; those responsibilities which are exclusively those of the president's office. However, the inclusion of termination for family reasons brings into play personal responsibilities which were active prior to the acceptance of the presidential role and which must find adjustment when the administrative leadership responsibility is superimposed. When such adjustment cannot satisfactorily be made, the relationship becomes active as a termination factor.

General Conclusions

1. Although demanding and difficult, the academic presidency is not the hopelessly impossible position that many contend it to be.

This study began with an intent to determine faults within the system and to suggest means of rectification, thus providing opportunity for longer presidential tenure. The study ends with a conclusion that, taken
in perspective, the presidency can be no different than it is and hope to remain as a positive force in the leadership of higher education.

Let the conclusion be supported by comments of the sample cited previously. (As all responses were received in confidence, presidents are identified only by control number.)

I thoroughly enjoyed being a president and believe that if one understands the job before he takes it, even during these trying times, good men will be attracted to the presidency. (14)

My two resignations as president were in no sense motivated by frustration or unhappiness in the positions. As anyone knows, the role of president is a taxing one, and there are times of discouragement. But on the whole I found the job rewarding and interesting. I would not change things very much if I had it to do over again. (22)

Peter Drucker in his book The Effective Executive calls it (the academic presidency) an impossible job. Frankly, I enjoyed my ten year stint, although I have no desire to continue for another ten years. The rewards far exceed the moments of disaffection. In a dynamic institution like this University in the last ten years the exhilaration of physical growth and faculty improvement would be impossible to match in any other undertaking. (46)

Trying, taxing, discouraging, and disaffection - this is the presidency. Enjoyable, rewarding, interesting - this too is the presidency. It would in fact seem true that on the whole "the exhilaration... would be impossible to match in any other undertaking."

2. Presidential tenure should be viewed in terms of relatively short periods of time and within the context of institutional developmental units.

The consensus among respondents is the perception of presidential
terms not less than five nor more than ten years. Departure prior to that time negates significant contribution, remaining after introduces the possibility of ineffectiveness. Likewise, the introduction of objective achievement concepts and theories of organizational development key on similar chronological units. Combined, they establish a circumstance of specific institutional need, the meeting of that need through selection of a presidential officer whose expertise fulfills institutional requirements, the subsequent passage of the institution into new levels of development, and probable selection of another president to meet the needs of the new level. The presidency is thus viewed as a means by which to build for current need, with each successive president adding to the previous foundation. It may well be that one individual may be sufficiently adaptable to pass through succeeding levels of development, or should serve within the context of specific contract periods with the completion of each period subject to contract renewal or termination. However, it should be accepted that in periods of rapid social change similar to those in which we now live, such developmental units are unbound by previous time constraints and result in what may seem to be an excessive turn-over rate among academic executives as judged by former standards. Thus such termination becomes a product of the social climate, unable to function simply within the institutional confines.

3. There is need to define more specifically the role of the college and university president, and even more importantly to understand its evolutionary nature.

The relatively major part which both factors of role expectation
and its evolutionary character played in presidential termination point
with some urgency to a need for such definition and understanding. This
circumstance is well summarized by a president of the sample:

In times of stress, it is inevitable that definitions of
roles will be tested. That for the presidency was never
clear to most interested parties, and during the test of
recent times it has been strained if not shattered. Dur-
ing my years as president (1963-69) the expectations of
me changed considerably.

At the present time, there does not seem to be agreement
in most colleges and universities on what the president
should do or be. My advice to search committees is that
they try to gain agreement on what faculty, trustees,
alumni organizations, and perhaps student organizations
expect before they attempt to invite someone to take
responsibility. (33)

The achievement of such definition is at best difficult, and in-
cludes responsibilities both implicit and explicit. It of necessity
must be a community project, for although an individual may perfectly
fill a role which he perceives, other perceptions by other individuals
make his attainment meaningless.

Yet it seems that once the definition has come, it is of greater
concern to project the non-static nature of that role, thus making the
definition of role a continual process, understood by both incumbent
and constituency. It is likewise important for the president to convey
his ability to change as the role itself evolves, and for those who view
that role to understand that such change is possible and does occur, i.e.
that the presidential officer is not type-cast, unable to extricate him-
self from the role he originally assumed.

Role definition thus becomes a community task, initially estab-
lished by all, yet understood to be evolutionary in nature.
4. Methods and procedures of college and university community government are generally in embryonic stages.

Although group participative methods are not necessarily new as a means of organizational management, there is sufficient reason to believe that they have not been refined on the college and university campus. There would appear to be several reasons. First, some presidents admit that based on former administrative styles in which they were trained and had experience, such procedures are difficult for them to achieve, or as one suggested, "Some of us - trained in the 'no' mode of 1948 administration - have no function in the system a-building." (47) Or another within this context when he remarked "I believe that the recent turnover of presidents is due to this change in the qualifications for the position and many of those in my generation have realized that their style does not conform to present and future needs." (22) Secondly, there is likewise an indication that not only presidents but constituent bodies have difficulty learning and adapting to group processes. As one president reflected on his institution, "...they found going 'democratic' hard. ...Response was clumsy." (6) Third, the time constraints which rigidly superimpose themselves over higher education, e.g. forty-seven minute classes, ten week terms, thirty week years, term papers due by a specific date, etc., work at cross-purposes with the basic need to build intraconstituent confidence and respect. This was well-summarized by a president who wrote. "There simply isn't enough time to talk with and establish trust and understanding with those who demand a share in the decision-making process." (41) And a fourth and final reason why group methods have not attained refinement on the university
campus revolves around the difficulty in reaching and maintaining a proper balance where the process is in fact group-centered and not skewed toward one particular constituent.

As a result of at least these four reasons, community government within higher education has not been fully developed. There is reason to believe that these barriers can be overcome, yet not without considerable introspection and overt effort on the part of all university groups.

5. Higher education must consider new methods of organizational structure and leadership.

Included within the survey of literature were several thoughts on the topic of changing structure and methods of administrative leadership. Considered were a leader - manager concept, and selection criteria based on an expertise which offers access to the decision-making process. The topic was struck again within the presidential response when an individual who had served two successive presidencies wrote:

...Not only must there be able and adequate staff help for the president, but the position itself must be divided so that there are at least two people to share the overall responsibility for the institution.

What we need (and the titles are unimportant) is a structure which puts the senior member of the administration in a strong place inside the governing board, and puts the chief operating officer in an equally strong spot within the daily operating structure of the university. (25)

Many points of view exist relative to the pattern which such structure should assume. And it was not the purpose of this study to propose such a model. However, the research leads to a conclusion that there is
need to consider new methods of leadership. The conclusion to consider and not to implement implies an uncertainty that such change is needed. However, it would appear that a number of causal factors cited by the sample as responsible for resignation, e.g. role expectations, role evolution, political and bureaucratic stifling, fund raising, and board of control relationship, might be significantly improved through means of institutional leadership other than that which has traditionally been of line - staff orientation.

6. Emerging boards of control present certain unique problems for the administrative leader.

Although previously considered in two separate specific conclusions, the generalized aspect of newly established boards of control deserves further mention. Implicit within the break-downs which occurred between academic presidents and their boards of control, both at the institutional and at the state level, appeared to be an evolutionary process in which the governing body moved from administrative to policy-level involvement. This phenomenon was apparent in five specific cases, two at the state level and three at institutional level, all of which occurred in situations where the board of control had been established within the past ten year period. The crux of the problem was that of an over-involvement by the board in administrative detail, and too little concern for its primary policy-making role. No such concern was cited by presidents who functioned with established boards. Other than noting its occurrence and symptoms, however, the process and factors of change have not been determined.
Considerations for Future Research

1. The specific consideration of individual motivating factors in resignation of the academic presidency, e.g.
   a. Avoidance of extended tenure: Implied within this causal factor was the desire by the incumbent to leave office prior to that time when his leadership is no longer effective. What factors contribute to the presidential perception that such effectiveness is, or soon, may diminish?
   b. Community environment: The climate in which the president functions must be one which is supportive of his effort and provides certain innovative freedoms. What are the variables within such an environment and are some of more importance than others?
   c. General employment alternative: Cited as among the most important of termination factors, the alternative to continued involvement in the presidency provides many unexplored areas. What are the factors within such involvement, e.g. salary, location, associates, national reputation, professional challenge, etc., and which serve as greater influential points than others?
   d. Role expectations: Confused, complex, evolving were the conclusions of this study. What are in fact the current expectations for the academic president as viewed by various constituencies?

2. A study in some depth of structural and organizational alternatives open to higher education.
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Expressed within this study has been suggested change for higher education, specifically in terms of organization. A conclusion was the need to consider new alternatives to meet current educational need. However, beyond very limited proposals, no attempt has been made to make specific recommendation. It would appear that such an area would provide abundant data for future research.

3. A consideration of the evolutionary process of newly established boards of control.

The fact that board relationship termination factors occurred only among newly established boards of control, both state and institutional, presents a topic of some interest. Is there in fact an evolutionary process through which such organizations move, or are other factors in play which seemingly force greater initial involvement in administration rather than policy, e.g. inability to make such change after complete involvement with institutional establishment for a period of several years?

4. The possibility of projecting presidential termination.

This study has concerned itself with retrospective concerns in presidential termination. Thus, is it possible from a prospective point of view to project presidential termination? Is it possible to contend that with the occurrence of specific factors presidential termination is more likely to occur? There has been such study in terms of school superintendents, e.g. the election of a certain proportion of new members to a school board will increase the likelihood that the superintendent of schools will be replaced. This study has shown that in the presence of
certain variables, e.g. alternative employment, physical stamina, and objective achievement, termination will occur. The purpose of future research would be a consideration of those or other factors which, as measured by a current standard, would indicate the likelihood of presidential resignation.

5. Presidential termination as considered from a total constituent point of view.

This work has involved itself with presidential termination from basically a singular perception, that of the president. There would also seem to be merit in a consideration of resignation from other points of view, e.g. board of control, faculty, student body, and local community. The comparison of varying points of view regarding a similar incident, i.e. the termination of a president, might prove of considerable worth.

6. A study of presidential resignation from a normative statistical base.

While the basis of this study has been citation of termination factors, a study based on certain normative factors - age, educational level, and specialty, previous experience, type of institution, etc. - as they relate with termination would add additional insight. This study, for instance, noted a seemingly large percentage of former college teachers among the resignees. As such statistics were included only to provide a generalized impression of the sample, no effort was made to relate the factor with resignation. However, a study such as that proposed would deal only with objective normative factors and their
occurrence among presidential resignation.

In Conclusion

It is extremely difficult to bring a research project of such length as this in terms of data, time, and personal involvement to satisfactory closure. On the whole the study has been an enjoyable and worthwhile experience both personally and professionally. Due to the nature of the study, much that has been presented has been the significant contribution of former academic presidents whose generosity it was to share their thoughts and reflections on factors influencing their termination decision. It would be the concern of the writer that such reflections have been placed in proper relationship and afford a new and perceptive view of academic presidential termination.
APPENDIX A

Letter of Request and Questionnaire
Dear:

The following quotes are undoubtedly familiar to you:

Despite the fact that nobody has either to to into academic administra-
tion or to stay in it, I doubt that there will ever be
a dearth of available candidates. Our growing problem is more
likely to be the unwillingness of outstanding men and women to
subject themselves to the increased rigors and decreased re-
wards that may be in prospect. (Logan Wilson, "A Few Kind
Words for Academic Administrators.")

The administrator. . .will find that the strain is chiefly up-
on his character rather than his mind. (Robert M. Hutchins,
"The Administrator.")

I found myself inescapably reminded of Malcolm in Macbeth as
he said of Duncan, "Nothing in his life became him like the
leaving it," and devising a paraphrase, "Nothing in the presi-
dency satisfies so much as leaving it." (Goodrich C. White,
The Education of the Administrator.)

The above phrases speak of the American academic presidency. Until re-
cently you held such office, yet chose to resign from the position to
invest your efforts in new areas of concern.

As a doctoral candidate in Higher Education at The Ohio State University
I have chosen as a dissertation topic those reasons prompting resigna-
tion of the presidential role. For it would seem that until a basic un-
derstanding of presidential termination exists, and corrective action
taken, the experience, training, and expertise of persons who fill the
role will continue to slip away from the presidential office, wasting
both institutional and individual resources. Few persons it would ap-
pear have taken the opportunity to consider such thoughts in written
form. Dr. Hutchins in the above cited article comments that very few
"do any important thinking about the end of their administrative activity.
There is little published evidence that any administrative officer has
done so since Marcus Aurelius."

Enclosed you will find a questionnaire which, based on readings by and
about college presidents, attempts to synthesize an extremely complex role into certain specific areas. It would be my hope that in the coming month you will have sufficient time to reflect on those reasons for your resignation and to share them with me. I am not so much concerned with a rank order listing as I am with the general thoughts of persons who have held the role and have then chosen to leave it. If you feel bound by the constraints of the questionnaire and would prefer to share your thoughts with me by means of a personal letter, this is perfectly acceptable. Should you wish to dictate your thoughts, yet do not particularly care to have clerical personnel share them, you may send the tape (IBM, Dictaphone, Stenorette, etc.) directly to me and I will transcribe the reply. In any event I would ask that completed replies or tapes be mailed to me on or before January 15, 1971. All materials received will be held as confidential.

May I take this opportunity to express my appreciation for both your time and talent devoted to this effort.

Sincerely yours,

Bruce T. Alton

Enclosures
In the following five questions you are asked to consider specific areas as they relate to the decision that you made to leave the academic presidency. Space is provided after each question for reply. Your reply may be of one or two sentences, may fill the space provided (approximately 350 words), or be continued on the reverse side.

1. **Role Expectations**: There would seem to be certain considerations which are basic to the presidency. The president alone must retain responsibility for achieving the overall goal of institutional purpose; it is a somewhat lonely role and seemingly one of many acquaintances but few friends. The position is viewed differently by each constituency, each having its own role definition and behavioral expectations. Consideration too must be made of the change agent role held in an environment which often resists change, yet requesting such leadership from a position which is viewed with some mistrust but knows no tenure.

   Such examples are merely suggestive in asking which, if any, similar role expectations were significant in your decision to leave the presidency office?
2. General Administration: Certain responsibilities are uniquely those of the president and no one else. Possibly most important is the relationship shared with the board of control, serving at their pleasure while at the same time serving a mediating role between board, faculty, students, and in certain circumstances the state legislature. The democratic process must be promoted in an atmosphere which often encourages haste and urgency, operating within a community structure of organization rather than hierarchy. The president must function with limited power, making decisions in an environment of great diversity and differing circumstance. While faced with unceasing routine, time must be found for innovation and planning.

Again, such items serve only as examples of tasks within general administration and act as basic guidelines in asking which, if any, played a role of some note in your action to leave?
3. Internal Relations: Important to the president are relationships with faculty - protection of academic freedom, the manner in which the faculty leadership role is assumed, the finesse of involvement in program development, and the individual approach to the circumstances which would move the president away from the educational center of higher education. Important too are relations with administrative staff, often men and women not of one's own choosing yet upon whom there must be great dependence. Likewise of concern are relationships with students who often feel rightful neglect.

Within such taxonomy how would you reflect upon internal relationships as you view the factors which brought about your resignation request?
4. External Relations: Although physically removed from the campus, external constituent factors present a concern as immediate as those physically present. Included individually or organizationally are parents, alumni, the public in general, and legal and extra-legal bodies, each holding some degree of vested interest. Complicating relations with external constituencies, particularly in recent years, has been the increasing social and political role played by colleges and universities. Finally, the academic president finds himself to be the primary spokesman, public relations agent, and fund raiser for the institution.

Within the confines of this definition, how did your relationship with external bodies affect or influence your final decision to resign the presidential office?
5. **Employment Alternative:** It is difficult to measure positive and negative forces in employment change - what percentage of the decision was the demand within yourself to leave, what percentage to accept a new and inviting offer. On occasion even pending unemployment is a positive alternative. Factors of primary consideration are location, associates, family needs, salary, opportunity for professional and personal growth and development, relief from administrative fatigue, etc.

Which factors similar to these were important to you as you left the presidency and assumed new responsibilities?
Name

Institution of which you were president

Note: The above information will be held in confidence and at no time will appear in the study.

Personal Characteristics:
1. Years of your presidency 19 ___ to 19 ___
2. Date of birth ________________________________
3. Earned degrees
   Degree Institution Major Area Year
   ________________________________  ________________________________  ____
   ________________________________  ________________________________  ____
   ________________________________  ________________________________  ____
   ________________________________  ________________________________  ____
4. Position held immediately preceding presidency
   Position _____________________________________________________________
   Inst/Orgn ___________________________________________________________
   Dates 19 ___ to 19 ___
5. Position held immediately succeeding presidency
   Position _____________________________________________________________
   Inst/Orgn ___________________________________________________________
6. Is this the position which you currently hold? Yes ___ No ___
7. If "No," the position which you now hold
   Position _____________________________________________________________
   Inst/Orgn ___________________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP LETTER OF REQUEST
During early December you should have received correspondence from me requesting your assistance in a definition of motivating factors for resignation of the academic presidential role.

I can appreciate the large number of similar requests that you receive daily. However, convinced of the need for such a study, I would encourage your response at the earliest date, preferably as soon after January 15 as is possible. The insight which you could offer in this area would be invaluable in an effort which attempts to more thoroughly understand the intricacies of the academic presidency. As this represents but the initial research phase of the study, it is important that I obtain as broad a base as possible.

If you have responded within the past few days may I thank you. If you have not yet responded, may I ask for your favorable consideration of the project and the return of the completed questionnaire or personal letter.

Sincerely yours,

Bruce T. Alton
APPENDIX C

Characteristics of Institutions at Which Presidents Served
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>College or University</th>
<th>Public or Private</th>
<th>Organizational Affiliation</th>
<th>Coed-Male-Female</th>
<th>Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 year College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>RSF</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 year University</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 year College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 year University</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 year College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>New England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 year College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4 year College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4 year University</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4 year University</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4 year College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>RSF</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4 year College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>RSF</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4 year College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2 year College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>LCM</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 year College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4 year University</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4 year University</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4 year College</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4 year College</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4 year University</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4 year College</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>New England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4 year University</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4 year University</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4 year University</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>New England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4 year College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4 year University</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Number</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>College or University</td>
<td>Public or Private</td>
<td>Organizational Affiliation</td>
<td>Coed-Male-Female</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>State Dept. Educ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>SBC</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>New England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>New England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Middle States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>New England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Middle States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>New England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Middle States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>North Central</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Affiliation Codes: AP: (State) Presbyterian; LCM: Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod; RC: Roman Catholic; RSF: Religious Society of Friends; SBC: Southern Baptist Convention; UM: United Methodist; UP: United Presbyterian
APPENDIX D

Respondent Personal Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Number</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number of Years In Presidency</th>
<th>Age at Time of Resignation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Number</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Number of Years in Presidency</td>
<td>Age at Time of Resignation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Information not available
TABLE 23
RESPONDENT PERSONAL DATA: FIRST AND SECOND EARNED DEGREES, TYPES OF INSTITUTION AT WHICH EARNED, AND MAJOR FIELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Number</th>
<th>First Pub/Fri Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Second Pub/Fri Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A.B. Private</td>
<td>History, English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr.Ph. Public (F)</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B.A. Public (P) *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Public (P) *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B.A. Private History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Private History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Public (F)</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B.A. Private (P)</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Public (F)</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A.B. Private</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Public</td>
<td>Political Science, Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B.A. Private (P)</td>
<td>English, Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Public</td>
<td>Education, English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>B.A. Public</td>
<td>History, Political Sci.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>B.A. Private</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.T.L. Private</td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A.B. Private</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td>M.B.A. Private</td>
<td>Management/Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>B.A. *</td>
<td>Romance Languages</td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Public</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A.B. Private History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. B.D. Private</td>
<td>Church History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>B.A. Public History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.D. Private</td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>B.A. Private</td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Public</td>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>B.A. Public</td>
<td>Geography, Geology</td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Public</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>B.S. Public (P)</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. B.D. Private</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>B.A. Public</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Private</td>
<td>Botany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>B.A. Private</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Private</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A.B. Private Botany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Private</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>B.A. Private English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Private</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>B.S. Private History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Private</td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>B.S. Private Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>B.A. Private (P) Classics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A. Private (F)</td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>A.B. Private History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.M. Public</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>B.A. Private Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.D. Private</td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Number</td>
<td>First Degree</td>
<td>Pub/Pri Institution</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Second Degree</td>
<td>Pub/Pri Institution</td>
<td>Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Military Professional</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>M.B.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Education - Math</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Guidance and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Private (P)</td>
<td>Biology, Chemistry</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Organic Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>S.T.L.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>Private (P)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Th.M.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Private (P)</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>A.B.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>A.B.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>A.B.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>A.B.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>A.B.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>B.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbol Key:  
F: Foreign institution  
P: Institution of presidency  
*: Information not available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Number</th>
<th>First Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Fourth Degree</th>
<th>Pub/Pri Institution</th>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public (F)</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>L.M.S.</td>
<td>Public (F)</td>
<td>Medieval Studies</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public (F)</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Political Sci., History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Educational Psych.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S.S.L.</td>
<td>Private (F)</td>
<td>Scripture</td>
<td>S.T.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>D.C.S.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Management/Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>History, Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Church History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Educational Psych.</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public (F)</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Botany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private (F)</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 24: RESPONDENT PERSONAL DATA: THIRD AND FOURTH EARNED DEGREES, TYPE OF INSTITUTION AT WHICH EARNED, AND MAJOR FIELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Number</th>
<th>Third Pub/Pri Number</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Fourth Pub/Pri Number</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>American History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Organic Chemistry</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>D.H.E.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Health Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Educational Admin.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Symbol Key:**
- **F**: Foreign institution
- **P**: Institution of presidency
- *****: Information not available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Number</th>
<th>Position Immediately Preceding Presidency</th>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Position Immediately Succeeding Presidency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Federal Government - Administration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Foundation Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assistant to the President (P)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Foundation Administration (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>College Administration - Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>College Teaching (P)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Leave of Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>State Government - Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Foundation Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>State Government - Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>College Teaching (P)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>College Administration - Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>College Teaching (P)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>College Administration - Chancellor (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>College Administration - Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>College Administration - Student Affairs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Educational Consultant - Self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>College Administration - Bus., Trustees</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Federal Government - Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>College President</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Federal Government - Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foundation Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Acting President, College Teaching</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>Federal Government - Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>College President</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Business/Industry - Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic (P)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>State Government - Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Business/Industry - Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Church Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Administration - Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic, Teaching</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Foundation Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Number</td>
<td>Position Immediately Preceding Presidency</td>
<td>Number of Years</td>
<td>Position Immediately Succeeding Presidency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Business/Industry - Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Federal Government - Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic (P)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>College Administration - Asst., Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>College President</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foundation Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic (P)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Leave of Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>College Administration - Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>College President</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Church Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic (P)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>College Administration - College Rel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>College President</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>College Administration - Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Church Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>College Administration - Business (P)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>College Teaching (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Higher Education Assoc. - Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>College Teaching (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Educational Consultant - Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>College Administration - Academic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Higher Education Assoc. - Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>College Administration - Student Affairs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Educational Consultant - Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>College President</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Educational Consultant - Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbol Key:  P: Institution of presidency  
*: Information not available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Number</th>
<th>Position Held Subsequent to that Immediately Succeeding Presidency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>College Administration - University Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>College Teaching (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>College Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Federal Government - Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>College Administration - Continuing Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Educational Consultant - Self-employed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbol Key:  P: Institution of presidency
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