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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Although social work has been sex-typed as a feminine occupation and there have always been more female than male social workers, the top administrative positions in the field have generally been held by men. A decade ago it was reported that two-thirds of the membership of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) were women but two-thirds of the social work administrative positions were held by men.\(^1\) Of particular interest for this study is the fact that during the academic year, 1978-1979; at a time when women outnumbered the men 2:1 in the profession, men outnumbered the women 3:1 as deans in schools with accredited social work graduate program. The discrepancy is noteworthy because, although not all social workers want to practice in administrative positions, and even fewer are attracted to educational administrative positions, the deanships offer the potential for exercising strong leadership, power, and influence within the profession as well as the promise of receiving substantial monetary and status rewards. The importance of these positions makes them an appropriate subject for study so
that all may understand not only what it's like to be a dean, but what one has to do to become a dean. This study is an effort to provide such information.

Background

Social work as a feminine occupation. The labelling of social work as a feminine occupation illustrates Merton's assertion that occupations tend to be sex-typed "when a very large majority of those in them are of one sex and when there is an associated normative expectation that this is as it should be." A majority of social workers are women and this is expected, both because of the nature of the work and because of the opportunities afforded to women within the profession.

As a profession, social work began with philanthropic and volunteer efforts to alleviate the distress of the poor and disadvantaged. It has moved far beyond the early moralistic and paternalistic activities of the first Charity Organization Societies, but social casework, the method in which a majority of social workers practice, is characterized by the same attention to individual needs and wants. Even within other (macro) social work methods there is an underlying service goal that calls for continued personal and humanitarian commitment. Social work is viewed as a nurturant, expressive kind of occupation and "the ideal social worker, like the ideal woman, is
selfless, nurturant, empathetic, and warm." In an analysis of social work as a semi-profession, Etzioni concludes that it will "always have an element of the subjective, the personal, and the emotional."

Since social work has been described as an extension of the traditional female role, it is not surprising that the profession has attracted women into its ranks, far exceeding the number of men. The early history of the profession is a rich tribute to such women as Dorothea Dix, Jane Addams, Zilpha Smith, Grace and Edith Abbott, and Mary Richmond, all of whom made their mark upon the profession in the late 19th and early 20th century. They founded and directed settlement houses, charity societies, and agency based training schools. They were the friendly visitors and they were the reformers marching in the streets, championing a variety of social and political causes.

A survey of social work positions in New York in 1916 found that 72% of the positions were held by women. The same situation was implied by a 1928 description of a social worker: "Usually the professional worker is a woman who has had between four and five years experience in the field and is doing casework . . ." A rationale for the prominence of women in the profession was given in an historical account: "One might say that social work
spread and developed in the United States not just because there was a need for its concerns and services (and there certainly was), but also because there were many young ladies who were determined to serve and who wanted not a patronizing and undemocratic role as a charity visitor, which Jane Addams explicitly rejected, but a dignified and paid career.7 As the profession grew, so did the number of female social workers. Since the 1940s, the percentage of females has fluctuated around 66%, exceeding that during the war years and declining slightly during the post-war years when men were actively recruited into the profession.8

Administration as a masculine activity. Administrative positions in most fields also reflect the kind of sex-typing described by Merton. It is men, however, who have dominated administrative positions, and this has been accepted on the grounds that administrative activity requires characteristics frequently associated with men. The very small representation of women in managerial positions was clearly shown in the 1970 census figures. Although women then made up 39% of the labor force, less than 5% of those earning over $10,000 a year in the census category of Officials, Managers and Proprietors were women and only 2.3% of those earning $25,000 or more were women.9
A survey of the attitudes of business executives toward women in 1965 revealed that 65% of the executives expressed unfavorable attitudes toward the entrance of women into management. The survey, replicated in 1971, produced similar findings. Other studies have documented the dominance of male administrators in female professions. Kadushin reported that "in 1971, only 15 percent of elementary school principals were male. Male nurses, who in 1970 made up only 1 percent of the working nurses, have become 'nursing directors, hospital directors, and presidents of state nurses' associations.'"

In the 1950s when social workers sought to raise the image of the social work profession, they deliberately chose to recruit men, hoping that the infusion of "male qualities" would overcome the negative aspects of what was being perceived as a woman's profession. The recruitment of males was to have a significant effect upon the employment opportunities for women, especially in the area of administration.

As men entered the profession, a division in the performance of social work functions, based upon traditional sex roles, was established. It seemed appropriate and natural that women should retain the "person-oriented" and "expressive" roles within casework and groupwork, while the men should assume the more "system-oriented" and "aggressive," i.e., masculine, roles within community
organization and administration. This division was justified as late as 1969 based upon the assumptions that 1) men were more likely than women to be concerned about income and so sought the higher paying jobs; 2) men would be sought for administrative positions because they were believed to be more effective in working with other men; and 3) men had greater desire for the professional advancement which administrative posts offered.\textsuperscript{14} In 1976, a similar argument was advanced in a discussion of how males adjust to being in a female profession. It was asserted that men tend to move into administrative positions because administrative activity is "a male sex-typed task" . . . and such activity with its higher prestige and salary level compensates for the role strain that might otherwise exist.\textsuperscript{15}

It is clear that, as women initially welcomed men into the ranks, they also accepted the division of labor that permitted men to assume the power positions. But what, at first, had been viewed as an acceptable division of labor came to be seen as inequality between the sexes. Women came to realize that they were being "tracked into casework positions, receiving lower salaries than male colleagues and being less likely to advance professionally."\textsuperscript{16} The issue became a major problem of manpower distribution in the 1970's. Two surveys documented
the declining percentage of female executives within social work. One stated that "over the last two decades, men have replaced women in administrative positions at the rate of 2% a year . . . . If the present trend continues, there will be no women in social work leadership positions by the year 1984." Summing up the female reaction to this trend, one writer observed,

Currently in our real, still sex-typed world, administration is perceived as basically a male function and the woman who aspires to this career as deviant. The 'maleness' of administration is seen as overriding the 'femaleness' of the profession, and social workers are being asked to protect this distinction.

Academe as a Masculine Environment. Although the occupation of college professor may not be sex-typed to the extent that social worker or administrator have been shown to be, academe has traditionally been seen as a male enclave. Caplow and McGee said in 1958 that "Women scholars are not "taken seriously and cannot look forward to a normal professional career." This prophecy, recorded twenty years ago, may not be as true today as it was then, but statistical reports confirm that women have generally been underrepresented in the academic marketplace. They have been underrepresented 1) as recipients of the doctoral degree (generally required for admission to faculty ranks), 2) as members of the faculty, and 3) as academic administrators.
Table 1 shows the number of women receiving doctoral degrees and serving as faculty members for the years since 1869-70. The overall number of doctorates has been declining since 1973 (not shown), but the number of women and the proportion of women recipients have continued to show an increase. The highest proportion was reached in 1977-78 when, for the first time, the percentage of women receiving the doctorate exceeded one fourth of the total.

Since the doctorate has traditionally been the entrance requirement for faculty positions, it is not surprising to note the relatively small percentage of women serving on faculties. Bernard, documenting the historical representation of women in academe, noted that the proportion of women who were faculty members increased fairly rapidly from the middle of the nineteenth century to a peak in 1939-40 when women represented almost 28% of the faculty. There followed a steady decline, the percentage dropping to 22% in 1963 and to 20% in 1971. There has been little change in the past decade with the women comprising about one fourth of college faculties. The reporting of gross national figures obscures the fact that a large percentage of the women faculty members are located in the community and private junior colleges. In the large public and private multiversities where there tends to be greater opportunity for high status and salary level, women are more underrepresented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Receiving doctorate</th>
<th>% Serving on faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1869-70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879-80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899-1900</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929-30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 presents similar data regarding the proportion of women who have received social work doctorates and who are on social work faculties. A quick comparison of the two tables shows that, although women in social work do not do as well as men in social work, they fare much better than women overall. In 1977-78, at a time when only 26.9% of all doctorates were received by women, 44.7% of the social work doctorates were received by women. Similarly, women represented a higher proportion on social work faculties than did women overall. Figures are not available for the years prior to 1972 when the Council on Social Work Education first started to collect statistics by sex.

Women in social work have been more likely to obtain teaching positions in higher education than their sisters in other fields, first, because proportionately more women earned doctorates in social work than in other fields, and, second, because, until very recently, the doctorate was not required for social work teaching positions. The Master of Social Work (MSW) degree was considered the terminal degree for the profession and in most schools, only a minority of the faculty held the doctorate. National statistics for 1978-79 show that the graduate social work faculty was composed of 34% women whose highest degree was the Master's degree, 27% men with the doctorate, 22% men with only a Master's degree, 13% women with the doctorate, and 4% men and women with other, or non-reported degrees.24
### TABLE 2
Proportion of women receiving social work doctorate and serving on social work faculty, 1967-68 to 1978-79

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Receiving doctorate</th>
<th>% Serving on faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This advantage for women, however, must be countered by the fact that in those schools that do require a doctorate for teaching positions, the doctorate does not have to be in social work as long as the candidate holds the Master of Social Work degree.\textsuperscript{25} This means that the availability pool for social work faculties does not have the same sex ratio as the pool of recent social work graduates (which in 1978-79 was 48% female and 52% male). Instead it has a much higher male percentage because of the higher proportion of male doctorate recipients in the fields of Psychology, Sociology, Public Administration and other fields from which faculty are drawn for schools of social work.

The foregoing account of the representation of women in academe as recipients of the doctoral degree and as members of the faculty is relevant to the forthcoming discussion of women in academic administration because deans are generally drawn from faculty ranks and hold the doctorate. In 1976, it was reported that women held only 2% of all the top academic administrative positions in higher education and most of these were low level positions lacking in policy making responsibility, were sex related jobs (such as Dean of Women) or in sex-typed departments (such as Home Economics or Nursing), or were
located in small private, women's or religious colleges.\textsuperscript{26}

The very familiar names of social work theorists, Mary Richmond, Charlotte Towle, Helen Harris Perlman, Florence Hollis, etc. bear clear testimony to the fact that women have contributed significantly to the development of a distinctive social work knowledge base. Since the time when social work education moved from the agencies into the universities, however, men have been the dominant administrators of social work programs. Jessie Bernard writes of the "take-over of the deanships by men" in the 40's, but a review of the annual rosters of social work deans dating back to 1929 shows that women have never held a majority of the deanships.\textsuperscript{27} The highest percentage of women deans was achieved in 1945 with 40\% (17 of 42 schools). The lowest percentage was reached in 1968 with 9\% (6 of 64 schools). The roster for 1978-79 showed that there were 22 women deans in the 87 accredited graduate social work programs. This included three in an acting capacity and one branch director. (The University of Tennessee's three branch programs have been included in the annual rosters because of the semi-autonomous nature of their branch programs.) While the 1978-79 proportion of female deans, 25\% of the total, represents a sizable increase from the low point of just ten years ago, it nevertheless reflects a continuing underrepresentation of women in the top
administrative positions of social work education. It seems clear that the 'maleness' of administration and of the academic environment are, indeed, overriding the 'femaleness' of the social work profession.

Statement of the Problem

Given the foregoing documentation of the sex-typing of social work, administration, and academe, and of the numerical underrepresentation of women in the administration of social work education programs, the question arises as to how those few women who have become deans have managed it. Are they a special population imbued with unique characteristics or capabilities? Or have they had educational and/or work experiences that may have uniquely prepared them for their executive positions? In what ways are they like the other social work deans, their male counterparts? In what ways are they like other female administrators, in other fields?

The research questions to be answered, then, are the following:

1. What are the variables that characterize the social work deans that may be considered to be associated with the administrative position?

2. Are there variables that distinguish the women deans as being significantly different from the men deans?
that may be considered to be associated with sex or gender orientation?

3. If there are gender related variables that characterize the women deans as being different from the men deans, are those variables similar to those identified in the literature as characteristic of women in management across a variety of fields?

Significance of the Problem

Any profession will be concerned about continuity and how the professional socialization process is carried on from one generation to another. In social work, that process takes place in professional, accredited schools of social work, and will be strongly influenced by the persons who provide leadership and direction to the efforts. The deanships are among the highest status and most influential positions within the social work profession. It is to be expected that there will be considerable professional interest in the persons who occupy those positions—who they are, where they came from, how they reached this status, and how they perceive their jobs.

Such interest may be expected from the general membership of the profession. The deans, themselves, might also be expected to take particular notice of the findings to discover how much alike, or how different, they may be from their peers. And the research will provide an
historical data base against which future comparisons may be made and trends and patterns identified. But the persons who will probably be most interested in this study are those in the profession who aspire to top level administrative positions, those who are interested in higher education and who might be thinking about preparing to become deans, and especially those persons with such aspirations who are also women.

In today's world, the woman who has administrative inclinations is being buffeted with facts and figures about the underrepresentation of women in top level positions, about discrimination, about the thrust for affirmative action and the need for educational and employment equity. Even women who do not already have such aspirations are being challenged to assess their own capabilities for leadership and are being encouraged to take the preparatory steps that might lead them to high level positions.

The women in the profession of social work are no less challenged and, indeed, are becoming increasingly conscious of the disparity in the sexual composition of the general membership and of the leadership of the profession. They face a real problem, however, when they seek information about the deanships and likely paths they might travel to attain such positions. Usually, when someone aspires to a certain career goal, he or she will try to find a person
who occupies such a position who will serve as a role model and who can be emulated. This valuable source of learning is particularly important for women aspiring to administrative positions since such positions are still sex-typed as masculine jobs and may be proscribed for women. Role models can help to break down stereotyped thinking and counterbalance negative feedback received from society.

Where role models are not available, however, such as where very few women are employed in key positions, this learning opportunity is lost. A generalized profile of those few women who do hold management positions then becomes the next best means for informing and encouraging aspirants. "Just as Abraham Maslow sought the best possible models (self-actualizers) for his psychology of the healthy, so might women seek the best possible examples (top-level administrators) for their role models in higher education." The current research is an attempt to serve this purpose.

This research has unexpectedly become a timely addition to another continuing discussion within the social work profession. Two closely related studies have appeared within the social work literature within the past two years addressing the subject of the rapid turnover of the deanships. These studies have surveyed a population of current deans plus some former deans to identify factors that may have been correlated with job satisfaction or the
decision to leave the deanship. Questions have been asked about personal and demographic characteristics, systemic characteristics considered to be related to performance and job satisfaction, and personal expectations of the position.

The data collection for these studies preceded that for the current research by approximately two years, but there is much overlap in the projects, both in the population under study and in the variables investigated. So, even though the author did not know of the earlier studies in sufficient time to replicate relevant sections of the questionnaires, or to build upon the earlier findings, there is still opportunity to compare many of the findings. Where this can be done, the combined findings provide trend data which should be most helpful in analyzing the problem under review. There is also convergence between the studies in that the rapid turnover of the deanships may create new opportunities for women to attain those positions. One of the women deans remarked recently about this possibility, "It's no wonder the women can get those jobs now--the men don't want them anymore!" Replication of surveys such as the present one should reveal whether the factors contributing to rapid turnover of the deanships (i.e., increased frustration with decreased resources and opportunities, etc.) are serious enough to be reflected in a changing profile of the persons holding deanships.
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CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study of the social work deans was begun with a review of relevant literature. Current social work journals and other recent publications were first explored to find what had been written about former social work deans and to begin to develop a list of references. The search was not overly productive. A 1963 study published by the Council on Social Work Education, Who Chooses Social Work, When, and Why, shed some light on relevant variables related to career choices and career paths of social workers, but did not contain information about the deanships.¹ A 1968 study also initiated by the Council on Social Work Education, A Survey of Faculty in Graduate Schools of Social Work, described the faculty in terms of personal and background characteristics, educational background and professional experience, but did not single out the deans for special consideration.² A 1971 article written by Eileen Blackey, a former dean of the school of Social Welfare at UCLA, discussed the complex challenges faced by a dean and recommended that curriculum specialization to prepare deans be offered.³ In 1979, two publications have emerged discussing the problem of rapid
turnover among the social work deans. Nothing else has been discovered that specifically addressed the subject of the social work deans.

Actually, very little has been written about any top administrative position in social work. There is a small body of literature related to administration in social service agencies, but the focus is largely upon middle management positions. A new journal, introduced in 1977, Administration in Social Work, included a rather humorous reference to the lack of attention given to top management in social work:

Top management . . . is a somewhat holy concept in social work. Top managers are regarded as omniscient, omnipotent, omni-present, never seen face to face, rarely described—even in the literature—and not often mentioned, certainly by name. No school is bold enough to attempt, or to claim to be, training top administrators. One of the closely guarded mysteries of our faith is where these gods do get their training.

The literature search has been conducted, therefore, in other fields, particularly in business management and educational administration. In turning to the literature of these fields, it will be necessary to clarify the basic terms being used. In business, the term "management" is distinguished from "administration," management being reserved to denote top level decision making, goal setting, and planning. Administration generally denotes the functions and processes carried out at the level where
policy decisions are implemented. Management is concerned with effectiveness and what gets done; administration is concerned with efficiency and how work gets done. In education and social work, the term "management" has been avoided until very recently and the single term, "administration," is generally used "to describe planning for the overall direction of an organization, in contrast to the details of how work is to be carried out." A review of the literature clearly shows, however, that the two terms are used inconsistently and sometimes in contradictory ways. There now seems to be more of a tendency to use the terms interchangeably. For the purpose of this paper, no differentiation will be made in the meanings of the two terms.

Since this research is focused upon women in particular administrative positions, attention has been directed toward the literature about women in administration and management. A sampling of recent titles from the business world illustrates the growing interest in that field for women in management: Bringing Women Into Management (Gordon and Strober, 1975), Breakthrough: Women Into Management (Loring, 1972), The Executive Suite—Feminine Style (Lynch 1973), The Effective Woman Manager (Stewart, 1978), etc. In education, similar publications have surfaced: "The Role of Women in Administration in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges" (Arter, 1972), Academic Women on the Move (Rossi and Calderwood, 1973), "Women as Academic
Administrators in the Age of Affirmative Action" (Palley, 1978), "Women in Administration in Higher Education" (Carroll, 1972), etc. Most of these publications have described the status of women in administration or management, have attempted to explain why there is such a small participation rate of women, and then have offered prescriptions for correcting the situation. The prescriptions have varied with the definitions of the problem.

Qualifications for Administration

Much of the literature has focused upon specific qualifications or traits believed to be required of effective administrators. Nieboer has identified the needed qualities as competition, independence, competence, intellectual achievement, and leadership. Bender has presented a list of adjectives used by male managers to describe the good manager: intelligent, aggressive, objective, decisive, reliable, flexible, motivated, pressured, sensitive, responsible, trustworthy, considerate, imaginative, and goal-oriented... but men consider toughness the most essential quality in an executive. Carroll includes qualities of intelligence, ingenuity, pressure tolerance, flexibility, and cool-headedness. To these attributes are added certain motivating attitudes that have been identified as characterizing effective
managers. These include the strong desire to manage, to be powerful, to compete, and to achieve. Desire to control the environment is another factor, considered especially important because the present environment is characterized by uncertainty and ambiguity and tends to be resistant to any control. The characteristics of flexibility, openness to change, and tolerance of ambiguity thus are recommended.

The identification of leadership "traits" such as those listed above has been a significant conceptual tool emphasized by some in an effort to discover predictors of executive personality. Although largely discounted today as a basis for identifying or training new leaders, the tendency to define executive behavior in such ways persists, if only in stereotyped thinking. Such stereotyping, and especially the linking of stereotyped managerial characteristics with stereotyped masculine qualities, presents particular problems for women which will be discussed more thoroughly later in this chapter.

It was largely in reaction to trait theories that Katz in 1955 attempted to direct attention away from descriptions of what the manager is to what the manager can do. With this objective in mind, he identified three types of managerial skills, technical, human relations, and conceptual. Technical skills include specialized
knowledge of the tools and techniques of a specific discipline. Human relations skills refer to the abilities to work with people both within and outside the particular organization. They include leadership skills, conflict resolution skills, communication skills, and understanding of group dynamics. They also include interpersonal relations that demonstrate sensitivity to others, empathy, humaneness and gentleness. Conceptual skills involve the ability to take a holistic view of the organization, to be an entrepreneur in the sense of risk taking and hard-nosed decision making, and to be an effective planner, organizer, and resource allocator.

While Mintzberg believed that there are personal characteristics "that lead some people to success and others to failure in a wide variety of managerial jobs" and specific characteristics that will be contingent upon the requirements of a particular position, he agreed that the most important qualification for effective management is particular skill development which can be measured through behavior and for which education and training is relevant. On the basis of his years of study, Drucker concluded that there was no "effective personality" and said that what executives shared in common was not particular traits, interests, knowledge, etc., but "the ability to get the right things done."
While it is clear that no one definitive statement can be made regarding the qualifications for an administrator in all jobs under all circumstances, the advice for women consistently includes three key ingredients—a knowledge base, demonstrated competence, and commitment to work. Bender identifies credentials and competency as key variables. Silver calls for outstanding scholarship along with demonstrated administrative ability. Rader, addressing the subject of administrators in higher education, cites the necessity for a doctorate. Several writers warn women of the need to invest much time and energy in their work; Williams cautions that "it is still necessary to work harder than men in order to excel. . .".

This literature with its emphasis upon requisite managerial characteristics strongly suggests that women either will not possess, or will not be perceived to possess, those skills and abilities that are necessary for entry into managerial positions. Given this definition of the problem based in a theory of "deficiency," the literature, not unexpectedly, prescribes a remedy that calls for women to enroll in educational programs and special managerial training sessions to remove their "deficiencies."
Cultural Expectations for Women

The underrepresentation of women in administrative positions has been attributed, in part, at least, to the effectiveness of the socialization process in which, traditionally, women have learned to avoid the very characteristics and behavior that seem most closely associated with executive roles. For it is through the socialization process that cultural expectations for "right" behavior are learned. Boys and girls learn to behave in ways that are considered to be socially acceptable for their respective sexes. They learn by imitating others of the same sex and by receiving positive reinforcement for sex-appropriate behavior. They gradually develop behavior patterns that correspond with their conception of "right" behavior. Positive self concept grows proportionately to the degree of congruence that exists between the perception of self and the societal expectations that have been internalized.

In much the same way as traits or psychological attributes have been associated with managerial roles, so have they also been associated with sex roles. The literature provides a vast array of reports of research conducted to identify typical masculine and feminine characteristics. The populations under study have varied as have the methodologies. There have been exploratory surveys examining perceptions of masculinity/femininity as well as laboratory
and field experiments to test men and women on particular characteristics. For women, many of the descriptors have been negative. Women are said to be uncertain, anxious, nervous, hasty, careless, dependent, passive, cautious, crippled by low esteem, emotional, irrational, jealous and frivolous. Horner's oft-quoted research on the 'fear of success' characteristic in women, although later challenged for its validity, followed in the tradition of identifying unique feminine characteristics acquired in conjunction with standards of sex role identity.

In more positive terms, the ideal woman has been described as attractive, wealthy, educated, supportive, flexible, intelligent, mature, tolerant, decisive, open-minded, frugal, loving, gentle and soft-spoken. Epstein lists the 'preferred and imputed feminine attributes' in American society as including, among others, "personal warmth and empathy, sensitivity and emotionalism, grace, charm, compliance, dependence and deference."

Spence and Helmrich maintain that a "core set of attributes" differentiate the sexes in most cultures, but the core set may vary from one culture to another. In this country, women are found to be more emotional, sensitive, and concerned with others, while men will tend to be more competitive, active, and independent. Broverman identified 41 attributes, 29 of which were more typical of
men and 12 of which were more typical of women. Bem listed 40 attributes, half of which were termed masculine and half of which were feminine. Women were also said to be more likely to choose careers where tasks are expressive and person-oriented—helping, nurturing and empathizing, to show concern for children, to engage in voluntary service, and to prefer democratic participatory leadership styles.

The so-called feminine characteristics are usually presented with a contrasting list of masculine characteristics. Uehling notes that most research findings attribute to men "greater deliberative and risk taking qualities" while Osborn and Vicars see the men portrayed as "naturally superior in productive pursuits—dominant, aggressive, competitive enough to gain follower respect . . . ." Male occupations are those "believed to require qualities of coolness, detachment, analytic objectivity, or object orientation."

"The impression emerges that the masculine gender role stereotype is a positive thing and the feminine one either negative or passive." It also appears to be true that there is a high correlation between masculine and managerial qualities. If, as has been implied, the masculine and feminine qualities are mutually exclusive, and the qualities are more innate than learned, it would
appear that "women do not fit the leadership image as it is presented." Women seeking careers in "masculine" fields would be seen as deviant and unfeminine, forced to choose between achievement orientation and a feminine self concept.

But there have been challenges to such findings and the sex role stereotypes have been criticized for being inaccurate and oppressive. Maccoby and Jacklin, summarizing their research on psychological sex differentiation, reported much of it to be popular folklore, vague and inconsistent, and completely ungrounded in empirical evidence. Their findings that are of particular interest for this research are that there are no significant differences between men and women on achievement, motivation, intelligence, learning, sociability or affiliation. There does appear to be empirical support for men being more aggressive than women, but aggression is not correlated with competition or dominance.

Other criticisms of the sex role literature have been raised. Sex roles, which refer to behavior appropriate to the sexes, are defined in social and cultural context for a particular time and place, but tend to persist long after the period in which they were developed. Thus, while "A woman's place is in the home" might have been an appropriate prescription for feminine behavior in a time
period when women were not needed in the industrial work force, the prescription is no longer appropriate or accept­able in a period when women are better educated, when home activities offer little challenge for creativity and achievement, and when almost half of all women are in the labor force. Sex roles, reflecting the values and ideology of a society at a particular point in time, become especially oppressive in a period of transition as changing behavior patterns challenge old beliefs and values.

It has also been noted that much research on sex differentiations has emerged from laboratory studies conducted with college students. The findings have not been generalizable to "long term, on-going, real life situations" and field studies have failed to produce similar findings.36

Behavioral scientists now are discounting the old conception of masculinity and femininity as bipolar ends of a single continuum and are acknowledging that they are independent constructs which will characterize both sexes to some degree in different situations. A new concept of androgynous behavior provides freedom from sex stereotypes and shows that individuals can be both masculine and feminine, both instrumental and expressive.37 Men can demonstrate the qualities of being gentle and caring (as social workers) without having their masculinity challenged; women can
demonstrate the qualities of being assertive, detached, and willing to take risks (as administrators) without having their femininity challenged.

Even though recent research may discredit old findings about male-female differences, the influence of past stereotyped thinking upon educational and career decisions is still clearly evident. Until very recently, women rarely questioned the validity of rigid feminine sex roles and acted in ways that seemed to justify and to perpetuate the stereotypes. They generally sought their fulfillment in the roles of wife and mother; if they ventured forth from home at all, it was most likely to assume a feminine sex-typed job—school teacher, nurse, social worker, secretary. At the same time it was accepted as appropriate that certain positions and occupations for which men seemed to possess the requisite qualities should be filled by men. DeLamater explains that socialization practices thus both result from, and cause, stereotypically feminine behavior, creating a vicious cycle, a self-fulfilling prophecy.38

Women who have internalized the old standards for feminine behavior, but who have been unwilling to give up aspirations for careers in leadership positions or in male dominated fields have had to struggle with problems arising out of role strain. They have had to face the problem of being perceived as deviant. They have had to struggle with
their own self assessment, wondering if they could possess the (masculine) qualities reported to be necessary in the positions being sought. They have had to fight against the expectation that they probably would not be hired simply because they were women. When they have been successful in obtaining desired employment, they have suffered from a lack of self confidence the cumulative effect of the internalized values, lack of experience in a competitive environment and lack of positive reinforcement for career goals. All these dynamics have operated as internal barriers keeping women from moving into the upper levels of the work world and causing particular problems for those who did manage to break through the barriers.

The same socialization processes that have led to the establishment of internal barriers keeping women out of male sex-typed positions, have also led to the establishment of external barriers that have effectively denied women equal opportunity in employment. There is much in the literature to document the fact that the status of women is not equal to that of men, the passage of non-discriminatory legislation notwithstanding. The belief that women do not belong may be operationalized in many different forms, both subtle and overt, but all have the same effect of reducing rewards that are legitimately deserved. Dearing has reported several different ways in
which a woman might be denied access to employment. The woman lacking the doctorate is told she does not have sufficient credentials; the woman with the doctorate is told she lacks experience. The single woman is not seen as a viable applicant because of the expectation that she will marry and leave the position. The young married woman is not seen as a viable applicant because of the expectation that she will get pregnant and leave the position. The older, mature applicant is discouraged from pursuing an administrative position because it is "just too late" for her to be starting in administration. Dearing says that "such assumptions and rationalizations are probably not maliciously intended, but they are operative and they need to be identified and surfaced and stopped..."

Carroll examines some of the myths that are quoted as reasons for not hiring women in administrative positions:

Women don't want to be administrators; women won't work under women; men are easier to work with than are women; women need to be protected from the unpleasantness involved in administration; women don't have the preparation necessary for administration; women can't or won't give the commitment to the job that top administrative positions require; men see and generate "big" ideas while women are better at following directions and doing detail work.

These myths reflect strong sex role stereotyping and generalized expectations for female behavior that become effective barriers to the upward mobility of women.
The literature in this section has focused upon sex roles and socialization as the basic explanation for the underutilization of women in management. It suggests that there is a dual impact—in the creation of internal, psychological barriers within women, and in the creation of external, social barriers that are manifested in patterns of resistance to hiring and promoting women. The prescriptions offered are also dual. Women must be helped to overcome the attitudes and beliefs that hold them back; this can be accomplished through consciousness raising experiences and through support offered by women's groups, mentors, and informal organizational work groups. But organizations must also change. They must examine their practices and procedures for selection, placement, training, compensation, and promotion to eliminate any that may be based upon discredited stereotyped beliefs. And they must institute new, explicit, enforceable procedures of affirmative action.

Alternative Sociological Perspectives

While women's deficient preparation for management jobs and attitudes of, and toward, women as a result of the socialization process have been factors contributing to the underrepresentation of women in major positions in management and administration, other variables, highlighted in different theoretical perspectives, have also
had an influence. Kanter has moved beyond the discussion of sex roles to account for the underrepresentation of women in executive circles and sees behavior as a function of position in a network of hierarchical relations. Using the three variables of power, opportunity, and numbers, she presents an integrated structural model of behavior in organizations. She argues persuasively that the uncertainty of the organizational environment and the internal pressures for conformity create the need of administrators to have within their inner circles those whom they can trust and with whom they can communicate with ease. The theory posits that these needs are best met by employing persons of similar organizational experience or, lacking that possibility, of similar social background and characteristics. When the administrator is white and male, then, there is a strong possibility that positions within the inner circle will be filled by other white males, thus creating a homogeneous peer group.

Ozawa provides another explanation that incorporates an organizational perspective. She presents a hypothetical case of a woman applying for a deanship and being passed over by a search committee on the belief that heads of other departments and outside agencies would deal more favorably with a male dean. An explanation from sociological theory is that:
. . . a person feels constrained in relating to another who is not in a congruent 'status set.' A status-set of man dean is considered congruent and appropriate, but a status set of woman dean is not. A person facing another in an incongruent status-set does not know how to behave, deal, or relate to such a person.45

Operating under such a dynamic, especially in a critical time of money crisis, a search committee cannot be criticized for being ill-intentioned or overtly discriminatory, but the effect of such action is still exclusionary for women.

Other explanations for the underpresentation of women in administrative positions have been drawn from different theoretical orientations. Those well acquainted with social learning theory have pointed out that "social behavior is developed through exposure to powerful and nurturant models and maintained by reinforcement contingencies."46 In demonstrating the importance of role models for women, Tidball has reported a finding of high positive correlation between the number of women who were high achievers (named in Who's Who of American Women) and the number of women role models to whom they had been exposed.47

Chafetz makes the point that role models are necessary in higher education, both as faculty and as administrators, first, to convince young women that such careers for women are possible, and second, to model the kinds of skills and behaviors that must be learned. She states that
"... a female professor can, simply by existing, be a formidable influence on a female student. By occupying a position in a 'man's field,' she sets an example that says 'It can be done.' Conversely, the absence or paucity of such role models implies the opposite, and to a large extent that is the situation at most American colleges and universities ..." Thus, within schools of social work, the current lack of women deans probably deters young women from aspiring to such careers, and lacking candidates for those positions, male dominance may continue to be the pattern for the future.

The knowledge that the statistical representation of women in administrative positions is not improving significantly, coupled with an understanding of several theoretical explanations for this underrepresentation, leads one to question how these few women have made it to the top. Epstein explores this in the pages of her book, Woman's Place, which she introduces in the following way:

The fact that a stratum of educated, trained, and professionally active women exists at all makes it unnecessary to argue the question of women's innate intellectual capacities or their ability to do sustained, high-concentration work. The question of whether women are as intelligent as men, or whether they can handle abstract ideas and solve problems, has been eliminated by their achievements in even such male-dominated fields as mathematics, chemistry, physics, law, and the social sciences. It is clear that, as with any other segment of society, not all women possess the intellectual capacities for professional or other upper-level work, and that even if all occupational barriers were removed not all of those
who possess such qualities would aspire to careers. The question that arises is even so why do so few capable women ever fulfill the promise of their potential and ability, and, conversely, how do those few who do, manage it? 49

In the following section, the literature from the fields of business management and education will be reviewed once again to determine what has been discovered about women who have succeeded in careers as administrators.

Case Studies of Women Administrators

Three studies have been examined closely to identify variables that have been found to be significantly related to achievement among women who have succeeded in male dominated occupations. The first, drawn from the field of Business Management, is the doctoral dissertation of Margaret Hennig, "Career Development for Women Executives." 50 The study was later developed into the popular book, The Managerial Woman. The second study, "Climbing the Ladder of Success In Highheels" is the doctoral dissertation of Jill Ann Steinberg that traces and compares the career development of three groups of women, homemakers, professional women in male-dominated occupations, and women in traditional female occupations. 51 The third study is part of the edited volume, Academic Women on the Move, entitled "Career Profiles of Women Doctorates" by Helen S. Astin. 52
Hennig studied the career paths of twenty five women executives in business and industry to discover what personal or experiential variables had combined to make it "possible for them to succeed in administrative roles which their culture and their society considered almost totally masculine." The women in her study were selected by a panel of three independent judges from various lists including Who's Who in America and the membership rosters of several national professional women's organizations. Criteria for selection specified:

1. Full-time, continuous work history;
2. Current position at the level of corporate vice president, president, or chief executive officer;
3. Employment in a medium/large firm;
4. Not employed in a position or type of business generally considered as 'feminine'.

Intensive interviewing provided the major source of information, but a questionnaire and an autobiographical statement were also obtained from each subject.

Hennig used a developmental model as the conceptual framework for her study and organized her findings around four critical life stages, Early Childhood, Adolescence, College and Early Career Years, and Mature Career Years. The major findings for each period are presented below.

In the early formative years of childhood, the subjects enjoyed warm, secure home environments where, as
the oldest child, they received much attention from loving parents. During this period they acquired the values of achievement, success and independence which both parents reinforced. The subjects all enjoyed a close relationship with their fathers and expressed a preference for male activities and adult company.

During the adolescent years, the subjects began to develop their own competencies, excelled in school work, and assumed leadership positions in coeducational groups. They began to reject the societal expectations for the traditional female role and talked about having a career and deferring marriage. They remained close to their fathers and identified with their fathers' life styles.

In the college and early career years, they selected a career and chose preparatory courses for that career simultaneously. During this period they perceived strong conflict between their femaleness and their chosen career aspirations, a conflict that was resolved during the early stages of the career by the decision to defer marriage and to adopt a masculine behavioral style at work. This style was characterized by hard work, task orientation, and carefully contrived interpersonal relationships. Each subject was driven by the compelling need to excell and devoted all her time and energy to improving her skills on the job. The Boss became a mentor, taking over the significant role formerly played by the father. Another
conscious choice was made to remain in one company rather than to attempt lateral moves in search of upward mobility. The women were promoted, along with their bosses until they finally reached middle management positions themselves. Throughout the period they remained aloof from both peers and subordinates for fear of having to deal with the potential conflict between their work and personal relationships.

During the mature career period, each of the subjects went through a hiatus period of personal reexamination and resolve, emerging with a successful integration of their female and professional roles and, consequently, with a new sense of security and acceptance of themselves as women. Half of the women married at this point; none bore children but some became step-mothers, having married widowers or divorced men with children.

In her conclusions, Hennig reviewed the many evidences of duality in the lives of her subjects, real or implied antagonism between two forces, i.e. the female person and the traditionally male executive role. She concluded that "what has so frequently been simply explained as an impossible fit between such antagonistic forces had its potential and possible compatibility demonstrated by this group of twenty five top women executives . . . (who were successful because they were) . . . able to recognize it, cope with it, and eventually deal with it."
In the second study, Steinberg surveyed 309 women residing or practicing in Colorado or Ohio. A category of "non-traditional" women consisted of 57 doctors randomly selected from a list of all the Colorado and Ohio women doctors who were members of the American Medical Women's Association, Inc. and 48 lawyers randomly selected from courthouse listings of all registered lawyers in Colorado and Ohio. A second category of "traditional" women consisted of 124 women randomly selected from two listings: members of the Colorado and Ohio Home Economics Associations and employees of the Denver and Columbus Public Health Nurses Associations. A third category of "homemakers" consisted of 81 women who were married to professionals (faculty wives and Junior Women's Club Members) who did not fit into either category and who had at least some college education.

Seeking to discover differences among these groups of women, Steinberg hoped to be able to answer questions focussed upon the non-traditional career women, including the following: Why do these women decide to confront the traditional female stereotype and become non-traditional career women? Are these women different from those women who choose more traditionally oriented female careers or women who become full-time homemakers? Were there events or people in their lives which positively influenced them
to become non-traditional career women? From the literature, Steinberg identified variables that had been found to be correlated with non-traditional career aspirations and grouped them into five categories—employment background variables, education variables, family background variables, environmental variables, and self-perception/personal characteristic variables. A mail questionnaire was used to obtain information.

Of the employment variables, there was mixed support for the hypothesis that non-traditional professional women will be more likely to have experienced a large number and wide variety of previous job experiences. During high school days, lawyers had held the largest number of jobs, but after high school, home economists had held more. Traditional women reported being most influenced by their previous jobs; doctors apparently were least influenced. There was support (especially from the lawyers) for the hypothesis that non-traditional career women who experience a woman's (support) group will perceive the experience as having positively influenced their career commitment.

Social issues also were found to be influential factors in the career development of the non-traditional career woman.

Of the educational variables, it was hypothesized that non-traditional career women would receive positive support from a professor or other influential role model.
during their college and post-college training. Again, mixed support was found with home economists indicating most influence from such role models, followed by doctors, homemakers, lawyers, and nurses. Other findings included the fact that non-traditional career women earned the highest grades in high school and college. They also reported least participation in high school organizations and the least problem with securing financial support for their career plans. Time was taken off during the educational period most by the home economists followed by the lawyers, doctors, homemakers, and nurses.

Of the family background variables, there was partial support for the hypothesis of positive correlation between non-traditional career status and being the daughter of an employed mother. Nurses and doctors had the largest number of employed mothers; lawyers had the least. Doctors most often reported having mothers in non-traditional careers with advanced degrees and also having been positively influenced by these mothers. Homemakers and lawyers recalled the most negative family role models. No positive support was found for the hypothesis of non-traditional career women being first born, without male siblings, experiencing a hostile childhood relationship with their mothers, or being of specific religious or socioeconomic background.
Of the environmental variables measured, non-traditional career women were most likely to have engaged in childhood activities of sports and reading. There was little support for the hypothesis that non-traditional career women more often remain single, or, if they get married, have fewer children. 91% of the homemakers were married, followed by 70% of the doctors, 57% of the lawyers, 48% of the home economists, and 41% of the nurses. Doctors tended to be older at the time they gave birth to their first child. Non-traditional career women were most committed to their present marital/career situation which, contrary to expectations, they described as combining marriage and child-rearing with employment.

Of the self-perception/personal variables, no support was found for the hypothesis that non-traditional career women would perceive themselves as more intelligent, more attractive, taller or stronger than other women. There was a trend difference showing that non-traditional women had a more positive self-image as children. Doctors seemed to cite more often their career development as having been positively influenced by positive self-characteristics.

The unexpected finding that there were more significant differences among the five groups than among the three categories was presented as a caution to other researchers lest they make the unwarranted assumption that all women
in male-dominated, i.e., non-traditional, careers will possess the same personal and experiential characteristics. Steinberg suggests that the career development of women and men in the same field may be quite similar, influenced as much by educational and occupation structures as by other background variables.

Steinberg concludes her study by commenting upon the remarkable similarity discovered among the careers of the traditional and non-traditional women. She explains that non-traditional career women have demonstrated acceptance of both professional and cultural expectations of behavior by integrating, rather than compartmentalizing their home and employment lives. They are, therefore, "significantly different from other women and traditional sex-role norms only in terms of their present non-traditional employment, but not significantly different in terms of lifestyle or values." 57

The third study which was thought to have particular relevance for the present research was "Career Profiles of Women Doctorates," by Helen S. Astin, included in the Rossi-Calderwood volume, Academic Women on the Move. Astin reanalyzed existing data from a survey conducted in 1965-66 on 1,547 women who earned doctorates in 1957-1958, supplemented by information secured in 1963 by the National Academy of Science on 1,045 women receiving doctorates since 1935. Although the findings are dated,
they provide a good comparative base for interpreting the findings of the present study.

Astin acknowledged that women doctorates constitute a unique group because of their limited numbers—even more true at the time of her survey than presently. Her research questions were similar to those addressed by Hennig and Steinberg. "What fields of specialization do women most often choose? How do they differ from the fields men are more likely to choose? What are the personal characteristics and early experiences that determine the kinds of field choices women make?" Some of the more significant findings are presented below.

The data confirmed previous findings that women traditionally choose different fields of specialization than men but were insufficient to explain "just how much these differences are attributable to differences in aptitudes and interests, and how much they are attributable to societal expectations that constitute educational and occupational barriers against women, and the key psychological consequence of these expectations." There is evidence to show that career choices are influenced at least partially by early achievements and interest, parent-child interactions, and mother's career interests and commitments.
Women who later achieved the doctoral degree were much more likely to have had an undergraduate major in the natural sciences than the college educated women in general. They also "tended to score about 1 to 1-1/2 standard deviations above the mean on measured abilities in high school . . . were high achievers and enjoyed scholarly endeavors." Positive correlation of career choice and being the daughter of an employed mother was obtained only for those women choosing psychology as a field of specialization.

Perhaps because of their superior achievement record it is not surprising to learn that these women had about equal access with men to educational programs in top quality institutions. 46% had received some financial support for graduate training in the form of governmental or institutional stipends. 50% of the women, compared to 42% of the men, had to use their own savings or depend upon financial support from their family or spouse.

Following graduation women doctorates (and men doctorates too) went to work in academe more frequently than in non-academic settings. A smaller percent of married women than single women indicated that their work had always been in academe. The three greatest barriers to such career development for married women were identified as 1) finding adequate domestic help, 2) employer
discrimination, and 3) husband's mobility. Women faculty members in academe received lower salaries than men and were found to occupy the lower academic ranks. In terms of productivity, the women spent more time in teaching and less in research and scholarly publications. (More recent studies confirm the finding that women spend more time teaching than men, especially at the undergraduate level, but when the findings are controlled by type of institution, women are found to be much more like men in their research efforts.)

Astin also addressed the issue of continuity and discontinuity in the career path. While the typical pattern of career development for the woman college graduate was characterized by initial entry, interruption for bearing and rearing children, and reentry at a later age, this was not found to be true of highly educated women. "The survey of women doctorates revealed that 91 percent of the women doctorates of 1957 and 1958 were in the labor force seven or eight years later. Of these 81 percent were working full time and only 10 percent were employed on a part-time basis. Seventy-nine percent of the women had never interrupted their careers; for the rest of the group, the median interruption was a mere fourteen months."
It was also learned through the survey that "the married woman doctorate who was fully employed typically had married before she had completed the doctorate. Thus, these women learned how to cope with dual roles early in their careers." Their coping was undoubtedly also supported by a certain amount of flexibility of schedule and freedom to pursue their own interests, partial benefits of being of high social class and high job level. As Epstein has noted, "the higher the rank of the statuses in a woman's status set, the more easily she may be able to manage a greater number of statuses."

In summary, although the literature presents some parallel findings concerning the determinants of career choice and career achievement, there is no single set of characteristics or experiences to describe the successful woman manager. There are many influences in the life of any person and causal effects are not easy to determine. Much more research needs to be conducted before it can be said with any surety which variables are critical to future career success or failure. What can be said now is that "career choice results from an interaction of a number of important variables: an individual's psychological predispositions, intelligence, skills and talents; socio-economic background and needs; and a progressive testing of the environment."
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CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Because the purpose of this study was to describe the existing status of the social work deans and to make comparisons of the findings for men and women, survey research was selected as the most appropriate research design. According to Kerlinger, "the survey researcher is interested in the accurate assessment of the characteristics" of a population and "focuses on people, the vital facts of people, and their beliefs, opinions, attitudes, motivations and behavior." Survey design facilitates the collection of such data.

In the initial planning stage of this project, the researcher considered both major tools of survey research, the personal interview and the mail questionnaire, to determine which would be the appropriate and most feasible instrument for data collection. Each has particular strengths and weaknesses but can provide the researcher with a large amount of fairly accurate information. Kerlinger notes that "the personal interview far overshadows the other (forms of survey research) as perhaps the most powerful and useful tool of social scientific
survey research.2 The personal interview permits the researcher to probe for in-depth information, to ask for clarification of responses, to seek reasons for particular answers. The questioning frequently opens up new avenues of inquiry not anticipated when the original interview schedule was constructed. There are also constraints upon the use of the interview, mainly the investment of time and money that frequently must be made in order to gain access to the desired subjects.

The mail questionnaire, on the other hand, can be sent to any location for which there is a mail address. The researcher stays at home and sends a limited number of questions to the subjects with the request that they be answered and returned immediately in an enclosed self-addressed envelope. Although this appears to be an easy method of data collection, there are several constraints upon the use of the mail questionnaire also. Construction of the questionnaire is a particularly demanding task inasmuch as there will be no opportunity to clarify confusing or ambiguous questions. Questions that are not clear will elicit answers that are meaningless for analytical purposes. Furthermore, an ambiguous questionnaire may cause such frustration that many subjects will fail to complete the task.
This suggests the most serious weakness of mail questionnaires—the high rate of non-response that sharply limits the generalizability of the research findings. The researcher must be concerned not only with the proper construction of the questionnaire, but must take extra measures to try to persuade the subjects to fill out the form. For this reason, researchers will construct instruments that are as attractive as possible, short, and easy to answer. While this may mean a trimming down of the questionnaire and a sacrifice of some information, it will assure a better rate of response. Most researchers will also try to include with the questionnaire some incentive to encourage a speedy response, and will telephone or send follow-up letters to those who do not respond readily. In the final analysis, however, the researcher is dependent upon the willingness of the subjects to cooperate. One final weakness of this research design must also be noted and that is cost. Since sample sizes required for representativeness often are quite large and the costs of printing, mailing, and followup increase proportionate to the sample size, the total cost of such a project can be very high.

After weighing the pros and cons of each method of data collection, a decision was made to use personal interviews. It was thought that interviews could be scheduled with a sample of the social work deans at the Annual
Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education in Boston in March of 1979. The dates of that conference, however, did not fit with the timetable established for data collection. Although the researcher could have travelled to a representative sample of campuses to interview selected deans, the commitment of time and money to do so seemed too great, and so the plan to use personal interviews was abandoned. The decision was then made to use a mail questionnaire which could be sent to all the deans throughout the country.

Population

The population under study was the universe of the deans of accredited social work master's programs in the United States. The names and addresses for all subjects were included in the Council on Social Work Education 1978 directory of accredited master's programs in social work. (Appendix A). The roster included 87 deans/directors, 22 of whom were female and 65 of whom were male.*

* Of the 87, nine could technically be considered non-deans. Six (5 men and 1 woman) were Acting Deans but were included because they were actually filling the roles of deans. Three (2 men and 1 woman) were directors of the branch programs of the University of Tennessee. The three were included because in this unique structure, they perform functions and enjoy autonomy comparable to the other deans.
In most survey research, a representative sample will be drawn from which to generalize to the target population. In this research, sampling was not necessary since the total number of deans in the population was small and could easily be included in the study. Questionnaires were sent to all who were listed in the 1978 CSWE directory. Inasmuch as each had had equal opportunity to respond and to be included in the findings, the obtained responses may be considered to have been randomly distributed and representative of the total population.

Research Instrument

With the exception of one section of the final questionnaire which presented a standardized test of the personality characteristic, tolerance of ambiguity, all items were original, designed to collect information on those variables that were considered to be most relevant to the study. The variables used were those that had been identified in a review of literature as related to career choices, career paths, and other experiences of women in managerial or academic positions. Questions were grouped in rough chronological order beginning with personal background and characteristics of the family of origin. The final questionnaire, which is reproduced in Appendix B, contained 118 questions arranged in nine sections.
The first section asked for general information about the respondent such as sex, age, race, marital status, and parental responsibility.

The second section focused upon the respondent's family of origin and childhood background. Questions were asked about sibling birth order, family religion, educational and work experience of parents, school activities and honors, sex of playmates, relationship to parents, and adolescent characteristics.

Sections III, IV, and V focused upon the educational path of the respondents through their baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral programs. Similar questions were asked in each section. Respondents were asked about the degree received, the institution from which it was received, the year in which it was awarded, the number of years to earn it, the major discipline, the sources of financial support, and whether or not there had been a mentor relationship. Section III further asked about undergraduate grade point average and whether or not the respondent had felt self confident during the undergraduate period. Section IV asked several additional questions specifically related to the social work master's program. Respondents were asked if their master's program had included specialization for a specific practice methodology or for a field of practice. They were also asked about the number of courses in administration/
management they had taken.

Section VI focused upon the professional work experience, both in social work practice and in social work education, following receipt of the master's degree. Respondents were first questioned about their decisions to become social workers—whether or not social work had been their only career decision and what had been the primary motivating factor behind the decision. Questions were then asked about the number of years spent at each level of practice—in direct service, supervision, and administration other than supervision. Similarly, questions were asked about the number of years spent at different ranks in social work education—as lecturer or instructor, as assistant professor, and as professor. Respondents were also asked how many years they had served as dean and as acting or interim dean.

Other variables in Section VI included the number of schools in which the deans had served as faculty member or as dean and the number of years it had taken to gain tenure. Two questions asked about any break in continuity in professional work following the master's degree and the reason for such a break if there had been one.

Section VII was designed to elicit perceptions as to the personal characteristics that deans should possess. Twenty characteristics were presented as options from which
the five most important were to be selected and ranked. Each of the twenty characteristics had been identified in the literature on management as being important for managers. Each had also been identified in the literature on sex roles as being either feminine or masculine sex typed characteristics. There were ten of each; all were positive in nature. After ranking the five most important characteristics, the deans were asked to rerank the same five in the order in which they served as good descriptors of themselves. It was acknowledged that, when asked to compare themselves against what they had already stated was important, the deans might choose the socially desirable response, and simply repeat the same rank order in the second question. It was thought, however, that such a bias would be largely avoided because of the positive nature of all the characteristics and because, implicit in the second question was the assumption that the deans did possess all the five characteristics they had identified as most important.

Section VIII incorporated the standardized test for tolerance of ambiguity. There is no generally accepted, common definition of ambiguity, or tolerance of ambiguity, or intolerance of ambiguity. The author has adopted the Budner definition used by MacDonald: "An ambiguous
situation may be defined as one which cannot be adequately structured or categorized by the individual because of lack of sufficient cues. It is possible to identify three such situations: a completely new situation in which there are no familiar cues; a complex situation in which there are a great number of cues to be taken into account; and a contradictory situation in which different elements or cues suggest different structures— in short, situations characterized by novelty, complexity, or insolubility."

MacDonald states his own impression that "persons having high tolerance of ambiguity (a) seek out ambiguity, (b) enjoy ambiguity, and (c) excel in the performance of ambiguous tasks." If one accepts the premise that the environment for management is characterized by ambiguity and that persons with high tolerance of ambiguity seek out ambiguity and perform well under such conditions, one would logically conclude that the deans being studied in this research would be characterized by a high level of tolerance. To determine if this were true an existing standardized test characterized by good construct validity and reliability, was incorporated in the questionnaire. The Revised Scale for Ambiguity Tolerance developed by A.P. MacDonald (1970) based on the Rydell-Rosen Ambiguity Tolerance Scale (1966) was selected because of its high internal consistency, computed at .86 (split-half,
corrected by Spearman-Brown), high retest reliability, estimated at .63 (p < .01) for a six month interval, and established construct validity.

The final section of the questionnaire asked further general questions about respondents' current tenure and salary status, about membership in the professional association, National Association of Social Workers (NASW) and its Academy of Certified Social Workers (ACSW), about the record of publications and whether a primary orientation was toward teaching or research. Another group of questions asked about the institutions in which the deans were employed, the public vs. private status of those institutions, the autonomy of the social work unit, the social work programs offered the number of students and faculty, and the institutional position to which the dean was accountable. Respondents were asked about employment practices of the school relative to the sex of previous deans. They were also asked whether or not they had actively sought the positions they hold, what they believe to be the primary reason they gained their appointments, whether or not their sex had helped them to get the jobs, and to what extent they were satisfied with their jobs. Finally, two open ended questions asked for the advice they would offer to aspirants for the position of dean.
and for their summary of the major challenges faced by social work deans today.

**Field testing**

The questionnaire was revised several times before it reached its final form. Part of the revision followed field testing of the questions. Since all social work deans were to be included in the study, other persons in similar positions were identified and invited to participate in field testing. Nine persons, four male and five female, agreed to assist in this way. Two were men who had formerly been deans of graduate social work programs; one woman was a former director of an undergraduate social work program. Two men and one woman were, or had been, associate deans of social work programs. Three women who were executives of social agencies but who had formerly served on social work faculties were also asked to participate.

A letter was sent to each participant in the field testing giving specific instructions, and explaining that because the questionnaire was directed toward deans currently in office, some of the questions would not be applicable to the non-dean respondents. (See Appendix D) They were instructed to skip over such questions. Their responses to the relevant questions were most helpful. They identified questions that were vague or ambiguous.
They suggested other important variables that should be added. And they commented on questions that seemed unnecessary or redundant. Finally, they reported the time it took them to complete the questionnaire, enabling the researcher to predict the time it would take the deans to comply with the request for participation. The field testing, therefore, proved to be of inestimable value in producing a final product which had clarity, conciseness and brevity, all characteristics which would facilitate the deans' quick and easy completion of the questionnaire.

Data collection

With the field testing completed and the questionnaire revised into its final form, the process of data collection was begun. A mailing was prepared for each of the deans listed in the 1978 CSWE directory. In each packet there was enclosed a copy of the questionnaire, a stamped, self-addressed return envelope, two letters, and a postcard. (Appendix F) The first letter was written by the researcher explaining the purpose of the project and asking for the cooperation of each dean. The second letter was written by the Dean of the College of Social Work at The Ohio State University, Dr. Robert O. Washington. Dean Washington expressed his own personal interest in the project and urged his colleagues to take the necessary time to fill out the questionnaires.
The cover letter carried within it the promise of confidentiality. It acknowledged that the small size of the population would make it easy to identify individual information and so only aggregate information would be presented in the research report and no one except the researcher would have access to the questionnaire. To promote anonymity, while at the same time keeping track of who was responding, a return postcard was included in each packet. Respondents were asked to sign and return the card at the time the questionnaire was mailed.

The first set of 87 packets was mailed on April 28, 1979. Three weeks later, 38 responses had been received and an identical packet was mailed to the 49 deans who had not responded. By June 1, one month after the first mailing, 51 responses had been received. It was determined at this point that extra effort should be exerted to get as large a return from the 33 female deans as possible. Therefore, all the non-responding female deans (and a few male deans) were contacted by telephone. Throughout June and July more telephone calls were made urging the deans to respond and additional packets were mailed out at their requests. A decision was made on August 13, 1979, to discontinue further efforts to solicit additional responses. Sixty five responses had been received, making an overall response rate of 75% which was 72% of the male deans and 82% of the female deans. A thank-you letter was mailed
to all respondents informing them of the response received and promising a copy of the abstract when completed.

Data analysis

The researcher used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to analyze the data. Since the purpose of the research was primarily to describe status, descriptive statistics were used. Frequencies and measures of central tendency and dispersion were obtained for all variables. Using the Crosstabs and Breakdown programs, relationships between variables and among subgroups such as sex, age, and marital status were examined. These statistics made it possible to compile an overall profile of the deans and sub-profiles of the male and female deans.

Where it was important to determine whether the observed difference between the men and the women on a given variable could have occurred by chance or whether such differences might reflect a significant difference between the sexes in the total population, the responses of the deans were treated as a representative sample and inferential statistics were used. The appropriate tests were selected based upon the level of measurement of each variable. The Chi square test of independence was used most frequently since that is the appropriate test of significance to be used with nominal variables. T-tests
were also used to rule out chance where interval level data were being computed.

Where these tests of significance ruled out the possibility of observed differences occurring by chance, measures of association could be calculated to assess the strength of the association. Again, the appropriate measures were selected based upon the level of measurement of the variable. For nominal data in a 2 x 2 contingency table, such as sex and tenure, the Phi coefficient was used. For larger tables using nominal data in R x C contingency tables, such as sex and practice methodology, Cramer's V statistic was used. Where data were ordinal, such as the rank ordering of characteristics of a dean, the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient was used. Where data were interval level, such as the number of years at rank or the percentage of financial aid received from various sources, the appropriate statistic was the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient.
FOOTNOTES


2 Ibid., p. 412.


5 Ibid., p. 797. Used with permission of A.P. MacDonald, Jr. and publishers of *Psychological Reports*. Letters of permission are in Appendix C.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS: CAREER PATH

This research was designed to collect information about the social work deans, to provide insight into the kind of people they are, the kinds of career paths they have travelled to reach their current positions, and specific differences between the male and female deans. All findings will be reported in Chapters IV and V, the former presenting data pertaining to the experiences of early childhood and the periods of educational preparation, and the latter presenting data related to professional work experiences including the present positions. Interpretations and discussions of the findings will be presented in Chapter VI.

Frequency totals will be used to report the responses of the deans as a total group and of the male and female subgroups. Both raw figures and percentages will be reported. Percentages provide a better base for comparison when groups are of different size, but, because percentages tend to distort the findings when very small figures are used, the raw figures will also be included to provide the proper perspective. All differences between the male and
female deans will be noted since they are descriptive of the total population; those that are statistically significant will be highlighted. Findings will be reported in approximately the same order as the questions on the questionnaire. They will be grouped and each major section will conclude with a summary.

Personal Characteristics

Of the 65 persons responding to the questionnaire, 59 were deans and 6 were acting deans; 47 were male and 18 were female. The racial breakdown as shown in Table 3 indicates 53 white, 9 black, 2 Hispanic, and 1 other. The religious breakdown shows 28 Protestant, 17 Catholic, 13 Jewish, 3 other, and 3 professing no religion. Both the mean and the median age of the deans was 51. The age range for the male deans was 34-66 with a mean of 51.38. The age range for the female deans was 38-62 with a mean of 51.61. (Table 3 also shows a quartile division of the deans by age. This breakdown has been used to control for age in the analysis of certain variables where the interaction of age was suspected.) There was no significant difference between the sexes on any of these variables.

Marital status, however, was the one variable in the whole study that stood out as reflecting the greatest amount of difference between the sexes. At the time the
### TABLE 3

Current Personal Characteristics of Deans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 21.2498; \text{d.f.} = 2; \ p < .0001 \]

**Quartile Division by Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57-66 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-56 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-50 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-47 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Age**

- 51.38
- 51.61
- 51.45

**NOTE:** Percentages on tables throughout this report may not always sum to 100 because of rounding errors.
questionnaire was answered, 24% of the female deans and 2% of the male deans had never married. Thirty-five percent of the female deans and 4% of the male deans had previously been married but were no longer; 41% of the female deans and 94% of the male deans were married. The chi-square test shows the difference to be statistically significant at the .0001 level.

All but 13 of the deans have had children. The male deans have from one to seven children with three being the mode. The female deans have from two to five children with a mode of two. Table 4 shows the occupations of the deans' spouses by the age of the deans and Table 5 shows the distribution by the sex of the deans. Both tables show that the deans, in high executive positions themselves, tend to have spouses who also occupy high status positions. The tables show that the spouses of the younger deans and of the female deans are more likely to be in one of the top two major categories of the Hollingshead occupational scale.

**Early Childhood**

Sixty deans reported that they had spent their early childhood in families with both parents present. The highest level of educational attainment of the parents of the deans is shown in Table 6. The data indicate that 66%
TABLE 4

Occupations of Spouses of Deans by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>57-66 N %</th>
<th>51-56 N %</th>
<th>48-50 N %</th>
<th>34-47 N %</th>
<th>Total N %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Executive and Professional</td>
<td>1 6 3 27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 43 10 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and Lesser Professionals</td>
<td>6 35 2 18</td>
<td>4 44 4 29</td>
<td>16 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators, Minor Professionals</td>
<td>1 6 0</td>
<td>1 11 0</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical, Sales</td>
<td>2 12 0</td>
<td>1 11 0</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled, Manual</td>
<td>1 6 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6 15 6 55</td>
<td>3 33 4 29</td>
<td>19 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Married</td>
<td>17 11 9 14</td>
<td>14 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Executive and Professional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and Lesser Professionals</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators, Minor Professionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical, Sales</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled, Manual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Blank</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Married</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6

Highest Level of Educational Attainment of Parents of Deans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male Deans</th>
<th>Female Deans</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School Graduation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate/ Some College</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Graduate Study/ Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X^2 = .23; \text{ d.f.} = 3; p &lt; .98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male Deans</th>
<th>Female Deans</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Fathers**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School Graduation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate/ Some College</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Graduate Study/ Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X^2 = 11.42; \text{ d.f.} = 3; p &lt; .01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the mothers of the deans had at least a high school education; 20% went on to complete a Bachelor's degree and about 11% initiated or completed graduate work. There was little difference between the male and female deans on this variable. There was, however, significant difference between the male and female deans on the level of educational attainment of the fathers. Eighty-two percent of the fathers of the female deans had at least a high school education while 30% went on to complete undergraduate programs. Forty-five percent of the fathers of the male deans completed high school with 19% going on to complete an undergraduate program. The fathers of the female deans thus tended to be more highly educated. (Chi square = 11.42; p < .01)

The data of Table 7 relative to the occupations of the fathers of the deans indicate that the fathers of the female deans also tended to hold higher level positions than the fathers of the male deans. The initial grouping of the occupations into twelve categories (a modification of the Hollingshead Occupational Scale\(^1\)) produced a result that was statistically significant \(X^2 = 24.97; \text{d.f.} = 11; p < .01\), but the large number of zeroes in the cells of that matrix, however, made the test untrustworthy. When the matrix was collapsed into five categories to avoid small
### TABLE 7

Occupations of Fathers of Deans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male Deans</th>
<th>Female Deans</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Executive and Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and Lesser Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators, Minor Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical, Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled, Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 11.24$; d.f. = 4; $p < .05$
cell frequencies, the difference was still statistically significant ($X^2 = 11.24; d.f. = 4; p < .05$). Data for the occupations of mothers of the deans are not reported because so few of the mothers were employed.

The relationship of birth order to the assumption of leadership position has frequently been studied and is a variable commonly used in case studies of women in management. The deans were asked to provide information about their birth order by answering questions about the number of older and younger brothers and sisters. The data were combined to determine how many of the deans were first-born children or the first of their sex in their families. As indicated in Table 8, ten of the women, or 59% of the women answering the question, were first-born among all the children of their families and 71% were the first daughter. In contrast, 24% of the men were the first-born in their families and 50% of them were the first son. Three of the men and one of the women were only children.

The deans were asked which parent they had felt closer to in the days before they reached high school. Fifty-four percent of the males and 39% of the females said they felt closer to their mothers. Thirty-nine percent of the males and 46% of the females said their relationship was equally close to both parents. Five percent of the males and 15 percent of the females said they felt closer to their fathers.
TABLE 8
Birth Order of Deans in Family of Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male Deans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female Deans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First child of either sex</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First child of same sex</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The deans were then asked about the sex of their playmates in the years before they reached high school. Table 9 shows that none of the male deans reported having played with all girls or with mostly girls. Only 30% of them indicated a 50-50 balance of male and female playmates. Seventy percent reported playing mostly with boys or entirely with boys. The female deans, on the other hand, all reported playing with children of both sexes—none reported having played with all girls or boys. These differences were statistically significant at the .0001 level.

To attempt to discover how long the deans might have had interest in social work, a question was directed to them concerning childhood dreams about what they would become when they grew up. There were no responses that could be interpreted to be evidence of early aspiration to be a social worker. Only 17 responses were received and
TABLE 9

Sex of Childhood Playmates of Deans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male Deans</th>
<th>Female Deans</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All boys</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly boys</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally boys and girls</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly girls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All girls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 26.46; \text{d.f.} = 3; p < .0001\]

Cramer V = .65325
they specified physician (6), minister or priest (4), teacher (4), lawyer (3), and wife and mother (1).

The deans were asked what were their favorite activities while in elementary school and while in high school. They were given the opportunity to give three answers to each question. Although almost 90% of the respondents named at least one activity for each of the questions, there was a drop-off of responses after the first answer, particularly for the question related to the elementary school period. Therefore, all answers for each period were combined. For the elementary school level, the female deans most frequently identified reading as their favorite activity, followed by sports and musical activities. For the same period, the male deans identified various sports activities (including both individual and team sports) first, followed by reading and musical activities. For the high school period, both the male and female deans identified sports first, followed by reading and musical activities.

To determine if leadership tendencies had been manifested early in life, the deans were asked to report any honors, special achievements, or leadership roles which they had enjoyed while they were in elementary school and high school. Again, for each question, they were given three open ended blanks. The responses to the question
relative to the elementary school period were too few to have any meaning and are not reported here. The question relative to the high school period drew 86 male responses and 39 female responses. Fifty-one percent of the women and 34% of the men identified most frequently a type of academic honor such as top rank in class, honor society member, scholarship or prize award. The second most frequent response of the male deans was a position in student government or as a class officer. The third most frequent male response was a tie between athletic achievements and positions as editor of a school newspaper or yearbook. After academic honors, the female deans indicated leadership roles as editor of school paper/yearbook, followed by student government leadership and debating. The responses are listed in Table 10.

Finally, the deans were asked to recall the way they acted as adolescents. They were asked to indicate on a Likert scale whether they acted rarely, sometimes, about half the time, quite often, or always in regard to specific characteristics. Table 11 reflects the percentages of male and female deans recalling that they manifested the given characteristics quite often or always. The data suggest that both males and females recalled themselves to be obedient, friendly, and independent. The males were
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic achievements</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valedictorian, first in class</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salutatorian, second in class</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors, honor roll, scholastic awards</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor society: National, Arista, Keystone</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards in math, science, history, essays</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership award, &quot;Outstanding,&quot; &quot;Most likely...&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships: College, Regents, Cal. Fed'n.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athletic achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State champion, 3-letter man, team manager or captain, Scholar/athlete, highest sports award, Pres. of Athletic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship and service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legion award, Scouting, YMCA, Sons of American Revolution, other service organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Club, Spanish Club, others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic, debating activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oratory awards, debating contests, national forensic organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journalism activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing, Editor of Yearbook, Editor of school newspaper, sports editor, Quill &amp; Scroll</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Musical, theatrical, dance activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band leader, concert master, musical awards, performances, senior play</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social recognition</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class officer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student council representative, officer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State champion dairy cattle judge</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II

Deans' Recollections of Adolescent Behavior
(Percent responding "Quite often" or "Always")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Obedient       | 86    | 73      | 83    | NS
| Friendly       | 80    | 86      | 81    | NS
| Independent    | 73    | 79      | 75    | NS
| Assertive      | 50    | 50      | 50    | NS
| Competitive    | 58    | 87      | 64    | *  
| Self-confident | 58    | 36      | 53    | NS

\[ X^2 = 10.36; \text{ d.f. = 4; } p \leq .05 \]
slightly more obedient than the females and the females were slightly more friendly and independent. They both recall being assertive and self confident to a lesser degree. Only half the male or female deans recall being assertive. While 58% of the male deans recall being self confident, only 36% of the female deans have a similar recollection. On one characteristic, there is a statistically significant difference between the male and female deans. Eighty-seven percent of the female deans recall their having been competitive while only 58% of the male deans recall having been competitive ($X^2 = 10.36; 4 \text{ d.f.}; p < .05$).

**Summary of early childhood characteristics.** In summary, it has been discovered that almost all the deans spent their early childhood in two parent families. About two-thirds of the mothers of the deans had at least a high school education and about 20% had earned a Bachelor's degree. A little more than half the fathers of all the deans had completed high school, although 82% of the fathers of the female deans had completed high school. Similarly, while 22% of the fathers of all the deans had earned Bachelor's degrees, 30% of the fathers of the female deans had attained that educational level. The fathers of the deans had been employed in a variety of
occupations but the fathers of the female deans tended to be employed in higher status positions.

The deans tended to be the first child of their sex born into their families; the female deans also tended to be the first child of either sex in their families. Half the deans report being closer to their mothers during childhood while a slightly smaller percentage report feeling equally close to both parents. While, during the years before they reached high school, the male deans tended to have more male than female playmates and the female deans tended to have more female than male playmates, there was a greater tendency among the females to include both boys and girls in their circle of friends. During this period none of the future deans gave much thought to the possibility of becoming social workers.

Throughout their elementary and high school days the deans tended to pursue extracurricular activities in the areas of reading, sports, and music. They reported having received during the high school period special recognition for academic excellence, for leadership in class or student government, for editing a school publication, for athletic achievements and leadership to service organizations.

Finally, all the deans recall that as adolescents they had been obedient, friendly, and independent and only
slightly less assertive and self confident. The female deans felt significantly more competitive than the male deans.

Educational Preparation

A significant part of the career path leading to a deanship consists of the years spent acquiring an education—years in which substantial choices are made and career-shaping experiences are encountered. This part of the findings identifies some of those experiences in the undergraduate, master's, and doctoral programs.

The deans were asked three questions related to their decisions to enter the field of social work. They were asked (1) if social work had been their only career decision or if, at any time following high school, they had intended to pursue another career; (2) the identification of the other career if there had been one; and (3) two reasons why they had chosen to enter social work.

Of the 65 deans responding to the questionnaire, 13 indicated that social work had been their only career choice. This included 19% of the male deans and 28% of the female deans. Forty-six replied that they had intended to pursue another career; 39 specified their earlier career choice:
5 Attorney (2 male; 3 female)
1 Personnel counseling (female)
4 Physician, psychiatrist (3 male; 1 female)
3 Psychologist (male)
6 Religious: priest or minister (male)
11 Teacher, professor (7 male; 4 female)
10 Other (7 male; 3 female)

The reasons given for entering social work are summarized in Table 12. In general, the most frequently cited reasons included some form of service or helping motivation, social action goals, the influence of other people, and economic reasons such as the availability of a job. With some modification in the order of the frequencies, these reasons were given by both male and female deans. The female deans cited the service reasons most frequently while the male deans cited social action goals most frequently. A total of 102 reasons were given, all of which are recorded in Appendix G.

Undergraduate program

In reporting their undergraduate degrees, 48 of the deans stated that they had received a B.A. degree; 15 had received the B.S. degree, and 2 had other baccalaureate degrees. They received their degrees from 47 different institutions. Those institutions awarding more than one of the deans' baccalaureate degrees were City University of New York (5), the University of Michigan (3), Tufts University (3) and the University of Wisconsin (2). A list
### TABLE 12
Deans' Reasons for Becoming Social Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation for Service</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Action Goals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of Other People</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic, Employment Related</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in People</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Experience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values Orientation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness Compared to Former Career Choice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Women, Minorities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Did not&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of all the awarding institutions is found in Table 13.

The data regarding undergraduate majors indicate an early learning toward the social sciences. Thirty indicated a major in sociology or social science; 6 indicated majors in social work or social service. Other majors in closely related fields were psychology (7), political science (6), and economics (3), social psychology (1), and anthropology (1). Majors in the humanities included English or Literature (8), History (5), and Philosophy (5). The other majors were scattered across ten different fields, all of which are listed in Table 14. Seventeen deans reported double majors and one reported a triple major.

All the baccalaureate degrees were received by the deans in the years between 1937 and 1961, the median year being 1950. There was a bimodal effect with six deans graduating in 1948 and six in 1953. At the time of graduation, the deans ranged in age from 18 to 29. The mean age was 22 with a standard deviation of 2.3 years. The mode was also 22. The female deans were generally younger than the male deans when they graduated. Their mean age was 21.1 with a standard deviation of 1.2 years while for the males, the mean age was 22.8 years with a standard deviation of 2.5 years. When the means of the two groups were tested with the t-test for significance, the t value
### TABLE 13

Educational Institutions Attended by the Deans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctorates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson College, Indiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustana College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryn Mawr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California (Berkeley)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Los Angeles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve University</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City University of New York</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Denver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisk University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno State College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson C. Smith University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephinium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University of Chicago</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryknoll College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Doctorates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Mount St. Vincent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina A. &amp; T. State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlin College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Puerto Rico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens College, North Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens College, Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rochester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Rey College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of St. Benedict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Michael's College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith College</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts University</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Theological Seminary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnical Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Union University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University, St. Louis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Subject</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Doctorates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work/Social Welfare</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling, Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology/Social Science</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Totals include undergraduate double majors and graduate secondary majors.
was found to be 2.72 with 63 degrees of freedom, significant at the .008 level. See Table 15.

The marital status of the deans at each level of their programs is shown in Table 16. It shows that 81% of the deans were unmarried during their undergraduate years. The figures indicate, however, that 23% of the male deans were married at that time in contrast to 6% of the female deans. The difference was not statistically significant but it marks the beginning of a trend which grew in the two subsequent educational periods.

The deans generally completed their undergraduate studies in four years although 13 completed them in less than four years and 10 took more than four years. As can be seen in Table 17, none of the women had taken more than four years to complete their programs and only two completed it in less than four years. On this variable there was significant difference between the men and women. \(X^2 = 7.08; \ d.f. = 2; \ p < .03\)

Performance in the undergraduate program as measured by GPA (Grade Point Average) and as recalled by the deans was generally well above average with a mean score on a 4-point scale of 3.29 with a standard deviation of .43. The modal response was "B average" or 3.0. There was no significant difference between men and women. During the undergraduate program only 28% of the deans had mentors.
### TABLE 15
Age of Deans When Bachelor's Degree Conferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $\bar{x}$: 22.76, 21.11, 22.31
- S.D.: 2.46, 1.23, 2.30
- Mode: 22, 22, 22
- Median: 22, 21, 22

$t = 2.72; \text{d.f.} = 64; p = 0.008$
### TABLE 16

Marital Status of Male and Female Deans while in Baccalaureate, Master's and Doctoral Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2 = 3.0732; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \ p < .21\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master's</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2 = 3.545; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \ p < .059\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2 = 10.193; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \ p < .001\)
**TABLE 17**

**Length of Time to Complete Baccalaureate, Master's and Doctoral Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baccalaureate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 4 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 4 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[x^2 = 7.08; \text{ d.f.} = 2; p < .029\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master's</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or less years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 2 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[x^2 = 6.25; \text{ d.f.} = 3; p < .10\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or less years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[x^2 = .77; \text{ d.f.} = 4; p < .95\]
A higher percentage of the female deans had mentors (47%) than did the male deans (21%). At this level, 61% of the mentors were male and 39% of them were female. These data are reported in Tables 18 and 19.

The deans were asked to specify, for each level, the percent of financial support received from each of five different sources— from their own earnings or savings, from their parents, from their spouse, from loans, and from scholarships and stipends (including the G.I. Bill). The means of the percentages of support from the different sources in each of the programs are reported in Table 20. Statistical differences were found at the undergraduate level where women received substantially more from their parents than did the men (p < .02) and where the men contributed substantially more from their own earnings and savings (p < .01).

Finally, the deans were asked if, as undergraduate students, they had felt self confident about their ability to achieve. The responses were overwhelmingly in the positive, 83% of the total answering "yes" including 100% of the female deans. On this variable there was a significant difference ($\chi^2 = 5; \text{d.f.} = 1; p < .05$).
TABLE 18
Mentor Relationships of Male and Female Deans while in Baccalaureate, Master's and Doctoral Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 2.9288; \text{ d.f.} = 1; p < .087 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master's</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .0788; \text{ d.f.} = 1; p < .779 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 2.2405; \text{ d.f.} = 1; p < .1344 \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baccalaureate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master's</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 20

**Means of Percentages of Financial Support**

**Received by Deans in Baccalaureate, Master's and Doctoral Programs by Source**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Males %</th>
<th>Females %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baccalaureate</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>34.43*</td>
<td>13.24*</td>
<td>28.71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>35.30**</td>
<td>57.76**</td>
<td>41.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>25.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master's</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>32.83</td>
<td>32.89</td>
<td>32.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>41.94</td>
<td>46.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>41.79</td>
<td>38.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>52.20</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $t = 3.37; d.f. = 60; p < .01$

** $t = 2.52; d.f. = 60; p < .02$
Summary of undergraduate period. Only 13 deans entered the practice of social work with a singular career aspiration to become a social worker. The others had pursued different career goals and turned to social work as a secondary interest. What seemed to motivate them primarily were service and social action goals although they were also strongly influenced by the encouragement of, and examples set by, other persons.

The deans attended a variety of schools for their undergraduate education and majored in many different subjects although there was a strong leaning toward the social sciences. All the deans graduated between 1937 and 1967 at an average age of 22. The undergraduate performance was well above average. The deans reported feeling self confident during this period. More women than men had mentors; more men than women were married.

Significant differences between the male and female deans during this period were found in four variables. The female deans were younger at the time of graduation and were more apt to have completed their program in the traditional four-year period of time rather than in either shorter or longer time periods. The women received more financial support from their parents while the men contributed more from their own earnings and savings. And, without exception, the women reported having been self confident at this period of their lives.
Master's program

Of the 64 deans responding to the question concerning the discipline in which they had done their Master's work, 58 reported that their degree was in social work. (See Table 14). Forty-five of these had a single major in social work, one received two different social work degrees, and 12 carried a second major in addition to social work. The seven deans who did not pursue a social work degree did their work in psychology (3), sociology (2), public administration (1) and agricultural economics (1). All the female deans earned a social work degree and three earned more than one Master's degree.

The deans received their degrees from 44 different institutions as listed in Table 13. The following schools were named more than once by the deans: Columbia (9), Catholic University (4), University of Michigan (4), University of Pennsylvania (3), University of Chicago (3), University of Minnesota (3), University of Southern California (3), and two each from Boston College, University of California at Berkeley, Case Western Reserve University, Fordham University, Ohio State University, University of Pittsburgh, Smith College, Tufts University, Washington University, and the University of Wisconsin.

The deans received their first Master's degrees in the years ranging from 1938 to 1970 with 1953 and 1954 both
being modal years and 1953 the median year. Second degrees were received by the deans in the years from 1941 to 1974, and both the median and modal years were 1958. Table 21 shows that the age of the deans at the time they received their first Master's degrees ranged from 21 to 39 with the mean age being 26.58. Again, the female deans were slightly younger with a mean age of 25.61. The mean age of the male deans was 26.96. The modal age for females was 24 and for males, 26. These differences were not statistically significant. Fifty-seven percent of the male deans were married during the Master's program, compared to 25% of the female deans. This difference approaches statistical significance with a Chi Square of 3.55 (p < .06).
(See Table 16.)

Table 17 shows that both men and women generally completed the Master's program in 1-2 years. Forty-four (76%) reported that they completed the first Master's degree in two or less years. This included 82% of the male deans and 60% of the female deans. Table 18 shows that more than half the deans enjoyed the support of mentors during their Master's programs. Table 19 shows that 54% of these mentors were female and 46% were male. During the Master's program, the deans had to rely almost completely upon their own financial resources, whether in monetary contributions or in academic credentials to win scholarships and stipends.
**TABLE 21**

Age of Deans When First Master's Degree Conferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{X} \] 22.96 25.61 26.58

S.D. 3.84 3.82 3.85

Mode 26 24 26

Median 26 24 26

\[ t = 1.27; \text{ d.f.} = 63; p \leq .20 \text{ N.S.} \]
Although the differences are not significantly different, the men received a higher percentage of support from scholarships than did the women. The women contributed from their own funds a higher percentage than did the men. The data are reflected in Table 20.

The deans were asked to identify the social work practice method in which they concentrated. If they did not have a social work major, they were asked to indicate the practice method which was most nearly equivalent to their own major concentration. There was no restriction given as to the number of methods that could be checked and fourteen deans identified more than one practice concentration. Ten deans (one female and nine male) identified two; these were counted as .5 in the computation for Table 22. Four male deans identified three or more concentrations; for comparative purposes, these have been grouped with the responses identified as generic.

As can be seen in Table 22, 49% of the deans identified casework as being at least a part of their educational background. The second most frequently identified method was groupwork with 14% of the responses. The generic and community organization responses were third and fourth with 11% and 10%, respectively. When the responses of each sex are looked at separately, the pattern is a little different. Both males and females identified casework most frequently,
TABLE 22
Deans' Practice Method of Concentration while in Master's Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casework</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic or 3 or more methods</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non response or NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 47 18 65

NOTE: Where two practice methods were checked, each was counted as .5
but the females identified it 67% of the time while the males identified it 43% of the time. Females were attracted to concentrations in community organization (14%) and group work (8%) after casework while the males were next attracted to group work and generic (or multi-) methods.

In response to a question about the number of administration courses they had taken in their Master's programs, the deans may have had some difficulty in recalling exactly how many courses they took (and some indicated that difficulty in marginal notes). Fifty-nine of the deans did respond, however, and their answers are reported in Table 23. Twenty percent of the deans had taken no administration courses and 31% had taken only one course. Forty-nine percent had taken two or more such courses. When broken down for sex, there is a statistically significant difference. Only 21% of the female deans took two or more courses in administration. Half of them took one course and 29% took none. In contrast, the male deans indicated that 58% took two or more courses, 24% took one, and only 18% had taken none. The $X^2$ test indicated significance at the .05 level.

The deans were further asked, "If you were planning on a career in social work while you were in the Master's program, in what field(s) did you intend to work?" They were asked to give no more than two responses. Ten deans either failed to respond to this question or indicated that
TABLE 23

Number of Administration Courses Elected by Deans during Master's Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = 6.35; d.f. = 2; p < .05

it was non-applicable. Thirteen gave two responses and 42 gave one response. The findings are reflected in Table 24. Mental health appears to have been the field that attracted the largest number of the deans during their Master's program. Twenty-four percent indicated such an interest followed by 19% intending to enter the field of child welfare, 17% going into community planning, and 16% into "other" fields. The latter category included research, teaching, church work, group work, settlement house work, Jewish Center work, poverty, and housing/race relations.
TABLE 24

Deans' Intended Fields of Practice While in Master's Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice/Corrections</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Welfare</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Medical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Welfare</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Social Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 37 18 55

Note: Where two fields of practice were mentioned, each was counted as .5
When the responses are broken down by sex, a slightly different pattern emerges. The female deans report having anticipated going into the fields of child welfare (33%), mental health (19%) and community planning (14%). The male deans report having planned to enter the fields of mental health (26%), "other" fields (20%), and community planning (19%).

Summary of Master's period. All female deans and all but seven male deans hold a Master's degree in social work. Thirteen deans hold more than one Master's degree. The degrees were awarded from 44 different institutions with Columbia, Catholic University, Michigan and Pennsylvania having awarded most. The median year for receipt of the first Master's degree was 1953. The average age of the deans was 27. The men were more likely to be married; the women, single.

A higher percentage of deans enjoyed a mentor relationship while in the Master's program than in either the undergraduate or doctoral programs. Over half their mentors were female. The primary source of financial support during this period was scholarships and stipends.

The deans indicated a strong background in preparation for casework practice with slightly less emphasis in group-work, community organization, and generic or multi-method practice. The female deans indicated a greater preference
for casework than the men, but the difference was not significant. The male deans generally took more courses in administration than the female deans and the difference was statistically significant. Overall, the deans indicated that, during the years when they were studying for the Master's degree, they were planning to enter the mental health, child welfare, and community planning fields.

**Doctoral program**

Fifty-six of the social work deans earned the doctorate degree, 35 (29 men and 6 women) receiving the Ph.D. and 20 (12 men and 8 women) receiving the DSW. One male dean holds a doctorate in Public Administration (DPA) and one female dean holds, in addition to the Ph.D., a J.D. law degree. Broken down by sex, 89% of the male deans and 78% of the female deans reported having earned the doctorate. Two deans reported having completed two years of post-Master's work without having completed requirements for the doctorate.

Forty-three of the deans with doctorates reported that the degree was in social work or social welfare. Included within the 43 are 12 received from Brandeis University where a distinction is made between social work and social welfare. The distinction was noted by five
Brandeis graduates in comments they made in the margin of their questionnaires. Also, in response to a letter, the Dean of the Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare at Brandeis University wrote, "The Florence Heller School, while having a long and close association with the social work community, is not a school of social work. Its orientation is toward social planning and management of the human services sector."²

The deans with non-social work doctorates reported that their studies had been taken in sociology (5), psychology (2), public administration (2) and one each in anthropology, economics, educational administration, and political science. The data are shown in Table 14. Secondary majors were identified as sociology (2), education (1), and law (1). Of the seven deans who did not receive degrees in social work at the Master's level, two earned a doctorate in social work or social welfare; the other five have no graduate degree in social work. Fourteen of the eighteen female deans earned doctorates. Thirteen were in social work (or social welfare) and one was in sociology. Forty-two of the 47 male deans earned doctorates, 30 of which were in social work or social welfare.

Brandeis University awarded 12 of the doctorates held by the current deans, more than any other institution as
indicated in Table 13. Schools conferring more than two doctoral degrees to the deans were Columbia University (6), University of Minnesota (5), University of California at Berkeley (4), Catholic University (4), University of Michigan (4), and University of Chicago (3).

The deans received their doctorates in the years between 1949 and 1977 with the median year being 1967 and the modal year 1970. As can be seen from Table 25, at the time they received their doctorates, the deans ranged in age from 25 to 53 years with 37.95 being the mean age with a standard deviation of 6.29. The men tended to be younger, ranging in age from 25 to 51 with a mean of 37.34 and a standard deviation of 5.73. The women were from 29 to 53 years old with a mean of 39.71 and a standard deviation of 7.68. The difference in ages was not significant but, as shown in Table 16, the difference in marital status was significant ($X^2 = 10.19; \text{d.f.} = 1; p < .001$). Ninety-one percent of the men were married in contrast to 46% of the women. The Phi coefficient (measuring the degree of association for nominal variables) was .4759 indicating moderate association between the two variables of sex and marital status of the deans while in doctoral programs.

Table 18 shows that only 4 female deans (31%) reported having mentors during the doctoral period while 25 of the male deans (60%) had mentors at that time. Table 19
TABLE 25

Age of Deans When Doctoral Degree Conferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{X} = 37.34 \quad 39.71 \quad 37.95 \]

\[ \text{S.D.} = 5.73 \quad 7.68 \quad 6.29 \]

Mode: 38,39 \quad 40,47 \quad 32,38,39,43

Median: 38 \quad 40 \quad 38

\[ t = 1.06; \text{ d.f.} = 54; p < .20 \quad \text{N.S.} \]
shows that the women were evenly divided in their relationship to male and female mentors while 92% of the male deans had male mentors. As in the Master's program, the primary source of financial aid during this period was the student's access to scholarships and stipends. (See Table 20.) Sixty-four percent of the deans reported finishing their doctoral studies within four years. The percentage figure was exactly the same for both men and women. (See Table 17.)

Summary of doctoral period. Fifty-six of the 65 deans responding to the questionnaire received a doctorate and three-fourths of these were in either social work or social welfare. The degrees were awarded from many institutions but Brandeis University awarded 12—more than any other school. It generally took two to four years for the deans to complete their doctoral programs, and the average age at graduation was 38. Both men and women drew primarily upon stipends and scholarships for financial support. The women tended to be slightly older than the men. The men tended to have a higher percentage of mentor relationships than the women. The only variable for which there was significant difference, though, was marital status, with most of the men being married and less than half of the women.
FOOTNOTES


CHAPTER V

FINDINGS: PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Professional Practice

The deans were asked to respond to several questions about the years spent in social work practice. All but five male deans responded that they had engaged in practice exclusive of their social work education positions. The mean number of years spent in practice was 7.98 with 7.68 for men and 8.72 for women, virtually the same for both. A t-test confirms that there is no significant difference. (See Table 26.) The data representing the number of practice years spent in direct service, supervision and administration other than supervision permitted some overlapping of figures since the terms were not defined as mutually exclusive categories. However, insight was gained into the relative number of men and women who did see their practice experience defined in these ways. Thirty-two men (76%) and 14 women (78%) reported being engaged in direct service. Sixteen men (34%) and 8 women (44%) reported being supervisors. Twenty-nine men (64%) and 7 women (39%) reported having been in administrative positions. A chi-square test of the difference between
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Social Work Practice</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years as Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 57 - 66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 51 - 56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 48 - 50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 34 - 47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years as Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 57 - 66</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 51 - 56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 48 - 50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 34 - 47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years as Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 57 - 66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 51 - 56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 48 - 50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 34 - 47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 26 (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MMeans</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M F Total</td>
<td>M F Total</td>
<td>M F Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years as Dean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excludes Acting Deans)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.15 3.94 5.48 5.09 2.49 4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 57 - 66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.73 5.20</td>
<td>5.71 3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 51 - 56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.44 3.50</td>
<td>4.64 2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 48 - 50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.78 3.75</td>
<td>4.55 1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 34 - 47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.30 3.00</td>
<td>1.83 1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years to Gain Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.70 4.75 3.98 2.40 2.46 2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 57 - 66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.54 5.25</td>
<td>3.04 3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 51 - 56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.55 4.00</td>
<td>3.40 2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 48 - 50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.67 5.50</td>
<td>1.58 1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 34 - 47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.30 4.33</td>
<td>1.11 1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.*
the men and women reporting experience in administrative positions in significant at the .05 level.

Social Work Education

In addition to data relative to years spent in social work practice, Table 26 presents data relative to the number of years spent in different positions within social work education. On an average, the deans have spent 3.67 years at the Assistant Professor level, 3.96 years at the Associate Professor level, and 7.53 years as full Professor. Table 26 also presents the data broken down by sex and by age. No significant differences were found between men and women although the differences noted were consistent with research findings about faculty women, i.e., women tend to be found more at the lower ranks.¹ These findings show that the female deans have spent more years at the Assistant Professor level than the male deans (4.0 years vs. 3.52 years), about the same number of years at the Associate Professor level (4.0 years vs. 3.94 years), and fewer years at the full Professor level (6.38 years vs. 7.92 years).

Further distinctions are noted when the data are broken down by age grouping. A distinctive difference emerges from the findings for the Assistant Professor level. While among the deans over the age of 50, female deans had actually spent less time than the male deans at this level,
among the deans under the age of 50, the female deans have spent significantly more years at this level. At the full Professor level, the male deans in all age groups have spent more time at rank than have the female deans. The difference is least for those deans who are oldest and seems to become greater with each younger group except for the youngest group. The t-test shows that the difference for deans aged 48 to 50 falls just short of significance.

Twenty-four deans reported that they had served as Interim or Acting Deans with an average number of years' service of 1.33. Although no question was asked about service as Assistant or Associate Dean, one female dean reported six years' service as Associate Dean. Two male deans reported service as Assistant Dean (3 years and 1 year) and one as Associate Dean for two years. Since the question was not asked, however, there is no way to know how many other deans may have served in this capacity. Table 26 shows that the current social work deans have served an average of 5.48 years in that position. The difference between the men (6.15 years) and women (3.94 years) is significant at the .05 level. When the t values are calculated for the individual age groups, it is apparent that the differences, although not significant, are greatest for the oldest deans.
The deans were asked how many years it took them to earn tenure. The average number of years for all deans was 3.98 with a standard deviation of 2.44. The male deans achieved tenure in a shorter time generally, with the average number of years being 3.70 while for the female deans it was 4.75. (Table 26) The difference is not significant, nor are any of the differences for the four age groups significant. What is revealed there, however, is the direction of the difference. With the exception of the 51-56 age group, the women at all ages average more years than the men in attaining tenure.

The deans were asked if there had been any break in continuity in their professional work experience after the Master's degree. If so, they were to give the reason for it and also the length of time it kept them away from their careers. Thirty eight reported that they had taken such break, 26 indicating that it had been for the purpose or pursuing the doctoral degree. One female dean reported a leave for illness and two male deans reported "other" causes for leaves. The remaining deans taking leaves from professional practice gave reasons that were strongly sex related, four female deans taking time off for child bearing/rearing and four male deans reporting time off for military duty. The women generally took longer breaks with four reporting an absence in excess of five years; no
men reported more than a five year break.

Two questions were asked to ascertain the relative mobility of the deans. The first asked for the number of schools in which they had served as faculty members. The average number of schools for all deans was 2.42 with a range from one to seven. There was a significant difference between the men and women on this variable. As can be seen in Table 27, male deans had served in an average of 2.71 schools while female deans had served in an average of 1.65 schools. The t-test showed a difference that was significant at the .02 level. When the t value is calculated for the different age groups, it can be seen that there is significant difference between the male and female deans over age 50 but very little difference between the deans under age 50. The figures also show that the younger male deans are serving in fewer schools that the older male deans while the younger female deans are serving in more schools than did the older female deans.

The other question related to mobility asked for the number of schools in which the deans had served in the capacity of dean. Fifty-seven of the deans have served as dean in just one school, presumably the one in which they are currently serving. None of the female deans have served in more than one. Six male deans have served in two and one dean has served in four schools.
TABLE 27

Average Number of Schools in Which Deans Have Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Faculty Member</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 57 - 66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 51 - 56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 48 - 50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 34 - 47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01
**p < .02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Dean</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 57 - 66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 51 - 56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 48 - 50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 34 - 47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .02.
**p < .05.
Summary of Practice Experience

The deans averaged 7.98 years in social work practice before entering higher education to teach. During the practice years, the women spent significantly less time in administrative positions. As faculty members, the deans averaged 3.67 years at the rank of Assistant Professor, 3.96 years as Associate Professor, and 7.53 years at the full Professor level. Tenure was achieved in approximately 3.98 years. In contrast to the men, the women spent more time at the lower ranks, more years to achieve tenure, and less time at the full Professor level. The deans averaged 5.48 years as dean and have served on faculties in 2-3 schools, although in only one as dean. The women have served significantly fewer years as deans and in significantly fewer schools as members of the faculty. A little more than half the deans have interrupted their professional careers for some purpose—for most, the break was to pursue doctoral studies. The female deans, several of whom also had maternity breaks, lost significantly more years from their careers while away.

Tolerance of Ambiguity

Among the personal characteristics being examined was one personality variable, tolerance of ambiguity. This was measured using a 20 question, standardized, true-false
test developed by MacDonald. Thirty seven men and 12 women answered all questions; seven men and two women answered 19 questions; one man and one woman answered 18 questions. This gave a total of 60 usable responses that could be analyzed. (Two deans did not attempt any questions; two completed eight and one completed 15.)

Each of the twenty items was scored with 1 for those answers representing high tolerance of ambiguity and 2 for those responses representing low tolerance of ambiguity. Mean scores for the items completed were calculated for each subject and put into a frequency distribution. Mean scores and standard deviations were then calculated for the total group and for the two subgroups of men and women. Overall, the mean score was 1.33 with a standard deviation of .13. Women had a mean score of 1.32 with a standard deviation of .013; men had a mean of 1.34 with a standard deviation of .134. A t test of the means of the two distributions confirmed what is apparent to the eye, that there was virtually no difference between the two populations with regard to the variable, tolerance of ambiguity.

**Professional Characteristics**

The National Association of Social Workers (NASW) is the major professional social work organization. Ninety-two percent of all the deans (44 male and 16 female) are current members. Sixty-eight percent of the deans also
TABLE 28

Research-Teaching Orientation of Deans and Journal Articles Published

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Research-Teaching Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X² = 3.40; d.f. = 2; p &lt; .20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Journal Articles Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X² = 10.16; d.f. = 4; p &lt; .05.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hold certification in the Academy of Certified Social Workers (ACSW). That includes 30 males and 14 females.

The deans were asked about a preferred orientation toward teaching or research. While 37% reported having no strong leaning toward one or the other, 43% reported an orientation toward teaching and 20% reported an orientation toward research. Table 28 shows how this distribution is broken down by the sex of the deans. While a much higher percentage of women is inclined toward teaching, compared to men, the difference is not statistically significant. There was, however, a statistically significant difference in the publication rate of the male and female deans. The deans were asked to indicate in four categories—books, journal articles, monographs, and chapters in edited books—whether they had none, 1-2, 2-5, 6-10, or more than 10 publications. The responses indicate that, on the average, the deans have published no books, 1-2 monographs, 1-2 chapters in edited books, and 3-5 journal articles (Table 28). Journal articles obviously are the major outlet for writing; 31% of the deans have written more than 10 articles; 22% have written 6-10, and 23% have written 3-5. The modal response for men was "more than 10" while for women it was "3-5." Only one man reported having written no journal articles while three women reported being in that category. The chi-square test produced a value of 10.16, d.f. = 4,
which was significant at the .05 level.

The Schools

The characteristics of the different institutions served by the social work deans are reflected in Table 29. The schools are predominantly in the public sector with a proportionate number of male and female deans serving in both public and private institutions. About 80% of the deans are operating autonomous programs in which they respond directly to one of the top two officials of the institution; 22 respond to a Provost; 19 respond to a Vice-President or Vice-Chancellor, and 11 report directly to the President or Chancellor. About 20% of the programs are subunits of other academic units and in such cases, the social work dean is responsible to the dean of the larger unit. On these characteristics, there is little difference between the schools served by the women and the schools served by the men.

The schools were fairly evenly divided with regard to the number of social work programs conducted. Since the schools were identified from the roster of accredited master's degree programs, it follows that all had master's programs. About 61% also had undergrad programs and 39% also had doctoral programs. The largest category was that in which there were undergrad and master's programs, but no doctoral. The female deans were divided over all the
# TABLE 29

## Characteristics of the Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Program Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Status</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subunit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Dean Responsible To

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dean Responsible To</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President/Chancellor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President/Vice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Social Work Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Work Programs</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Only</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters and Undergrad</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters and Doctoral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Three Programs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Student Enrollment ($\bar{x} = 386; \text{Median} = 301$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 220</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 - 300</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325 - 500</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 - 900</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Faculty FTE ($\bar{x} = 30; \text{Median} = 25$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty FTE</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 29 (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Former Deans</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More women than men</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally men and women</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More men than women</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All men</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 41 | 17 | 58
categories but disproportionately in the category with all three programs, 7 of 18 serving in such schools.

The size of student enrollments and faculty full time equivalents were also examined. The average social work school represented by the deans in this study had 386 students and 30 faculty FTE's. The median student enrollment was 301; the median faculty FTE was 25. The female deans tended to be located in the larger schools where the average student enrollment was 474 and the average faculty FTE was the same as overall, 30.

The deans were also asked about the sex of former deans of their schools. The data in Table 29 clearly indicate that most schools have had male deans in the past. The current deans assumed positions in which 24 had previously been held exclusively by men and 21 which had been held by more men than women. Only one school appears to have been headed exclusively by women and a woman remains as dean there. More men than women filled positions where there had formerly been more women or equal numbers of both men and women. Most of the women have assumed positions formerly held by men.

The Person in the Position

The last set of questions sought information about the current status of the deans in their positions as deans. They were first asked about tenure and salary.
As shown in Table 30, all but four of the deans were tenured. The one female dean lacking tenure noted that her school does not offer it. Each of the three male deans added a comment clarifying that they "did not have it" or "have never achieved it." One of the latter was an Acting Dean. Table 31 describes the salary levels of the deans by sex and by age. Almost half the deans are earning salaries in the top salary level, over $40,000. The age differential appears to be greater than the sex differential. The percent of deans receiving salaries over $40,000 is greatest (71%) for the deans aged 57-66, decreasing to 58% for those aged 51-56, to 43% for those aged 48-50, and lowest for those aged 34-47. The percent of males in this salary level is 51% compared to 41% of the females. Included among the female deans in this salary range are five of the seven currently married deans and four of the ten female deans who have children.

The deans were asked if they had actively sought their positions. As can be seen in Table 32, 67% of the deans responded that they had not. This included 64% of the men and 75% of the women. This question was followed by two which sought other perceptions of the deans regarding their appointments. They were first asked if they thought their appointments were due primarily to 1) their own desire and effort, 2) the active support and sponsorship
### TABLE 30

**Current Tenure Status of Deans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have tenure</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not have tenure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 31

**Current Salary Levels of Deans by Sex and Age**

(Acting Deans Excluded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>57-66</th>
<th>51-56</th>
<th>48-50</th>
<th>34-47</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $30,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-40,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $40,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 32
Deans' Perceptions of Various Aspects Their Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did seek job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment due to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own effort</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help from others</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex help get job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age breakdown of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those believing that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex did help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of others, or 3) being in the right place and the right
time, i.e., chance. Although they were requested to choose
only one answer, four deans gave combined answers, two
saying that both 2 and 3 were operative, and two saying that
both 1 and 3 were operative. Of those giving only one re-
sponse, however, 32 (53%) gave credit to the active support
and sponsorship of others. The male and female deans agreed
upon this response with 52% of the men and 56% of the women
answering in this way. Thirty percent of the deans (30%
of the men and 31% of the women) thought that being in the
right place at the right time had helped them. The re-
mainder (9% of the men and 13% of the women) thought that
their own efforts had been most instrumental.

The other perceptual question relating to the ap-
pointment asked whether or not they felt that their sex had
helped them get the job. Fifty one of the deans (84%) said
no. This included 87% of the men and 75% of the women.
When these answers are broken down by age, there is evi-
dence of a slight change from the oldest to the youngest.
The percentage of women saying that their sex helped them
increased from 20% to 50% while the percentage of men
saying that they were helped by their sex decreased from
17% to 8%. The numbers supporting this evidence of
change are too small to be more than suggestive of any
real trend.
When asked about the degree of satisfaction felt in their positions, the deans demonstrated a high degree of satisfaction. Fifty-four percent including 51% of the men and 61% of the women felt "Very satisfied"; 33% including 38% of the men and 22% of the women felt "Somewhat satisfied." Three men and two women had "No real feelings about it." One male dean expressed being "Very dissatisfied"; one male dean and one female dean each stated they felt "Somewhat dissatisfied." Since only 13% of the deans expressed any indifference or dissatisfaction, attention was directed to those few cases just to see if there might be any clues to suggest further research. There was no relationship between a lack of satisfaction and the variables of sex, marital status, or number of children. There was some tendency for Brandeis graduates and older deans to express dissatisfaction. The greatest range of feeling was expressed by those who had been deans for three years. There was no expression of indifference or dissatisfaction by deans with more than seven years of service.

Perceptions of the Future

Twenty characteristics frequently used in the literature to describe effective managers were listed from which the deans were asked to select and rank the five which they thought would be most important for a dean. Each
response was weighted by the rank assigned to it, 1-5. The weights for each of the twenty characteristics were then added and the totals arranged in rank order. Table 33 lists the rankings with accompanying weights for the male deans, female deans and all deans. A Spearman rank order correlation was computed for the total list of 20 items (all but one of which had been ranked as important at least once) and revealed an overall strong, positive (rho=.81) relationship between the rankings of the men and the women. When the same computation was made for the first seven items upon which there was agreement, however, the Spearman rho was -.22, indicating a very slight negative relationship.

Even though all the characteristics were positive in nature, ten were sex-typed as feminine and ten were sex-typed as masculine. In both the male deans' list and the overall deans' list, the first five characteristics were all masculine; the last two were feminine. The identified masculine characteristics were analytical, decisive, willing to take risks, flexible, and task oriented. The two feminine characteristics were sensitive to the needs of others and person oriented. The women chose the same seven characteristics as the most important, but gave more weight to being person oriented than willing to take risks.

Following the identification of the five most important characteristics, the deans were asked to rerank the
TABLE 33
Ranking of Twenty Characteristics Perceived to be Important for Deans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male Item</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Female Item</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>All Item</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Task oriented</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risking</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Person oriented</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Task oriented</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task oriented</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Risking</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person oriented</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Risking</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Person oriented</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att. to details</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Att. to details</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Att. to details</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tough minded</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough minded</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tough minded</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nurturant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nurturant</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s = .81; \ p < .01.$
same five on the basis of the degree to which each characteristic described themselves. Since 22 of the deans left that section blank or wrote in "Same," a correlation between what they had said was important and what they said was descriptive of themselves was not attempted. The questionnaire concluded with two open ended questions designed to evoke specific information that might be helpful to aspirants for the position of dean. The first asked, "If you were to advise someone who aspires to become a dean, what difficulties in reaching that position should he or she be warned about." One female dean stated, "I would advise against such an aspiration! If undeterred, I'd point out the special problems for women." Others urged a slow pace—"Don't act too eager for power," "Don't aspire too hard," and "Don't move too fast to get there." Some gave specific suggestions relative to needed preparation. Aspirants should be "respected scholars, researchers, publishers, and teachers first," "well prepared in terms of the profession," and with "a sound knowledge base in social work." They should also have "a range of academic experience including academic administration," and management competency. One dean enumerated some of the "high costs of deaning" and then added, "If you want to anyway, develop analytical, assertive, political, and task organizing skills, breadth of concept and vision, flexibility, pragmatism, and interpersonal skills ... and
PLEASE keep your compassion and idealism intact . . ."

Other deans made references to the pressures and demands of the job. One said, "Give up the need to win" and another said, "A batting average can only be fair; if greater achievement is expected, avoid deaning." A dean must have "a thick skin and a sense of humor." He or she "must be able to transcend personal (ego) concerns." He or she "can't worry about everyone liking you--they won't."

There was much commentary about the multiple constituencies pressuring a dean "from above (higher university administration), below (students and faculty), and from outside (community agencies)." The necessity for, but the lack of, support from higher administrative bodies was frequently mentioned. Faculty "factions" and "conflicts," the "no-man's land between faculty and students," "variance between what the faculty expect and want with what administration expect and want" were other problematic conditions identified that create a "highly political system" in which one needs to learn to "make political alliances" and "to bargain harder for resources." Added to these interpersonal and interorganizational problems are the "usual difficulties of being an administrator," the "paper work" and "administrative details," the funding problems, and the struggle to get accurate information. The full responses to the question are listed in Appendix H.
The second open ended question asked, "What do you think are the major challenges for a social work dean today in carrying out the responsibilities entrusted to the position?" In descending order in which the specific type of challenge was identified as a percent of all responses were the following:

**Financial concerns (27%)**: Fund raising, budget matters, retrenchment, uncertain resources, grantsmanship, "Survival!" and "Keeping the ship afloat!"

**Faculty concerns (20%)**: Recruitment, retention, development, especially in the context of tenure and non-productive members, morale, and collegial interactions.

**Curriculum concerns (19%)**: Program development, addressing change, academic standards and quality issues, innovativeness and creativity, maximizing a learning milieu.

**Multiple constituencies (6%)**: Need to be responsive to, and need for support from, multiple constituencies.

**Professional issues (6%)**: Developing human service delivery systems, meeting needs of clients, interpreting social work.

**Personal challenges (6%)**: Providing educational leadership, risk-taking.

**Research and scholarship challenges (6%)**

**Student concerns (6%)**: Recruitment, especially minority and part-time, sensitivity to special needs.
Environmental challenges (2%): Constraints imposed by a complex and litigacious society.
These responses are reported in full and identified by sex of the respondent in Appendix H.
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was undertaken to gather information about the 1978-79 population of deans of graduate schools of social work. Designed as descriptive, exploratory research, it sought to identify those variables held in common by all the deans and those variables which distinguished the female deans from the male deans. This subpopulation of female deans was a particular focus of interest since women were underrepresented, constituting only a fourth of the total number of deans. A major purpose of the study was to discover the special circumstances (if any) by which these women obtained their positions. Were there personal or professional characteristics, educational or work experiences, personal relationships, or perceptions of the job which might have uniquely prepared them for their positions? In what ways were the female deans like the male deans in the same field of social work and in what ways were they more like female executives in other fields?

Answers to such questions were thought to be of special interest to 1) current members of the social work profession who want to know about the leaders in whose
hands the training of new professionals has been entrusted, 2) researchers who will be able to use these findings for comparative purposes to detect changes within social work education, and 3) social workers who want to become deans, and who seek guidance in making important career decisions. It was further believed that the findings regarding the female deans would be especially helpful to women as a needed source of guidance and encouragement to pursue similar career goals.

The discussion of the findings will be presented, as in Chapters IV and V, under subject headings that parallel the various career stages of the deans. Attention will be directed first toward characteristics describing the total group of deans in the study. Because the total group was seventy-five percent male, these characteristics, with very few exceptions, may also be used to describe the male deans. There follows a discussion of the characteristics that distinguished the female deans from the male deans. This discussion notes both those variables for which there was a statistically significant difference between men and women and those differences which, while not statistically significant, nevertheless describe the population under study and which seem important to note. Tentative hypotheses will be suggested to explain these differences. The study concludes with a statement
of the implications of the findings and suggestions for further research.

A Profile of the Deans

**Personal Characteristics.** The deans in this study were predominantly male (72%), white (82%), Protestant (44%), aged between 48 and 56 (44%), married (80%) and with two or three children (62%). This profile of leadership does not vary too much from what one might expect to find in almost any large American enterprise. The dominant cultural values are very clearly expressed, indicating, perhaps, that social work, in spite of its reputation for championing the causes of those outside the mainstream of activity—is, itself, very much a part of that mainstream.

The profile of the dominant majority, however, should not obscure the reality of the minority. For a fourth of the deans are female, 18% are minority, 27% are Catholic and 20% are Jewish, 56% are either older than 56 or younger than 48, 20% are not currently married and 20% are childless. While these figures undoubtedly reflect recent affirmative action practices inspired by legislative and accrediting mandates, it is believed that the size of this minority representation is evidence of the opportunity structure that exists within the profession.

**Early Childhood.** Most deans grew up in two parent homes in which both parents had completed at least twelve
years of formal education and where the father was employed in a high status occupation. They were likely to have been the first born child of their sex and to have felt a little closer to their mothers than to their fathers. These factors suggest that the deans were born into stimulating environments where they were warmly nurtured, encouraged, and challenged. They played primarily with friends of the same sex, read extensively, and engaged in musical and sports activities. During the high school years, they tended to distinguish themselves, first, with academic honors, and secondly with leadership positions in extra-curricular activities—school government, athletics, and school publications. They thus obtained early experience in competitive activities and in roles requiring interpersonal skills, and had ample opportunity to demonstrate basic intelligence and competence. Most recalled that, during these formative years, they had usually been obedient, friendly, independent, and competitive. They were about equally divided between those who recalled having been assertive and self confident and those who were not. The picture emerges of young people who enthusiastically entered into the life of the home and school, thriving on a variety of activities that provided them excellent learning experiences and contributed to an emerging sense of positive self concept.
Educational Preparation. Very few of the deans had held early aspirations to become social workers; most had held other career goals. Their decisions to enter social work seem to have been made in conjunction with their planning for graduate study and were motivated primarily by service or social action ideals. These findings are consistent with a 1963 study of career choices in social work in which it was found that fifty-one percent of the students in the first year of the graduate social work program had made their decisions to enter social work after graduation from college.¹

The deans received their baccalaureate degrees during the 40's and 50's, completing their studies in four years at an average age of twenty-two. They continued into Master's programs during the late 50's and early 60's, completing those studies in one or two years at an average age of twenty-six or twenty-seven. Many apparently delayed doctoral work until after a period of professional practice and then obtained their degrees within two to four years, primarily within the 60's and 70's. The average age upon receiving the doctorate was thirth-eight.

Thirty eight of the deans in this study (58%) re­ceived at least one graduate degree from one of the fol­lowing schools of social work that have been consistently ranked among the best: Columbia, Chicago, Michigan,
Brandeis, and the University of California at Berkeley.² Nine deans received both graduate degrees from one or more of these five schools. The study did not explore the question of whether these schools identified the future-deans in their student bodies as promising leaders of the future and gave them added support and encouragement, or whether the future-deans, already wise and discerning, chose to attend those good schools for the advantage to be gained in having an education and a degree from a top-ranked school. In any case, one can make the assumption that existing strong leadership potential was enhanced through exposure to outstanding academic training.

Only six of the deans majored in social work or social services in the undergraduate program although thirty majored in sociology and eighteen majored in other related social science areas. While this fact is consistent with the finding that decisions to enter social work were made after completion of the undergraduate program, it also reflects the reality that, in the period when the deans were in school, baccalaureate programs in social work were not accredited and probably were not attractive to strong students. Then, too, entrance requirements for graduate social work programs were more likely to have specified a strong social science background than specific social work training, so even if there had been an early
decision to enter social work, it might not have been translated into an undergraduate major in social work.

The importance of the Master's degree in social work is reflected, however, in the fact that all but seven of the deans do hold such degrees. For this population of deans, it seems to have been even more important than the doctorate. Nine deans did not get a doctorate and 13 received it in a field other than social work. It is expected that this situation may change, however, as the doctorate is increasingly considered to be essential to academic life and is recognized as "a badge of expertise." And, because new doctoral programs in social work are being developed and strengthened, more social work deans may be expected to hold social work doctorates in the future.

The coursework the deans took during their Master's programs reflects not only their interest but also the emphases in social work education at that time. Nineteen thirty-1950 was a period in which Freudian psychoanalytical theories were being emphasized and when the schools prepared students primarily for careers in direct service with individuals and groups. Since many of the deans were doing their graduate work during that time, it is not surprising that about half of them stated that they had specialized in casework. The strong interest evidenced in the field of mental health at that time also fits the
period (although mental health has consistently attracted social workers preparing for direct service careers.) The fact that half of the deans took two or more courses in administration is probably a reflection of the particular career aspirations of those deans inasmuch as most of them (19 of 29) graduated before 1960—before the big demand for administrators and middle managers began to be expressed in curriculum design.

The support systems behind the deans during the school years may well have operated to give them certain advantages over other students. Marital status might have contributed either positive or negative effect. Few of the deans were married during their undergraduate programs; about half were married during the Master's programs and many were married during the doctoral programs. If being married was viewed as a positive support, it was not manifested in terms of financial support received. Even during the doctoral period, spouses proved to be a minor source of financial support. They provided very little during the Master's period and essentially none during the undergraduate period. Stipends and scholarships were the primary sources of financial aid during the graduate programs; parents provided the greatest amount of financial support during the undergraduate years.
A more important source of support probably was the availability of mentors, persons who actively supported, encouraged, and facilitated the deans' personal, academic and career goals. About one fourth of the deans enjoyed mentor support as undergrads while over half of them enjoyed such relationships during both periods of graduate study. The mentors during the undergraduate and doctoral periods tended to be male while the mentors for the Master's program were more likely to be female. This finding probably reflects the fact that there were more women teaching in the Master's level social work program than in either the general undergraduate programs or any doctoral program.

Professional Experience. Most deans spent time in professional social work practice other than in education, the average number of years being eight. Moving into the educational arena, they spent, on an average, four years at the Assistant Professor level, four years at the Associate Professor level, and eight years at the Professor level. They have generally served on the faculty of two schools, but as dean in only one school. The average deanship has been five years.

Most deans are tenured and about half are earning salaries in excess of $40,000. They are more likely to have an orientation toward teaching than toward research
although many express no preference in this respect. More than half have published six or more journal articles. Most are members of the professional association, NASW, and they tend to hold AGSW certification.

Only about one third of the deans state that they actively sought their jobs while over half say that it was the strong support of others that helped them most in obtaining the deanship. Very few believe that their sex was a determinant in the employment process even though 3/4 of the schools have a tradition of mostly male deans.

The deans tend to have a high level of tolerance of ambiguity—perhaps one reason why most of them assert that they are satisfied in their positions while, at the same time, reporting strong challenges coming from multiple constituency demands, faculty discontent, declining resources, etc. They perceive the need to meet these challenges with the qualities of decisiveness, analytical ability, task orientation, and flexibility. They urge aspirants to the position to move slowly, and to become fully prepared, both personally and professionally, to take on the heavy challenges.

Female Differences

While the previously stated characteristics were derived from a composite view of all the deans, they also
describe the male deans fairly accurately. They do not, however, always accurately portray the female deans who represented only one fourth of the total population of deans being studied. Those variables for which there was a statistically significant difference between the men and women will be discussed in this section. Other differences, not statistically significant, but considered to be important, will also be noted.

**Marital Status.** Men and women differed most significantly on the characteristic of marital status. It has been pointed out previously that a slight, non-significant difference existed during the undergraduate period, that the gap widened during the Master's period, and then reached significance during the doctoral period. The difference was even greater at the time the deans were responding to the questionnaire. At that time, all but three of the men were married—ninety-four percent compared to only forty-one percent of the women. Twenty-three percent (4) of the women had never married and thirty-six percent (6) had previously been married but were no longer. Attempts to interpret this data revealed a weakness in the questionnaire, in the failure to provide response options that would distinguish between two subcategories of "previously married," i.e., "widowed" and "divorced." Since the distinction would make a difference in the interpretation, other records pertaining to
the social work deans were consulted and it was learned that three of the six "previously married" were widows; it was assumed (but not verified) that the other three were divorced.

The fact remains that fifty-nine percent of the female deans were unmarried. Since the questionnaire had not explored the relationship between marital status and obtaining or maintaining the deanship (as might have been done in a personal interview) one can only speculate regarding the nature of that relationship. Initially, the statistics on marital status were interpreted as evidence of the kind of career-marriage dilemma that confronts most women in high level positions. It seemed to corroborate the findings of Williams that many female executives eliminate the problem by remaining single "not because they were necessarily against marriage in general, but because they felt being married was a detriment to their careers" or, having married early, they rise on the career ladder, bypassing their husbands, and reach "a turning point where they knew they would either have to sacrifice their career or their marriage." It is highly possible that some of the single female deans have chosen to "sacrifice" marriage for their careers. It is also possible that some of the previously married female deans have found the dual roles of wife/mother and dean incompatible and have chosen to "sacrifice" the marriage for the career.
There are, however, other plausible explanations that merit consideration. By any measure of scholarship or accomplishment, the female deans must be recognized as an elite group of women. Possessing essentially the same personality characteristics as the male deans, they clearly demonstrate the capacity to be independent, to take risks, and to act as non-traditionalists. It is quite likely that the never-married women may be in the forefront of a growing number of Americans who consciously choose to remain single, not necessarily to avoid the demands inherent in marriage, but to enjoy the freedom and independence afforded by single status. Likewise, divorce is less likely these days to carry a negative connotation and can be viewed as liberation. It should be noted, in this respect, that the female deans who enjoy high status, economic independence, and who are married to spouses who also enjoy high status and economic independence, have a greater freedom to "escape" from marriage (if that is desirable) than do most of the male deans who are married to economically dependent spouses. This may account for the finding of fewer divorces among the male deans.

Because the difference between the female and male deans in marital status has been found to be such a strong, statistically significant difference, it merits much more attention. Further research is needed to determine the deans' own perceptions regarding the relationship of
marital status to becoming a dean and to fulfilling the obligations of being a dean. Likewise, research should be undertaken to determine how the married deans cope with their dual roles, and this should include a comparative study of men and women. While high status and the academic environment permit much freedom of movement, the demands of the dual roles, wife/mother and dean, undoubtedly necessitate considerable contingency planning for dealing with potential conflict. Married female deans will be most helpful as role models if they will explain how they have managed their roles and offer practical guidance to those who would follow in their steps.

Personal Characteristics. Although marital status was the biggest difference between the male and female deans, there were other significant differences. Some findings seem less important because the variables are not amenable to influence. An example of this is birth order in the family of origin. The female deans were much more likely than the male deans to have been the first born child; they were very likely to have been the first daughter. The female deans also tended to have fathers who were generally much more highly educated than the fathers of the male deans, and who, not unexpectedly, worked in higher status occupations. Although these variables cannot be influenced by someone aspiring to be a dean, they appear
frequently enough in the literature about women in executive positions to warrant further attention. It is hypothesized that the combination of being the first born child and having a father of high educational and occupational status may be a strong predictor of future high achievement for a young girl.

Certain characteristics not generally attributed to young women definitely characterized the female deans during their youthful years. The first was competitiveness. Many of the women reported activity in competitive sports and recalled being competitive most of the time during the adolescent period. This finding corresponds with the Hennig and Jardim observation that the women in their study had actively participated in childhood games and sports and probably had learned through those experiences how to handle the give and take of compromise that goes on in the business world. The fact that more women than men recalled a high level of competitive activity suggests that this variable may be a highly significant predictor of future high achievement for women.

The other personal characteristic that significantly more women than men claimed to possess was self confidence. Basic research into sex roles (notably Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974) and case studies based upon that research (e.g., Hennig and Jardim, 1977) emphasize that females
tend to lack early childhood experiences that contribute to self confidence, that they tend to underestimate the extent of their own demonstrated competence, and that, in their efforts to get ahead, they become overly preoccupied with their own adequacy or lack of it. The data relative to the female social work deans only partially support the research findings. When asked to recall their behavior as adolescents and to indicate how often they had acted with self confidence a little more than one third of the females responded that they had acted with self confidence either "quite often" or "always." However, at the same time they reported having participated in a number of school activities and had, without exception, reported a variety of awards and special achievements during the high school period.

When asked if they had felt self confident as an undergraduate student, all the women answered an unqualified "Yes." This was an unexpected response especially since several men had answered "No" or "sometimes" to that question. Even though the two questions on self confidence had been worded differently, it seems likely that the female deans were recalling from their high school days, some experiences in which they had lacked self confidence, but that they had no such recollections from their undergraduate college days. No further questions about self
confidence were asked. Future research should explore the impact of the passage of time upon the development of self confidence, posing the same question at repeated intervals to determine critical periods and critical experiences that have a significant bearing upon the increase or decrease of self confidence. Since self confidence contributes considerably to the way people perceive themselves and the world around them, and consequently to the way they approach the world, a clearer understanding of how it is acquired and reinforced, especially in the social work field, will provide helpful information to those who as parents, friends, teachers, or mentors, want to help women move into high level positions.

Support Systems. Three variables have been examined from the perspective of support provided to the deans as they travelled along their respective career paths. They are marital status, financial support, and mentors. Marital status has already been discussed. Although husbands undoubtedly served as a source of psychological support for the few female deans who married, it is probable that those women who remained single or who had to readjust to single life after a divorce or being widowed have drawn comparable strength from other persons or from their own inner resources. Lacking these strengths, they probably would never have become deans.
In regard to financial support, the female deans received significantly more help from their parents during the undergraduate college days while the male deans during this period contributed a greater percentage from their own savings and from employment. This finding is not unexpected since the females were mostly from high status families that probably expected to pay for their daughters' college education. The pattern shifts in graduate school, however, and at both the Master's and doctoral levels, the men received a higher percentage of their funds from scholarships and stipends than did the women. At both levels the women contributed a higher percentage of their own funds than did the men. Although these differences at the graduate level were not significant, they did tend to substantiate findings from the literature (Astin, 1973) and the general implication that women have received less financial support than men from the graduate schools.

Although there were no significant differences between the numbers of men and women enjoying the support of mentors, there were differences which are especially noteworthy because they are in the same direction as the differences in the other sources of support. The female deans had more mentors at the undergraduate level but the male deans had more during the doctoral period. Thus, in that stage of educational preparation when the pressures
are greatest, the male deans tended to have the most support—from wives, from scholarships, and from mentors. Caution is urged in interpreting these differences because, as already noted, statistical significance was found only for marital status. The other differences cannot be overlooked, however, for they are consistent with research findings and may be relevant factors explaining the underrepresentation of women.

Child Bearing. Because child bearing can have such a big influence upon a woman's career, attention will be directed to the significance of this variable for the ten female deans who became mothers. The timing of the child bearing years and the length of time taken off is important inasmuch as the research literature suggests that women typically take time out for child bearing at precisely the stage in their careers when they would otherwise be moving rapidly ahead. (Williams, 1977) Once having lost momentum in their careers, women never seem to overcome the disadvantage.

In response to a question about the reasons for any break that might have been taken in the career path following completion of the Master's program, both male and female deans indicated that doctoral study had been the main reason for taking such a break. Secondary reasons given included childbearing for four women and military
leave for four men. Six women reported no time off for child bearing, although this included two who had given birth to their children before starting their graduate studies. Seven of the female deans who became mothers did so immediately following the Master's program and preceding entrance into the doctoral program for those who went on. One gave birth to three children in the years immediately preceding and following the receipt of the doctorate.

Although the average time taken off from the career was greater for the female deans than for the male deans, the longer breaks for women were associated with illness and doctoral study as frequently as with child bearing. Additionally, it was discovered that the women who had children before going on for a doctorate took much less time off, if any, to do so, than did those women who did not go on for a doctorate. One must be careful in speculating on the basis of so few cases, but it appears that those with higher educational goals, i.e., the doctorate, were less inclined to take time off from their career goals. It might also be noted here that six of the fourteen female deans with doctorates have remained childless while all of those without the doctorate who married, have children. This lends further support to the finding of Toomey that women choosing not to have children have
"significantly higher educational and occupational aspirations" than do women who wish to have children.\(^5\)

Thus, while it appears that, for this population, educational and/or career aspiration may be seen as an independent variable with direct influence upon child bearing as a dependent variable, there is the possibility that child bearing may have served as an independent variable affecting educational aspiration of those who did not go on for the doctorate. It may be that the child bearing experience was in itself sufficiently pleasing to have dissuaded some from pursuing further study, whether or not they had originally had such intentions. It must also be remembered that in the period when most of this child bearing was occurring, women were still very much caught up in stereotyped sex roles and would have received greater societal approval for their mothering role than for going ahead with doctoral study.

**Administrative Preparation.** A significant difference was found between the men and the women on both the number of administration courses taken in the Master's program and the number reporting having been in administrative positions in social work agencies before entering higher education. In each case the women were on the short side, having taken fewer courses and having been less in administrative positions. One conclusion is that very few, if any,
of these women had administrative aspirations at the time they were in the Master's program and that after graduation they practiced in the direct service and supervisory roles for which they had been prepared. This interpretation fits with the fact that 75% of the female deans stated that they had not sought the position of dean. Future research may well investigate the extent to which the deans prepared for administrative posts—measured by the timing of career decisions, the number of administrative courses taken, and the number of administrative posts held before becoming a dean. It is suspected that all deans will have greater administrative preparation in the future, if only because the schools are strengthening the administration components of their programs.

Professional Career in Academe. As has been pointed out previously, there are non-significant differences between the male and female deans regarding the number of years spent at different faculty ranks, and the differences are consistent with research findings reported in the literature. (Astin, 1973; Baldridge, 1978; Cassara, 1978) Women spend more time at the Assistant Professor level, about the same time at the Associate Professor level and less time at the Professor level. They also have spent significantly fewer years than the men in the position of Dean. These are the kinds of differences that may be indicative of sexist discrimination. This study did not
specifically ask about experience with discrimination, although it was thought that the open-ended question soliciting advice for aspirants might have warned about it. The closest responses were given by a male dean who said that "Internal politics in seeking a dean often does not select the best qualified person" and by a female dean who advised women against aspiring to the deanships because of the "special problems" for women.

A significant difference between the number of journal articles published by the men and by the women has also been noted. The modal response for men was "more than 10" while for women it was "3-5." Since the literature suggests that productivity probably will not vary significantly by sex when other variables are controlled, (Astin, 1973; Baldrige, 1978), an attempt was made to examine this finding more closely, to look for relationships between the publication rate and marital status, and again for the number of children. Just looking at the raw data, it appears that "never married" and "previously married" women all published more than did men in the same categories, married men published the most, and married women published the least. It also appears that for women there is an inverse relationship between the number of publications and the number of children, whereas the same is not true for men. However, in both instances, the small number of cases in
some of the categories being compared indicate that caution should be used in drawing any conclusions. Future research might use larger samples to test the hypothesis that the different rates of publication among men and women within comparable positions and settings are more directly related to responsibilities associated with marital status and children than to sex alone.

Finally, there were findings of significant difference in the mobility patterns for men and women. Men tend to have served as faculty members in more schools than have the women, but this difference is much more apparent among the older deans than those in the younger half of the total population. Since the younger half of the female deans are also less likely to be married, or, if married, to have children, one explanation that seems likely, and which is reported in the literature, is that being married and having a family can serve as a deterrent to career mobility for women. Another explanation, supported by research findings, is that women tend to stay with one firm where they have established a good reputation rather than to risk moving to another firm where they must reprove their competency. (Williams, 1977; Loring and Wells, 1972; Hennig and Jardim, 1977) As the traditional pattern of a husband's career determining where the family shall live gives way to a consideration of other variables, such as
the woman's career opportunities, more women may opt to follow a job-hopping pattern. Future research should ascertain whether female deans choose such a path, becoming as mobile as the male deans.

**Implications of the Study**

This study initially set out to develop a profile of the social work deans, particularly so that members of the social work profession would have a better understanding of those persons directing the training of new social workers. It has accomplished this purpose and, in so doing, has established some linkage with past research findings and provided the basis for future comparative study. There have been few surprises. All deans have had strong family ties, good educational training, and substantial professional work experience before becoming deans. They view their jobs in essentially the same way and identify common characteristics needed to manage the job. Their similarities far outweigh any differences that may distinguish them and together they stand out as leaders of whom the profession may well be proud.

One particular difference was studied in depth and that was the difference between the male and female deans. Since women have always held a small minority of the deanships in a profession that has consistently been dominated by women, there was a concern to discover why this should
be so. Where the findings showed the female deans to be significantly different from the male deans on variables other than sex, those variables and their relevance for obtaining and/or maintaining the deanships were carefully examined. Implications were to be drawn for both the women aspiring to become deans and the educational institutions that train students, hire faculty, and appoint deans. The differences noted in variables such as birth order, father's educational level and occupation imply that the development of leadership qualities in women may get an early start in a particularly nurturant and stimulating environment. The differences noted in variables such as amount of financial aid received, availability of mentors, and years spent at rank imply that women do not get the same kinds of institutional support as do men. And, finally, the differences noted in the variables of mobility and rate of publications may be related, as already noted, to marital status, implying that women aspiring to become deans need to consider very carefully choices concerning marriage and motherhood and the consequences for their career development.

Aside from the differences noted above, the outstanding finding was the similarity that exists between the male and female deans, particularly on those variables related to the current position. No significant difference was found between the men and women on the following characteristics:
1. Level of tolerance of ambiguity.
2. Identification of characteristics needed by a dean.
3. Orientation toward teaching rather than research.
4. Identification of major challenges facing a dean today.
5. Identification of other people as providing the support needed to secure the deanship.
6. School characteristics.
7. Salary level.
8. Level of job satisfaction.

These findings help to answer the question as to why the current female deans were appointed. They show that the female deans demonstrated the same qualifications as the men. The question remains, however, why are women so underrepresented in the deanships. A study to compare the population of current female deans with a population of women whose applications for deanships have been rejected might answer that question but may not be feasible due to the problems inherent in trying to identify and study the second population. Lacking that research, the present study should convince doubters of the solid qualifications of the present female deans and may serve as incentive to encourage other women to apply for deanships that become available. The fact that most of the deans attribute their appointments to the active support of other people should serve as a clear incentive for aspirants—especially women—to take advantage of networks, as well as mentors.
and to be certain that their competency and their aspirations are well known to those who are in a position to help.

In presenting this profile of the social work deans, there was the expectation that the information would contribute to the knowledge base from which future studies about the deans would be conducted. The present study has immediate relevance, however, in corroborating and extending the findings of a recently published study of the social work deans. The 1979 research conducted by Gandy, Randolph, and Raymond, and published by the College of Social Work at the University of South Carolina, was designed to identify factors associated with the rapid rise of turnovers of the deans. The Gandy study analyzed responses from the same number of active deans as in the present study (65) and, considering the demographic descriptions, from a similar population. The Gandy data, however, were gathered in 1977; the present, in 1979. The research questions and findings were similar with one notable exception. In 1977, the modal number of years the deans had served was three; the mean number of years was 7.27. In 1979, the mode was one; the mean was 5.48—a dramatic illustration of the problem being studied—the rapid turnover of deans.
Gandy's findings relative to the sources of dissatisfaction also paralleled those of the present study. He identified the sources as problems related to funding, faculty problems, position of the college within the university, responsibility for a wide variety of functions, and pressures from special interest groups. All but one of these, position of the college within the university, was identified by the deans in the present study. An additional finding of this study sheds light upon the timing of the deans' dissatisfaction. Almost all the deans professed to be very satisfied or somewhat satisfied including all who had been in the position for just one year and those who had been deans for more than seven years. An analysis of those who were not in the satisfied category revealed that the greatest range of responses came from those who had been deans for three years. The implication of this finding is that deans face a critical time following the "honeymoon" period—probably around the third year in office, and if any intervention can ward off the intent to resign, it needs to occur then. In depth interviewing of the deans during the first three years of office might suggest factors or conditions most amenable to change.

The relationship of the Gandy study and the present one is an illustration of how the current research may contribute to the knowledge of the social work deanship—corroborating, confirming, and extending existing studies,
and providing new data to be corroborated, confirmed, and extended in the future. Above all, the profiles provide a basis from which to detect changes in established appointment patterns and preferred characteristics sought in deans.

Limitations of the Study

It has already been suggested that certain key questions were omitted from the questionnaire. If there were an opportunity to revise the instrument, additional options would be included in the questions about marital status (divorced, separated, widowed) and salary ($40,000 - 45,000, $45,000 - 50,000). Questions would be added about the number of years served in the capacity of Assistant Dean and Associate Dean. Questions would also be added regarding the position held immediately before attaining the deanship, whether it was a faculty position, an academic administrative position, or a position outside academe, and, if the previous position was in academe, was it in the same school or another. It would also be helpful to obtain a fuller chronology of work experience by asking for more precise information about jobs and dates. Certain other information that would add to the profiles is suggested in the section on future research.

Although the questionnaire methodology was adequate for securing the kind of information sought, it necessarily
limited the number of questions that could be asked. In retrospect one concludes that it may have been the best methodology for an exploratory study. It produced much information about a number of variables, some of which obviously need to be studied in greater detail. Further study of this subject should include in depth interviews to gather the information the questionnaire could not provide.

Throughout the discussion of the findings, caution has been urged in the interpretation of the data, mainly because the numbers are so small. With a female population of eighteen and a male population of forty-seven, the responses of just one or two persons could make a sizable difference in the percentages being reported. Especially where inferential statistics were used to indicate statistically significant differences between men and women, care must be exercised in stating the meaning of the findings. Inasmuch as the size of this population probably will not grow too much in the near future, and since it is the total population, not a sample, that is being studied, the note of caution is probably sufficient for reporting purposes.

Future Research

This study has examined close to a hundred different variables in an effort to discover those which are
most descriptive of the social work deanship and those which seem best to differentiate between the male and female deans. The findings may, or may not, apply to the total population of deans, twenty-five percent of whom did not participate in the study, and, likewise, they cannot be generalized to future populations of deans. Replications of the study will be necessary to determine consistent findings over different populations and to develop theory about the relationships discovered.

Certain hypotheses have been generated within this study that merit further testing. They include the following:

1. Women who become deans are likely to have been the first born child in a family where the father has high educational and occupational status.

2. Women who become deans have actively participated in competitive games and sports during their childhood.

3. Persons who become deans have demonstrated in their high school careers academic excellence and extracurricular leadership.

4. Female deans are likely to have demonstrated a strong sense of self confidence during high school and undergraduate days.

5. Male deans are more likely to be married than are female deans.

6. Male deans receive a higher percentage of institutional financial support for graduate studies than do female deans.

7. Male deans enjoy more mentor relationships during the period of doctoral study than do female deans.

8. Male deans take more college courses in administration than do female deans.
9. Female deans spend more years at the rank of Assistant Professor.

10. Female deans spend less years at the rank of Professor than do male deans.

11. Female deans have fewer children than do male deans.

12. Married female deans publish less than unmarried female deans.

13. Married female deans serve in fewer schools than do unmarried female deans.

Certain questions have also been raised that need to be explored especially to note changing patterns and trends over time. They include the following:

1. If women express varying degrees of self confidence at different stages of their careers, what factors seem to be related to high and low levels of self confidence?

2. At what point in their careers do the social work deans make the decision to become social workers?

3. At what point in their careers do the social work deans make the decision to become deans?

4. What are the primary motivating factors behind the decision to become a dean?

5. Does Brandeis University continue to produce a disproportionate number of the social work deans? If so, why?

6. Have the female deans experienced what they might call sex discrimination in their career development?

7. How does marital status relate to obtaining the deanship?

8. How does marital status relate to fulfilling the obligations of the deanship?

9. How do married female deans manage their "dual roles?"
10. Are there correlations between the amount of support received (i.e., time in workload, availability of research assistants, spouse to type, etc.) or constraints imposed (workload pressure, marital and family obligations, etc.) and rate of publishing?

Finally, there are logical extensions of the present study that might be pursued. The first includes a more detailed study of the administrative styles of the deans, i.e., decision making, use of authority, task vs people orientation, dependence upon an "inner circle" of trusted co-workers, etc. Such a study might involve observation of behavior and interviews with faculty and other administrators as well as in-depth interviews with the deans. The findings would permit further comparison of men and women to see if there are distinctive style differences.

Other studies might also contribute to an understanding of women in administration. A comparative study of the female social work deans with female administrators in social agencies, in terms of career path variables and indices of administrative style, would show whether there are any differences in perspective, preparation for administrative activity, or leadership style. One further step would be the comparison of female administrators in social work, in either academe or agency setting, with female administrators in other so-called feminine fields, such as education and nursing. A major purpose for such studies, as with the present study, would be the provision
of information to serve in lieu of role models to guide those women who aspire to high level positions within the professions but who have not known any women in such positions and do not know how to proceed to prepare themselve.
FOOTNOTES


7Ibid., p. 22.

8Ibid., p. 39.
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APPENDIX A

Deans of Schools of Social Work
With Accredited
Master's Degree Programs
July 1978

University of Alabama
School of Social Work
P. Frederick DelliQuadri, Dean

Arizona State University
School of Social Work
Ismael Dieppa, Dean

University of Arkansas at Little Rock
Graduate School of Social Work
Fred A. Morrow, Dean

California State University, Fresno
School of Social Work
Richard D. Ford, Dean

California State University, Sacramento
School of Social Work
J. Paul Walsma, Dean

San Diego State University
School of Social Work
E. Percil Stanford, Director

San Francisco State University
Department of Social Work Education
Phyllis Rochelle, Director

San Jose State University
School of Social Work
Armando J. Sanchez, Dean

University of California, Berkeley
School of Social Welfare
Harry Specht, Dean

University of California, Los Angeles
School of Social Welfare
Maurice F. Connery, Dean

University of Southern California
School of Social Work
Maurice B. Hamovitch, Dean
University of Denver
The Graduate School of Social Work
LeVerne McCummings, Dean

University of Connecticut
School of Social Work
Robert Green, Dean

The Catholic University of America
The National Catholic School of Social Service
Joan Mullaney, Dean

Howard University
School of Social Work
Jay Chunn, Dean

Barry College
Barry College School of Social Work
John M. Riley, Dean

Florida State University
School of Social Work
Patricia Vance, Acting Dean

Atlanta University
Atlanta University School of Social Work
Genevieve T. Hill, Dean

University of Georgia
School of Social Work
Charles A. Stewart, Dean

University of Hawaii
School of Social Work
Daniel S. Sanders, Dean

George Williams College
Division of Social Work Education
Harold F. Schrage, Acting Dean

Loyola University of Chicago
School of Social Work
Charles T. O'Reilly, Dean

University of Chicago
School of Social Service Administration
Margaret K. Rosenheim, Dean
University of Illinois, Chicago Circle
Jane Addams College of Social Work
Shirley M. Buttrick, Dean

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
School of Social Work
Donald Brieland, Dean

Indiana University
School of Social Work
Leonard Schneiderman, Dean

University of Iowa
School of Social Work
Ruth Brandwein, Director

University of Kansas
School of Social Welfare
David A. Hardcastle, Dean

University of Kentucky
College of Social Professions, Graduate Social Work Program
Ronda S. Connaway, Dean

University of Louisville
The Raymond A. Kent School of Social Work
Roger M. Lind, Dean

Louisiana State University
School of Social Welfare
Bernard J. Wiest, Dean

Tulane University
School of Social Work
Fred Morris Southerland, Dean

University of Maryland at Baltimore
School of Social Work and Community Planning
Ruth H. Young, Dean

Boston College
Graduate School of Social Work
June Gary Hopps, Dean

Boston University
School of Social Work
Hubert E. Jones, Dean

Simmons College
School of Social Work
Meyer Schwartz, Dean
Smith College
School for Social Work
Katherine Gabel, Dean

Michigan State University
School of Social Work
Fred M. Cox, Director

University of Michigan
School of Social Work
Phillip Fellin, Dean

Wayne State University
School of Social Work
Sidney Dillick, Dean

Western Michigan University
School of Social Work
John P. Flynn, Director

University of Minnesota, Duluth
School of Social Development
Willard K. Dodge, Acting Dean

University of Minnesota-Minneapolis
School of Social Work
Neil Bracht, Director

University of Southern Mississippi
School of Social Work
Shirley Jones, Dean

St. Louis University
School of Social Service
Joan M. Smith, Acting Dean

University of Missouri
School of Social Work
Richard Boettcher, Director

Washington University
The George Warren Brown School of Social Work
Shanti Khinduka, Dean

University of Nebraska at Omaha
Graduate School of Social Work
Hobart A. Burch, Director
Rutgers University
Graduate School of Social Work
Harold W. Demone, Jr., Dean

Adelphi University
School of Social Work
Joseph L. Vigilante, Dean

Columbia University
School of Social Work
Mitchell I. Ginsberg, Dean

Fordham University
Graduate School of Social Service at Lincoln Center
Mary Ann Quaranta, Dean

Hunter College of The City University of New York
Hunter College School of Social Work
Harold Lewis, Dean

New York University
School of Social Work
Shirley Ehrenkranz, Dean

State University of New York at Albany
School of Social Welfare
Seth W. Spellman, Dean

State University of New York at Buffalo
School of Social Work
Sherman Merle, Dean

State University of New York at Stony Brook
School of Social Welfare
Sanford L. Kravitz, Dean

Syracuse University
School of Social Work
Kermit K. Schooler, Dean

Yeshiva University
Wurzweiler School of Social Work
Lloyd Setleis, Dean

University of North Carolina
School of Social Work
Morton I. Teicher, Dean
Case Western Reserve University  
School of Applied Social Sciences  
Merl C. Hokenstad, Dean  

Ohio State University  
College of Social Work  
Robert O. Washington, Dean  

University of Oklahoma  
School of Social Work  
Francis J. Peirce, Director  

Portland State University  
School of Social Work  
Bernard Ross, Dean  

Bryn Mawr College  
The Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research  
Robert R. Mayer, Dean  

Marywood College  
School of Social Work  
Rev. Edward Ryle, Dean  

Temple University  
School of Social Administration  
Ione Vargus, Dean  

University of Pennsylvania  
School of Social Work  
Louise P. Shoemaker, Dean  

University of Pittsburgh  
School of Social Work  
Davis E. Epperson, Dean  

University of Puerto Rico  
Beatriz Lassalle Graduate School of Social Work  
Carmen F. Q. de Rodriguez, Acting Director  

University of South Carolina  
College of Social Work  
Joseph I. Hungate, Jr., Dean
University of Tennessee
School of Social Work
Ben P. Granger, Dean

Centers:

Knoxville Branch
Roger M. Nooe, Director

Memphis Branch
Kate Mullins, Director

Nashville Branch
David P. Fauri, Director

Our Lady of the Lake University of San Antonio
The Worden School of Social Service
Louis Tomaino, Dean

University of Houston
Graduate School of Social Work
Daniel E. Jennings, Dean

University of Texas at Arlington
Graduate School of Social Work
Paul H. Glasser, Dean

University of Texas at Austin
School of Social Work
W. Joseph Heffernan, Jr., Dean

University of Utah
Graduate School of Social Work
Edwin G. Brown, Dean

Norfolk State College
School of Social Work
Ethelyn R. Strong, Dean

Virginia Commonwealth University
School of Social Work Academic Center
Elaine Rothenberg, Dean

Eastern Washington University
Inland Empire School of Social Work and Human Services
John F. O'Neill, Dean
University of Washington
School of Social Work
Scott Briar, Dean

West Virginia University
School of Social Work
Ralph Nelson, Acting Dean

University of Wisconsin-Madison
School of Social Work
Anne Minahan, Director

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
School of Social Welfare
Stuart Kirk, Director
APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRE

Throughout the survey different formats of questions will be used; in general, you should circle the number of the appropriate alternative or fill in the blank. Please feel free to clarify any answer if you feel it is necessary. DO NOT WRITE IN THE BLANKS ON THE RIGHT MARGIN.

1. General information about you.
   1. Your sex: 1. Male 2. Female (5)
   2. Your year of birth: 19_ (6,7)

5. If married, occupation of your spouse: 

6. If you have had the responsibility for rearing any children (your own, step-children, adopted etc.) please indicate year of birth of each: 19_ 19_ 19 _ (10,11)

II. Your family and childhood background

1. Please indicate the number of brothers and sisters in your family:
   a. Older brothers 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 (24)
   b. Older sisters 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 (25)
   c. Younger brothers 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 (26)
   d. Younger sisters 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 (27)

2. Religious affiliation of your family when you were a pre-schooler:

3. Mother's highest level of educational attainment:
   1. Less than high school graduation
   2. High school graduate
   3. Some college
   4. Bachelor's degree
   5. Some graduate school
   6. Graduate degree or degrees (29)

4. Father's highest level of educational attainment:
   1. Less than high school graduation
   2. High school graduate
   3. Some college
   4. Bachelor's degree
   5. Some graduate school
   6. Graduate degree or degrees (30)

5. If mother worked while you were a child (other than as a housewife) what was her occupation? 

6. Father's occupation when you were a child: 

7. During your preschool years, were you raised primarily by:
   1. Both parents
   2. Mother alone
   3. Father alone
   4. Other: If not raised by either parent, please also fill in blanks 2 and 3 above. (31,32)

8. What were your favorite childhood activities—sports, hobbies, and other interests:
   In Elem. School In High School (33,34)
9. Please recall and list any honors, special achievements, or leadership roles you enjoyed while you were in elementary school or high school:

In Elementary School:

In High School:

10. In the years before you reached high school, did you play with:
1. All boys
2. Mostly boys
3. Equally with boys and girls
4. Mostly girls
5. All girls

11. In the years before you reached high school, what did you dream of being when you grew up?

12. In the years before you reached high school, did you feel closer to:
1. Your mother
2. Your father
3. Neither; felt equally close to both of them

For the following set of questions, you are asked to recall how you acted as an adolescent. Please answer each question by circling the correct answer using the following code:
1. Nearly always
2. Sometimes
3. About half the time
4. Often
5. Always

As an adolescent:

14. Did what my parents told me.
15. Was intelligent and outgoing.
16. Was introverted.
17. Was assertive.
18. Was competitive.

11. After you found yourself in college, please recall your undergraduate college days:

1. Your undergraduate degree was a: 1. B.A. 2. B.S. 3. Other
2. In what school did you earn your undergraduate degree?
3. In what did you major?
4. Fear in which degree received: 19
5. Number of years from entrance to receipt of degree:
   1. Less than four years
   2. Four years
   3. More than four years
6. Were you married to an undergraduate: 1. Yes 2. No
7. Please estimate the percentage of financial support received from each of these sources for your undergraduate studies:
   a. From parents
   b. From savings
   c. From loans
   d. From scholarships, stipends, etc.

8. What was your grade point average for undergrad years? (9.0, 9.1, 9.2)

9. Was there one particular person who served as a role model for you during this period? 1. Yes 2. No

10. If yes, was that person: 1. Male 2. Female

11. As an undergraduate student, did you feel self-confident about your ability to achieve? 1. Yes 2. No
IV. And then you were accepted into graduate school! Please try to recall the facts surrounding your experience in the Master's program. If you earned more than one Master's degree, please answer questions 1-5 for each.

1. Your Master's degree: 1. MSW 2. Other: ______________________
   Second degree: ______________________ (25)

2. From which school(s): (1) ____________ (2) ______________________ (26,27)

3. Year(s) in which Master's degree received: 19__ 19 ___ (30,31)

4. Academic discipline(s): (1) ______________________ (2) ______________________ (32,33)

5. Number of years in each program:
   1. One year or less
   2. One to two years
   3. Two to three years
   4. Three to four years
   5. More than four years (36,37)

6. Were you married in the Master's program: 1. Yes 2. No (40)

7. a. If your studies were in social work, in which practice methodology did you specialize:
   6. Administration Management 7. Generic 8. Other (41,42)

   b. If your Master's degree was NOT in social work, you may have had training which you feel was equivalent (or very similar) to one of the social work modalities. If so, which one?
   6. Administration/management 7. No equivalent training (43)

8. How many courses in administration/management did you take?
   1. One 2. Two 3. Three 4. Four 5. Five or more 6. None (44)

9. If you were planning on a career in social work while you were in the Master's program, in what field(s) did you intend to work? (Please do not circle more than two.)

10. Please estimate the percentage of financial support received from each of these sources for your Master's program:
    % from own earnings and savings (47,48)
    % from parents (49,50)
    % from spouse (51,52)
    % from loans (53,54)
    % from scholarships, stipends, etc. (55,56)

11. Was there one particular person who served as a role-model for you during this period? 1. Yes 2. No (57)

12. If yes, was that person: 1. Male 2. Female (58)

V. Doctoral program.

1. a. Your doctoral or professional degree:

   b. If no doctoral degree, how many years of post-masters study? (60)

2. Primary Discipline in which doctoral or professional studies taken:
   1. Social Work 2. Other: ______________________ (61,62)
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3. School: ___________________________ (63,64)

4. Year in which degree received: 19 (65,66)

5. Number of years in program from initial entrance to final exit:
   1. Two years or less
   2. Two to three years
   3. Three to four years
   4. Four to five years
   5. Five to six years
   6. Six to seven years
   7. Seven to more years
(67)

6. Were you married while working on your doctorate? 1. Yes 2. No (68)

7. Please estimate the percentage of financial support received from each of these sources for your doctoral studies:
   1. From own earnings and savings
   2. From parents
   3. From spouse
   4. From loans
   5. From scholarships, stipends, etc.
(1-3) ID DUP (4) 3
(5,6)
(7,8)
(9,10)
(11,12)
(13,14)

8. Was there one particular person that you recall as having served as a role model for you during this period? 1. Yes 2. No (15)

9. If yes, was that person: 1. Male 2. Female (16)

VI. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE: Your years as a practicing social worker.

1. Please recall first your decision to become a social worker. Was that decision:
   1. Your ONLY career decision
   2. Not your only career decision; you had already been, or at some time following high school, you had intended to become a (occupation) (17)
(18,19)

2. Please cite two reasons why you chose to become a social worker:
   1. __________________________________________________________________________ (20,21)
   2. __________________________________________________________________________ (22,23)

3. Total number of years spent in social work practice (excluding years in social work education) since Master's degree: (24,25)
   a. How many of these years were in direct service: (26,27)
   b. How many of these years were in supervision: (28,29)
   c. How many of these years were in administration other than supervision: (30,31)

4. Total number of years spent in social work education since Master's degree: (32,33)
   a. How many of these years were spent as:
      1. Lecturer or instructor? (34)
      2. Assistant professor? (35,36)
      3. Associate professor? (37,38)
      4. Professor? (39,40)
      5. Acting or interim dean/director? (41,42)
      6. Dean/director? (43,44)

5. In how many schools have you been on the faculty? (45,46)

6. In how many schools have you served as dean/director? (47,48)

7. How many years did it take you after becoming a faculty member to earn tenure? (49,50)

8. If there has been any break in continuity in your professional work experience after the Master's degree, what was the reason for it? (51)
   1. Doctoral study
   2. Military duty
   3. Illness
   4. Other: ___________________________
9. If there was such a break in your professional experience, how long were you away?  
1. Less than one year  
2. One to two years  
3. Two to three years  
4. Three to four years  
5. Four to five years  
6. Over five years

VII. Thanks for staying with this so far. Now, for a little change of pace, please consider the following list of 20 characteristics which have been used to describe persons in executive positions.

- Aggressive
- Analytical
- Attentive to details
- Compassionate
- Competitive
- Expressive
- Flexible
- Forceful
- Gentle
- Independent
- Understanding
- Decisive
- Nurture
- Person-oriented
- Sensitive to needs of others
- Tough-minded
- Task-oriented
- Warm
- Willing to take risks

Would you please choose five of these characteristics which you feel are most important for you to have in your position as dean. Rank them so that the most important is #1, the second in importance is #2, etc.

1. ________________________  
2. ________________________  
3. ________________________  
4. ________________________  
5. ________________________

Now, using the same five characteristics identified above, please rank them once again so that the one that is most descriptive of yourself is #1, the second most descriptive of yourself is #2, etc.

1. ________________________  
2. ________________________  
3. ________________________  
4. ________________________  
5. ________________________

VIII. You're almost done, please do not spend much time on this section. There are twenty true-false questions for which there are no right or wrong answers. Therefore, your first response is important. Circle T for true and F for false. Be sure to answer every question.

1. A problem has little attraction for me if I don't think it has a solution. T F

2. I am not a little uncomfortable with people unless I feel that I can understand their behavior. T F

3. There is a right way and a wrong way to do almost everything. T F

4. I would rather bet 3 to 6 on a long shot than 3 to 1 on a probable winner. T F

5. The way to understand complex problems is to be concerned with their larger aspects instead of breaking them into smaller pieces. T F

6. I get pretty anxious when I'm in a social situation over which I have no control. T F
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7. Practically every problem has a solution. T F

8. It bothers me when I am unable to follow another person's train of thought. T F

9. I have always felt that there is a clear difference between right and wrong. T F

10. It bothers me when I don't know how other people react to me. T F

11. Nothing gets accomplished in this world unless you stick to some basic rules. T F

12. If I were a doctor, I would prefer the uncertainties of a psychiatrist to the clear and definite work of someone like a surgeon or X-ray specialist. T F

13. Value and impressionistic pictures really have little appeal for me. T F

14. If I were a scientist, it would bother me that my work would never be completed because science will always make new discoveries. T F

15. Before an examination, I feel much less anxious if I know how many questions there will be. T F

16. The last part of writing a paper used to put in that last piece. T F

17. Sometimes I rather enjoy going against the rules and doing things I'm not supposed to do. T F

18. I don't like to work on a problem until there is a possibility of coming up with a clear-cut and unambiguous answer. T F

19. I like to work with new ideas, even if they turn out later to be wrong. T F

20. Perfect balance is the essence of all good composition. T F

IX. CURRENT STATUS. This last group of questions should be easy to answer since you can go through them quickly, but they are all important for the general profile, so please answer them all.

1. Present position: 1. Dean/director 2. Acting or interim dean/director 3. Former dean/director

2. Tenured? 1. Yes 2. No

3. Member of BUMH 1. Yes 2. No

4. Member of ACM 1. Yes 2. No

5. Basic institutional salary before taxes or deductions: 1. $10,000 - $19,999 2. $20,000 - $29,999 3. $30,000 - $39,999 4. $40,000 - $49,999 5. $50,000 - $59,999 6. Over $60,000

6. In your personal orientation toward: 1. Research more than teaching 2. Neither research or teaching more so than the other 3. Teaching more than research

Record of publications: Please check the appropriate blanks.

7. Number of books: None 1-3 4-10 More than 10

8. Number of journal articles

9. Number of monographs

10. Chapters in edited books
11. Your institution is: 1. Public 2. Private (35)

12. Your social work program exists as:
1. An autonomous unit
2. A subunit within another school or college (36)

13. As head of the social work program you are directly responsible to:
1. President
2. Provost
3. Dean of
4. Director of
5. Chairperson of
6. Other (37)

14. Your school offers the following social work programs:
1. Master's program only
2. Master's and undergraduate programs
3. Master's and doctoral program
4. Master's, undergraduate, and doctoral program (38)

15. Before you were appointed, your program was directed by:
1. All women
2. More women than men
3. About equally, men and women
4. More men
5. All men (39)

16. Approximate student enrollment in all social work programs in your school: (40,41,42)

17. Number of FTE social work faculty in your school: (43,44)

18. Did you actively seek the position as dean/director?
1. Yes
2. No (45)

19. Was your appointment as dean/director primarily due to:
(Please check only one answer)
1. Your own desire and effort
2. The active support and sponsorship of others
3. Being in the right place at the right time (46)

20. Do you think that your sex helped you get this job?
1. Yes
2. No (47)

21. To what extent do you feel satisfied with your career development?
1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. No real feelings about it
4. Somewhat dissatisfied
5. Very dissatisfied (48)

22. If you were to advise someone who aspires to become a dean, what difficulties in reaching that position should he or she be warned about? (49,50)

23. What do you think are the major challenges for a social work dean/director today in carrying out the responsibilities entrusted to the position? (51,52)

24. What do you think are the major challenges for a social work dean/director today in carrying out the responsibilities entrusted to the position? (53,54)

Thank you for your time and effort. Please put completed questionnaire in return envelope and send immediately to: Priscilla M. Alexander 303 B Stillman Hall 1940 College Road Columbus, Ohio 43210
APPENDIX C

USE OF COPYRIGHT MATERIAL

334 E. North Street
Worthington, Ohio 43085
February 23, 1979

Psychological Reports
Box 1441
Missoula, Montana, 59801

Dear Sirs:

I am a doctoral student in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University currently engaged in dissertation research. I have encountered MacDonald's Revised Scale for Ambiguity Tolerance as published and copyrighted in your journal, 1970, Volume 26, pages 791-798, and would like to incorporate the 20 item test in my questionnaire to be sent to all deans/directors of schools of social work. I am exploring the hypothesis that extensive uncertainty and ambiguity in the academic arena requires that an administrator have a high level of tolerance for ambiguity. In subsequent research, I should like to add comparisons using populations of social work faculty that a) do not aspire to become administrators or b) who have been turned down for administrative positions.

I am therefore requesting permission to use this copyrighted scale both in my current dissertation research and in subsequent follow-up research.

Yours truly,

Priscilla M. Alexander
Ms. Priscilla M. Alexander  
334 East North Street  
Worthington, OH 43085

Dear Ms. Alexander:

We have received your letter of February 23 in which you request permission to "incorporate the 20 item Revised Scale for Ambiguity Tolerance by MacDonald, "in your questionnaire to be sent to all deans/directors of schools of social work." This material appeared in PSYCHOLOGICAL REPORTS, 1970, 26, 791-798; the table containing the scale, itself, appears within that pagination on page 793.

We understand that you are conducting your doctoral research and expect to submit this effort to your doctoral committee. The journal will grant you permission to copy the items from this scale provided you obtain written permission from the authors. In order to do this easily, we have included appropriate information at the bottom of this letter. On the reproduced material, which you will be submitting to others, should be the statement, "reprinted with permission of the authors and publisher from: PSYCHOLOGICAL REPORTS, 1970, 26, 793." In your dissertation, the complete citation and acknowledgement of written permission should be included. That will protect the copyright and indicate that you have taken appropriate steps to use copyrighted materials.

We wish you to send us a copy of your thesis and suspect that rather than a monetary outlay, our authors would be most pleased to have you extend the same courtesy to them. A copy of your research might be very interesting to them.

We suggest you write immediately and have posted a copy of our reply to you, as well as your request to us, so that we might help complete the arrangements at the earliest possible time.

Sincerely,

Carol H. Ammons, Ph.D.  
Editor

cc: Dr. Al P. MacDonald, Jr.  
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee  
Systematic Center for the Study of Minorities and the Disadvantaged  
The Graduate School  
P. O. Box 413  
Milwaukee, WI 53201
March 10, 1979

Dr. Al P. MacDonald, Jr.
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Systematic Center for the Study of Minorities and the Disadvantaged
P.O. Box 413
Milwaukee, WI 53201

Dear Dr. MacDonald:

The attached correspondence is being sent to you in compliance with instructions received from your publisher, *Psychological Reports*. I am seeking permission to use your Revised Scale for Ambiguity Tolerance as part of a questionnaire I am using in my doctoral research. I will, of course, be happy to provide you with a copy of my dissertation upon its completion.

Please note also that I have requested permission to use the scale also in proposed follow-up research. I trust that you will be specific with regards to limits within which I may use your scale.

I will appreciate your prompt attention to this request.

Sincerely yours,

Priscilla M. Alexander
Ms. Priscilla M. Alexander  
334 E. North Street  
Worthington, Ohio 43085  

Dear Ms. Alexander:

I am pleased to grant you permission to use my Revised Scale of Ambiguity Tolerance in both your current dissertation research and in subsequent follow-up research. Permission is not however granted to publish the scale in whole or part in a commercial publication or any book or document that is produced for profit.

I am delighted that you will share a copy of your dissertation with me.

Sincerely,

A. P. MacDonald, Jr., Ph.D.  
Associate Director & Associate Professor  
Center for the Family  
108 Skinner Hall  

cc: Dr. Carol Ammons  
Editor, Psychological Reports
Dear Friend:

And I hope you will still be my friend when you finish this task! I really appreciate your being willing to help me with the pre-testing of my questionnaire and hope that this isn't reaching you at a very busy time. The final draft will be sent to all the current deans/directors of accredited graduate social work programs. On the basis of information received, I will construct a profile of the deans—a composite of all of them, the women deans, and the men deans.

Would you please help me by doing the following:

1. Record the time it takes you to complete the whole questionnaire. I know it is long, but I'm not sure just how long it will take to complete it. I will certainly welcome any suggestions you have about items to cut. Your response to #2 will probably serve as the best guide to items to cut.

2. Record any reactions you have to specific items. Feel free to write your comments in the margins or between questions or on the back of this sheet. Look especially for:

   a. Is the meaning of any question unclear or ambiguous?

   b. Is any item offensive or too sensitive to ask as I have done?

   c. Is there anything else about any item that "turned you off"?

Your own answers to the questions will not be used in my research. I am only interested in your reactions to the questions. I want assurance that questions will be answered uniformly and that I don't inadvertently "turn off" my subjects. You may omit any answers you prefer not to give or which are not appropriate for your present position. Please mark these with NA so I know you have considered them.

I will appreciate your early return of the questionnaire, and, again, please accept my sincere thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Priscilla M. Alexander
Field-Testing
Questionnaire

PROFIE OF SOCIAL WORK DEANS
SURVEY DATA FORM

Throughout the survey different formats of questions will be used; in general, you should circle the number of the appropriate alternative or fill in the blank. Please feel free to clarify any answer if you feel it is necessary. DO NOT WRITE IN THE BLANKS ON THE RIGHT MARGIN.

I. General information about you.
1. Your sex: 1. Male 2. Female (5)_____
2. Your year of birth: 19______ (6,7)_____
4. Your current marital status:
   1. Never married 2. Married 3. Previously married but not now (9)_____
5. If married, occupation of your spouse: ________________________ (10,11)_____
6. If there have been children living in your household (your own, step-children, adopted, etc.) please indicate year of birth of each:
   19______ 19______ 19______ 19______ 19______ 19______ (12,13)_____
   (14,15)_____
   (16,17)_____
   (18,19)_____
   (20,21)_____
   (22,23)_____

II. Your family and childhood background
1. Please indicate the number of brothers and sisters in your family:
   a. Older brothers 1 2 3 4 5 6 (24)_____
   b. Older sisters 1 2 3 4 5 6 (25)_____
   c. Younger brothers 1 2 3 4 5 6 (26)_____
   d. Younger sisters 1 2 3 4 5 6 (27)_____
2. Religious affiliation of your family when you were a pre-schooler:
3. Mother's highest level of educational attainment:
   1. Less than high school graduation (29)_____
   2. High school graduate
   3. Some college
   4. Bachelor's degree
   5. Some graduate school
   6. Graduate degree or degrees
4. Father's highest level of educational attainment:
   1. Less than high school graduation (30)_____
   2. High school graduate
   3. Some college
   4. Bachelor's degree
   5. Some graduate school
   6. Graduate degree or degrees
5. If mother worked while you were a child (other than as a housewife) what was her occupation?

6. Father's occupation when you were a child:

7. During your preschool years, were you raised primarily by:
   1. Both parents
   2. Mother alone; Father died or left home when you were age ___
   3. Father alone; Mother died or left home when you were age ___

8. What were your favorite childhood activities--sports, hobbies, and other interests:
   In grades 1-8 In grades 9-12

9. Please recall and list any honors, special achievements, or leadership roles you enjoyed while you were in grade school or high school:
   In grades 1-8 In grades 9-12

10. In the years before you reached high school, did you play with:
    1. All boys
    2. Mostly boys
    3. Equally with boys and girls
    4. Mostly girls
    5. All girls

11. In the years before you reached high school, what did you dream of being when you grew up?

12. In the years before you reached high school, did you feel closer to:
    1. Your mother
    2. Your father
    3. Neither; felt equally close to both of them

For the following set of questions, you are asked to recall how you acted as an adolescent. Please answer each question by circling the correct answer using the following code:
   1. Rarely  2. Sometimes  3. About half the time  4. Quite often  5. Always
As an adolescent, I
13. Did what my parents told me. 1 2 3 4 5
14. Was friendly and outgoing. 1 2 3 4 5
15. Was independent. 1 2 3 4 5
16. Was assertive. 1 2 3 4 5
17. Was competitive. 1 2 3 4 5
18. Was self confident. 1 2 3 4 5

III. And then you found yourself in college! Please recall your undergraduate college days.

1. Your undergraduate degree was: 1. B.A. 2. B.S. 3. Other____
2. In what school did you earn your undergraduate degree? _______________________
3. In what did you major? _______________________
4. Year in which degree received: 19____
5. Number of years from entrance to receipt of degree:
   1. Less than four years
   2. Four years
   3. More than four years
7. Please estimate the percentage of financial support received from each of these sources (for your undergraduate studies):
   ___% from own earnings and savings
   ___% from parents
   ___% from spouse
   ___% from loans
   ___% from scholarships, stipends, etc.
8. What was your grade point average for undergrad years? _____________
9. Was there one particular professor who served as a role model for you? 1. Yes 2. No
10. If yes, was that person: 1. Male 2. Female
11. As an undergraduate student, did you feel self confident about your ability to achieve? 1. Yes 2. No

IV. And then you were accepted into graduate school! Please try to recall the facts surrounding your experience in the Master's program.

1. Your Master's degree: 1. MSW 2. Other: _______________________
2. From which school: _______________________
3. Year in which Master's degree received: 19____
4. Number of years from entrance to program to receipt of degree:
   1. One year or less
   2. One to two years
   3. Two to three years
   4. Three to four years
   5. More than four years

5. Were you married while in the Master's program? 1. Yes 2. No

6. Field of study: ______________________________

7. a. If your studies were in social work, in which practice modality did you specialize:
   1. Casework
   2. Groupwork
   3. Community organization
   4. Planning
   5. Research
   6. Administration/management
   7. Generic
   8. Other

7. b. If your Master's degree was NOT in social work, you may have had training which you feel was equivalent (or very similar) to one of the social work modalities. If so, which one?
   1. Casework
   2. Groupwork
   3. Community organization
   4. Planning
   5. Research
   6. Administration/management
   7. No equivalent training

8. How many courses in administration/management did you take?
   1. One 2. Two 3. Three 4. Four 5. Five or more

9. If you were planning on a career in social work while you were in the Master's program, in what field did you intend to work?
   1. Child welfare
   2. Community planning
   3. Criminal justice/corrections
   4. Family welfare
   5. Health/medical
   6. Mental health
   7. Public welfare
   8. School social work
   9. Other: ______________________________

10. Please estimate the percentage of financial support received from each of these sources for your Master's program:
    _____% from own earnings and savings
    _____% from parents
    _____% from spouse
    _____% from loans
    _____% from scholarships, stipends, etc.

11. Was there one particular professor who served as a role model for you? 1. Yes 2. No

12. If yes, was that person: 1. Male 2. Female

V. Doctoral program. If no doctoral or professional degree, please go to Section VI or professional


2. Discipline in which doctoral or professional degree received:
   1. Social Work 2. Other ______________________________
3. School: ____________________________________________

4. Year in which degree received: 19_____

5. Number of years from entrance to program to receipt of degree:
   1. Two years or less
   2. Two to three years
   3. Three to four years
   4. Four to five years
   5. Five to six years
   6. Six to seven years
   7. Seven or more years

6. Were you married while working on your doctorate? 1. Yes 2. No

7. Please estimate the percentage of financial support received from each of these sources for your doctoral studies:
   _____% from own earnings and savings
   _____% from parents
   _____% from spouse
   _____% from loans
   _____% from scholarships, stipends, etc.

8. Was there one particular professor that you recall as having served as a role model for you? 1. Yes 2. No

9. If yes, was that person: 1. Male 2. Female

VI. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE: Your years as a practicing social worker.

1. Please recall first your decision to become a social worker. Was that decision:
   1. Your ONLY career decision
   2. Not your only career decision; you had already been, or at some time following high school, you had intended to become a (occupation) _______________________________________________________________

2. Please cite two reasons why you chose to become a social worker:
   1. _________________________________________________________________
   2. _________________________________________________________________

3. Total number of years spent in social work practice (excluding years in social work education) since Master's degree: ______________________
   a. How many of these years were in direct service:____________________
   b. How many of these years were in supervision:____________________
   c. How many of these years were in administration other than supervision:____________________

4. Total number of years spent in social work education since Master's degree: ______________________
   How many of these years were spent as:
   a. Lecturer or instructor? ______________________
   b. Assistant professor? ______________________
   c. Associate professor? ______________________
d. Professor? 

e. Acting or interim dean/director

f. Dean/director?

15. In how many schools have you been on the faculty? 

6. In how many schools have you served as dean/director?

7. How many years did it take you after becoming a faculty member to earn tenure? 

8. If there has been any break in continuity in your professional work experience after the Master's degree, what was the reason for it? 
   1. Doctoral study  
   2. Illness  
   3. Childbearing and/or rearing  
   4. Military duty  
   5. Other 

9. If there was such a break in your professional experience, how long were you away?

VII. CURRENT STATUS. This group of questions should be easy to answer so you can zip through them quickly. But they are all important for the general profile, so please answer them all.

1. Present position:  
   1. Dean/director  
   2. Acting or interim dean/director  
   3. Former dean/director 

2. Tenured?  
   1. Yes  
   2. No 

3. Member of NASW?  
   1. Yes  
   2. No 

4. Member of ACSW?  
   1. Yes  
   2. No 

5. Basic institutional salary before taxes or deductions:  
   1. $15,000 - $20,000  
   2. 20,000 - 25,000  
   3. 25,000 - 30,000  
   4. 30,000 - 35,000  
   5. 35,000 - 40,000  
   6. Over $40,000 

6. Is your personal orientation toward:  
   1. Research strongly  
   2. Research somewhat  
   3. Neither research or teaching more so than the other  
   4. Teaching somewhat  
   5. Teaching strongly 

   Record of publications: Circle the appropriate number.  
   1. None  
   2. One to five  
   3. Six to ten  
   4. Ten or more 

7. Number of books  
   1 2 3 4 

8. Number of journal articles  
   1 2 3 4
9. Number of monographs 1 2 3 4
10. Chapters in edited books 1 2 3 4
11. Your institution is: 1. Public 2. Private
12. Your social work program exists as
   1. An autonomous unit
   2. A subunit within another school or college
13. As head of the social work program you are directly responsible to:
   1. President
   2. Provost
   3. Dean of
   4. Director of __________________________
   5. Chairperson of __________________________
   6. Other __________________________
14. Your school offers the following social work programs:
   1. Master's program only
   2. Master's and undergraduate programs
   3. Master's and doctoral program
   4. Master's, undergraduate, and doctoral program
15. Before you were appointed, your program was directed by:
   1. All women
   2. More women than men
   3. About equally, men and women
   4. More men than women
   5. All men
16. Approximate student enrollment in all social work programs in your
    school: __________________________
17. Number of FTE faculty in social work: __________________________
18. Did you actively seek the position as dean/director?
   1. Yes 2. No
19. Was your appointment as dean/director primarily due to:
    (Please check only one answer)
    1. Your own desire and effort
    2. The active support and sponsorship of others
    3. Being in the right place at the right time
20. Do you think that your sex helped you get this job? 1. Yes 2. No
21. To what extent do you feel satisfied with your career development?
    1. Very satisfied
    2. Somewhat satisfied
    3. No real feelings about it
    4. Somewhat dissatisfied
    5. Very dissatisfied
22. If you were to advise someone who aspires to follow a similar career path, what particular problems would you want to warn him or her about?

23. What do you think are the major challenges for a social work dean/director today in carrying out the responsibilities entrusted to the position?

VIII. Thanks for staying with this so far. The hard work is over now. Please try to have a little fun with the last two sections.

The following list of 20 characteristics have been used to describe persons in executive positions.

- Aggressive
- Analytical
- Attentive to details
- Compassionate
- Competitive
- Expressive
- Flexible
- Forceful
- Gentle
- Independent
- Decisive
- Nurturant
- Patient
- Person-oriented
- Sensitive to needs of others
- Tough-minded
- Task-oriented
- Warm
- Willing to take risks
- Understanding

Would you please choose five of these characteristics which you feel are most important for you to have in your position. Rank them so that the most important is #1, the second in importance is #2, etc.

1. ____________________________
2. ____________________________
3. ____________________________
4. ____________________________
5. ____________________________

Now would you please consider the same list of 20 characteristics again and this time choose the five which you feel are probably most descriptive of yourself.

1. ____________________________
2. ____________________________
3. ____________________________
4. ____________________________
5. ____________________________
IX. FINALE. You're almost done. Please do not spend much time on this last section. There are twenty true-false questions for which there are no right or wrong answers. Therefore your first response is important. Circle T for true and F for false. Be sure to answer every question.

1. A problem has little attraction for me if I don't think it has a solution. T F
2. I am just a little uncomfortable with people unless I feel that I can understand their behavior. T F
3. There's a right way and a wrong way to do almost everything. T F
4. I would rather bet 1 to 6 on a long shot than 3 to 1 on a probable winner. T F
5. The way to understand complex problems is to be concerned with their larger aspects instead of breaking them into smaller pieces. T F
6. I get pretty anxious when I'm in a social situation over which I have no control. T F
7. Practically every problem has a solution. T F
8. It bothers me when I am unable to follow another person's train of thought. T F
9. I have always felt that there is a clear difference between right and wrong. T F
10. It bothers me when I don't know how other people react to me. T F
11. Nothing gets accomplished in this world unless you stick to some basic rules. T F
12. If I were a doctor, I would prefer the uncertainties of a psychiatrist to the clear and definite work of someone like a surgeon or X-ray specialist. T F
13. Vague and impressionistic pictures really have little appeal for me. T F
14. If I were a scientist, it would bother me that my work would never be completed (because science will always make new discoveries). T F
15. Before an examination, I feel much less anxious if I know how many questions there will be. T F
16. The best part of working a jigsaw puzzle is putting in that last piece. T F
17. Sometimes I rather enjoy going against the rules and doing things I'm not supposed to do. T F
18. I don't like to work on a problem unless there is a possibility of coming out with a clear-cut and unambiguous answer. T F

19. I like to fool around with new ideas, even if they turn out later to be a total waste of time. T F

20. Perfect balance is the essence of all good composition. T F

Thank you for your time and effort. Please put completed questionnaire in return envelope and send immediately to Priscilla M. Alexander
303 B Stillman Hall
1948 College Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Dear Sir:

I respectfully request a waiver of informed consent for my doctoral dissertation research entitled, "A Profile of Men and Women Deans of Schools of Social Work." I intend to send a mail survey questionnaire to all the current deans of accredited graduate social work programs and believe that such methodology entails no probing, coercion, or other invasion of human rights. The subjects are free to respond or not to respond. I shall interpret a returned questionnaire as consent.

Sincerely,

Priscilla M. Alexander

Chairperson of Human Subject Review Committee
Room 205
OSURF
Campus

303B Stillman Hall
1947 College Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210
12 April, 1979
When submitting a proposal to the Behavioral and Social Sciences Human Subjects Review Committee, we would appreciate your supplying the following information in summary form. Having these details prior to reading and reviewing the protocol can expedite the process. Please be as specific as possible such that the reader can have a rather complete and accurate idea of exactly what your subjects will experience when they participate in your research, as well as know the protections that have been included to safeguard the subject against adverse consequences (e.g., are they free to not participate if they choose; do they or their parents know exactly what they are getting into before they are committed to participate; will both their participation and any collected data be completely confidential).

1) In a sentence or two, briefly describe why the proposed project is of interest. The intent of this question is to give the reviewer a brief idea of the background and purpose of the research.

The research is an outgrowth of interest in women in administration. Profiles are to be constructed for a composite social work dean, the female dean and the male dean. Certain comparisons will be made between the male and female deans and also between the women deans and women administrators in other fields.

2) Briefly describe each of the different conditions or manipulations to be included within the study.

None. This is a descriptive study.

3) What is the nature of the measures or observations that will be taken in the study?

A questionnaire seeks responses from subjects about their career paths, educational experience, and perceptions of relationships with certain other persons.

4) If any questionnaires, tests, or other instruments are to be used, please provide a brief description and either include a copy or indicate approximately when a copy will be submitted to the committee for review.

A copy of the questionnaire now undergoing pre-testing is attached; it is expected that no new questions will be added but several will be deleted. Part I-factual answers and perceptions; Part II-job and self-perceptions; Part III-standardized test of ambiguity test, used with permission of author.
5) Will the subjects encounter the possibility of either psychological, social, physical or legal risk?  □ Yes  □ No  If so, please describe.

6) Will any stress be involved in the study?  □ Yes  □ No  If so, please describe.

7) Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way?  □ Yes  □ No  If so, please describe and include a statement regarding the nature of the debriefing.

8) Will there be any probing for information which an individual might consider to be personal or sensitive?  □ Yes  □ No  If so, please describe.
   No "probing" because it is a mailed questionnaire. It is hoped that pre-testing will identify questions that should be deleted because they are sensitive.

9) Will the subjects be presented with materials which they might consider to be offensive, threatening or degrading?  □ Yes  □ No  If so, please describe.

10) Approximately how much time will be demanded of each subject?
    Questionnaire will be shortened until it takes no more than 1/2 hour.

11) Who will be the subjects in this study? How will the subjects for this study be solicited or contacted?
    Current deans/directors of accredited graduate social work programs as listed on official Council of Social Work Education roster.
    All will be contacted; cover letter will be introduction by Dean of College of Social Work at OSU to persons he knows well.

12) What steps will be taken to ensure that the subject's participation is voluntary? What, if any, incentives will be offered to the subjects for their participation?
    It is assumed that a returned questionnaire implies voluntary consent to participate in the study.

Form HS-0008 (Rev. 4/78)
13) IT IS IMPORTANT THAT A SUBJECT BE INFORMED REGARDING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT HE WILL EXPERIENCE WHEN HE PARTICIPATES IN A STUDY, INCLUDING PARTICULARLY A DESCRIPTION OF ANYTHING HE MIGHT CONSIDER TO BE EITHER UNPLEASANT OR A RISK. PLEASE PROVIDE A STATEMENT REGARDING THE NATURE OF THE INFORMATION WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE SUBJECT PRIOR TO HIS VOLUNTEERING TO PARTICIPATE.

The administrators who are to be my subjects are well aware of the facts to them of filling out another questionnaire. I shall try to persuade them that the significance of this research makes it worth while for them to participate.

14) WHAT STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN TO INSURE THAT THE SUBJECTS GIVE THEIR CONSENT PRIOR TO PARTICIPATING? WILL A WRITTEN CONSENT FORM BE USED? □ YES □ NO. IF SO, PLEASE INCLUDE IT. IF THE SUBJECTS ARE MINORS, WILL THEIR PARENTS' CONSENT BE OBTAINED? □ YES □ NO. IF SO, PLEASE INCLUDE THE FORM AND IF NOT, PLEASE INDICATE WHY NOT.

A returned questionnaire implies consent; the researcher becomes involved only in asking for the response.

15) WILL ANY ASPECT OF THE DATA BE MADE A PART OF ANY PERMANENT RECORD THAT CAN BE IDENTIFIED WITH THE SUBJECT? □ YES □ NO

16) WILL WHETHER OR NOT A SUBJECT PARTICIPATED IN A SPECIFIC EXPERIMENT OR STUDY BE MADE A PART OF ANY PERMANENT RECORD AVAILABLE TO A SUPERVISOR, TEACHER OR EMPLOYER? □ YES □ NO

17) WHAT STEPS WILL BE TAKEN TO INSURE THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF THE DATA?

Return postcards will be sent out with the questionnaires, to be mailed at the same time as the completed questionnaire, but separately. Names of participants will be known thereby, but not associated with a questionnaire. Much of the data may be self-revealing, however.

18) IF THERE ARE ANY RISKS INVOLVED IN THE STUDY, ARE THERE ANY OFFSETTING BENEFITS THAT MIGHT ACCRUE TO EITHER THE SUBJECT OR SOCIETY? □ YES □ NO

A fact which I shall acknowledge in the cover letter to subjects, inviting them to withhold any answers that are too personal.

19) WILL ANY DATA FROM FILES OR ARCHIVAL DATA BE USED? □ YES □ NO
WAIVER OF WRITTEN CONSENT APPROVED

Protocol No. 798 189
Original Review ☑
Continuing Review ☐

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

PROPOSED USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS: ACTION OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Behavioral & Social Sciences Review Committee has taken the following action:

1. Approve

2. Approve with Conditions

3. Disapprove

with regard to the employment of human subjects in the proposed research entitled: A Profile of Men and Women Deans of Schools of Social Work

W. Frederick Staub/Priscilla M. Alexander is listed as the principal investigator.

The conditions, if any, are attached and are signed by the committee chairperson and by the principal investigator. If disapproved, the reasons are attached and are signed by the committee chairperson.

It is the responsibility of the principal investigator to retain a copy of each signed consent form for at least four (4) years beyond the termination of the subject’s participation in the proposed activity. Should the principal investigator leave the University, signed consent forms are to be transferred to the Human Subjects Review Committee for the required retention period.

Date April 20, 1979 Signed 
(Chairperson)
April 21, 1979

Dear

In my position as Assistant to the Dean at Ohio State, I have enjoyed the privilege of observing Dean Washington in his role of educational administrator. The experience has been exciting and has led me to raise numerous questions. I have frequently wondered about the small number of women deans and have asked about the factors that might be associated with one's becoming a dean. My doctoral dissertation is designed to provide some answers to these questions. I am hoping that you will be willing to assist me in this process.

The enclosed questionnaire asks specifically about you and the path you followed to reach your present position. Because only you know the answers to such questions, you will not be able to delegate this task. I fully realize how many questionnaires you receive each year (they frequently are delegated to me!) and I know how difficult it is for you to find the time to complete them. With that in mind, I have tried to simplify my questionnaire as much as possible. The answers should all be in your head so there will be nothing you have to look up. Almost all questions are set up with easy check-off answers and the total time to complete the form should not exceed thirty minutes.

Will you please mail the enclosed postcard separately at the time you send your questionnaire back to me. Use of the card will reduce my follow-up costs and save you the bother of receiving a follow-up plea after you have returned your questionnaire. The post card return is also designed to protect the anonymity of the questionnaires. Quite frankly, however, after you have read through the questions, you may wonder how much your identity can be protected. Because I know that some of you—the women especially—will be recognizable through your answers, I wish to assure you that no one but myself will have access to the questionnaires and that only aggregate information will be used in the final report. I trust that this assurance will permit you to answer all questions candidly.

I will be most appreciative of your cooperation and will send you an abstract of my study upon its completion.

Sincerely,

Priscilla ("Bunny") Alexander
April 24, 1979

Dear

My assistant, Ms. Priscilla Alexander, has completed her doctoral courses and is now conducting research for her dissertation. Bunny, as we call her, has chosen as her topic "A Profile of Men and Women Deans of Schools of Social Work."

The focus of this study is to identify the special circumstances under which a few (19) women have become Deans/Directors of Schools of Social Work. Also, it seeks to discover if there are personal characteristics, educational and work experiences, or personal relationships which may have uniquely prepared these women for their positions. The research design will permit comparisons of male and female deans on selected variables.

I am making this personal plea to you and the rest of my colleagues for your wholehearted cooperation because I believe that this is a very timely study which requires maximum participation from a very limited universe.

Please take a few minutes of your time and complete the enclosed questionnaire. It would mean a great deal to me.

On behalf of Ms. Alexander, may I thank you.

Robert O. Washington
Dear Dean,

Several weeks ago I sent you a questionnaire seeking information about you as a dean or director. The information is to be used to construct a profile of the social work deans and of the men and women deans separately. I am particularly interested in the responses of the 22 women currently serving as deans for I wish to discover in what ways their characteristics and career paths are similar to those of the men deans, and in what ways they may be more similar to those of women administrators in the business world.

Almost half of the deans have already responded, but in order to do an adequate analysis of this information, I really need to hear from more of you. I am happy to report that there have been some very favorable comments about the instrument, leading me to believe that I have the potential for a valuable report—even more valuable with each additional response! I do hope, therefore, that you will find the time (about 25 minutes) to complete the questionnaire.

The postcard return system is working well, and with only one exception (the postcard was not signed nor mailed separately, and the outer envelope bore no postmark) this second request should not be received by anyone whose response I have received. So, please do sign the postcard and mail it separately.

I hope to hear from you soon, and I thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Priscilla M. Alexander
Dear

I want to take this opportunity to thank you for returning my doctoral research questionnaire entitled "Profile of Social Work Deans". As of this weekend I have received 58 useable responses from 61 of the 67 current deans/directors. This fine response has greatly encouraged me, as has also the thoughtful, complete way in which you have answered the questions. I am deeply appreciative of the time and effort you have given.

If all continues to go as well as it has so far, I should be able to complete the dissertation in time to receive the degree at the December commencement exercises. I hope to get copies of the abstract to you before the end of the year and to make a presentation at CSWK-APR in Los Angeles in March.

Sincerely,

Priscilla (Bunny) Alexander
APPENDIX G

DEANS' REASONS FOR ENTERING SOCIAL WORK

Interest in working with people

Liked people
Liked working with people
Liked working with people
Liked working with people
Liked working with people
Wanted to work with people
Respect for people
Interest in people
Liked people
To work with people, not rats (had planned to be a psychologist)
Liked youth work

Motivation for service and helping

To help people
Altrusism
Wanted to help persons in need
Interest in helping students (had planned to be a teacher)
Willingness to be more helpful
Service orientation
Desired direct activity with people in need
Desire to help others
To help people individually
Wanted to help people with problems
Service
Interest in service on an individual basis
Satisfying as a career to help others
Wish to help children and youth
Interest in working with people with problems
Better helping methods (had planned to be a psychologist)
Saw they had good skills to help people

Social action, social change goals

To do community planning
To change social problems
Desire to see societal changes
To work for social justice
Wanted to improve on the social order
Interested in social action
Political radical
To influence social policies
Wanted to be involved in institutional change
Change environmental, social conditions
Concern for the disadvantaged
Concern for the "underdog"
To solve social problems
Concern with deprived populations
Political commitments

Values orientation

Religious identification
Analogous to the ministry and philosophically attractive
(had planned to be a minister)
Social work values
Social commitment -- values
Personal values
Psychoanalysis and reassessment of life goals

Influence of other people

My own family background influenced me
Interest in psychology through mentor
Mentor in MSW program convinced me to apply
College professor's advice
Influence of Whitney Young
Friends were social workers
Admired several social workers
Knew others as social workers
Family influence
Sister was MSW
Had relatives in the profession
Wife became social worker
Observation of social workers at work

Prior experiences

Experience in US Navy WW II
Became aware of field during WW II
War experience -- desire to improve social conditions
Experience with American Red Cross Disaster Relief Society
Summer experience in Social Work
Fell into it through community organizing
Part-time experience
Had part-time experience in community center
Drafted into present position from corrections background

Opportunity for blacks and women

Opportunity for women
Few professions that blacks could move in
Need for more blacks in the profession
Availability of job, economic reasons

It was the first job offer I had after BA degree
There were no openings for teachers (had planned to be a teacher)
A position became available
Recruited
Cost
Income
Job offer
To earn a living
Opportunity
Ability to obtain a job
Economics
Availability of jobs
"Door was open" -- job opportunity
Cost of law school (had planned to be a lawyer)

Attractiveness related to prior job

To get out of college union work
Professional dissatisfaction (had planned to be a teacher)
Self doubt -- wanted clinical psychology but didn't think I could make it
Clarity of job function compared to marriage counselor

Other

It was undergrad academic choice
Interest
Interest
Chance
Seemed to be enjoyable
Interested in psychiatry
Desire to engage in applied research
Availability of research subjects
APPENDIX H

Responses to Open Ended Questions

I. If you were to advise someone who aspires to become a dean, what difficulties in reaching that position should he or she be warned about?

Personal characteristics:

An individual must be able to transcend personal (ego) concerns. M

Qualifications needed are multiple. You have to be willing to take a lot of pressure and put in a lot of time. M

Have a thick skin and sense of humor. M

Know yourself and be willing to risk. F

Has to work well under pressure from above (higher University administration) below (students and faculty) and from without (community agencies, NASW, NABSW, etc.) F

Knowledge and skills

The issue is not how difficult it is to reach the position—that's relatively easy. The problem is to be very well prepared in terms of the profession. F

Need for administrative experiences. Other attractive job possibilities. M

Learn to listen; always invite participation in decision making. Faculty should control curriculum. You can influence its developments and direction. Get control of the money! It consolidates your authority. M

No major difficulties—task is to gain range of academic experience, including academic administration. M

First develop a sound base in a knowledge area in social work. Then make a study of administration via successive exposures to administrative responsibility. M

High cost of deaning in energy, stress, conflict with warm and loving social work instincts,
inability to pursue excellence in teaching and research and do a good administrative job, too. If you want to anyway, develop analytical, assertive, political, and task organizing skills, breadth of concept and vision, flexibility, pragmatism, interpersonal skills. Academic ability is sought but is secondary. AND PLEASE keep your compassion and idealism intact, even tho it is more painful to do so, because without that you can become one of the enemy. Also, exploit the "mentor" route and join the "club". M

1. Getting academic administrative experience early.
2. Get substantial practice and research experience. M

Need to be a respected scholar--researcher--publisher--teacher before becoming an administrator. M

Should be broad based. M

Special preferences of administration. Competition. Management competency development. F

Pace/Speed

Not moving too fast to get there. F

Don't aspire too hard. Difficult to answer since I really did not aspire to it. F

I do not enjoy the position and am only "paying my dues" for 3 years. I would warn someone who "aspires" to not act too eager for power. F

1. Your own career goals should be achieved.
2. You should give up the need to win.
3. Be willing to accept a lot of ambiguity and pressure. M

Relationship with multiple constituencies

1. Your agenda is set by others, not by you.
2. Research and scholarship are difficult to pursue.
3. You are forced into an adversarial position vis a vis faculty. M

Multiple systems to relate to--much pressure. M

Variance between what faculty expect and want with what administrations expect and want. M
Faculty cliques. Budgeting limitations. M

Faculty conflicts. Community image. M

Interpersonal relations. Interorganizational concerns. Intraschool organizational concerns. M

Administrative detail. Faculty constituencies. University environment. M

Factions in faculties. M

To become a dean one must appeal to the institution. Some look for scholars, others for minorities and women, others for demonstrated competence. To be invited to interview, one must first be selected. Then, the searchers are looking for someone who will be personally compatible with most constituencies. M

Need support of University administration to be successful. M

Lack of reality orientation of academic faculty—removal from real world. M

The no-man's land between faculty and students. F

Political environment

The highly political nature of the selection process. M

Beware of the power and manipulation of upper administration. M

Political considerations. Ability to work with President and Board of Trustees. Must be willing to move on needed change. Can't worry about everyone liking you—they won't. F

Internal politics in seeking a dean often does not select the best qualified person—much disappointment here! M

I can't think of significant difficulties. (If I had it to do over, wanted the job less than I did, I would have bargained harder for resources.) M

Operating constraints

The time demands. M
II. What do you think are the major challenges for a social work dean today in carrying out the responsibilities entrusted to the position?

Financial concerns

The realities of economics of higher education. M

Fund raising in a receding market. F

Getting $. F

Increasingly, the problems and issues are in funding and dealing with legal environment of education. F

In my experience, the specific priorities of the University President (for example, allocation of financial resources among various schools in the University) are the major factors in determining
whether the School can achieve its goals. F

Maintain personal and professional integrity in the face of budget and academic pressures. F

Finding money. Retrenchment of faculty. Generally lack of resources. F

Educational planning.
Budget. M

Budgeting and fund raising. Attracting faculties. Promoting and conducting research. Interpretation of social work—speaking and writing. M

Maintaining fiscal stability as federal support shrinks.
Doing justice to collegiality while keeping the program moving. M

Fund raising. Support of the profession nationally. Finding excellent, compatible faculty. F

Fiscal constraints; keeping faculty service and research oriented rather than entrepreneurial; "declassification" trend in public welfare; conflicting values in the larger society which social work reflects. M

Adequate finances. Selecting faculty. M

How to cut the budget and keep everyone happy. M

To survive! Especially in face of financial difficulties. M

Securing adequate financial support. Effecting selection of students and faculty. Making curriculum more effective. M

Grantsmanship. Ability to maintain open channels of communication between Faculty-Dean-Administration-Students. Sensitivity to needs of students. Knowledgeable—trends in social work education and practice. M

Sufficient funding. Qualified program faculty and community support. Support from administration. F

Era of limited resources makes this position at times untenable. Also the tensions in faculty-faculty interaction and faculty-dean interaction makes
change in planned fashion very difficult. M


Leadership

To provide leadership and statesmanship to maintain a curriculum of quality. M

Maintaining tie with and leadership of the faculty. M

Relevant curriculum development/leadership. F

Educational leadership.
Capacity to take risks.
Right judgment and combination of scholarship/research and administrative skills. M

Providing leadership in curriculum development.
Giving leadership to faculty professional growth. M

Providing intellectual leadership for school and assuring relevance and service to community. M

The challenge of sound, responsive, responsible and visionary educational leadership. M

Limited resources, high degree of tenured faculty, inflation, lowered status of makeup, complete environment: Exercising leadership through this tangled web is the challenge. M

Academic/Professional standards

Academic standards. Providing skilled practitioners for changing society. Developing sound social work knowledge. M

Maintenance of academic quality. Responsibilities to social work profession. M

Deliver effective humane quality program to students and to stimulate the faculty to address change. M

Opportunity to effect direction of social work education in relation to critical issues (curriculum, manpower, research, field, etc.) through decisions made, persons appointed, leadership given. F

Quality program for students. Helping recruit first rate faculty. Research. Budgeting and financing. M
Curriculum development/program change

Being able to keep sight of the goal of education while you are trying to keep ship afloat. To increase scholarship. M

Program development during resource retrenchment. M

Curriculum changes. Employing excellent faculty. Salaries--Budget. M

The development of curriculum that is relevant to the future needs of the professional social worker. M

Exciting opportunity to help meet needs of clients, develop professionals, and improve human service systems. Lots of problems to solve creatively and opportunities to identify and exploit. M

To be able to introduce changes in the program as the manpower needs of the region change. To deal with the bureaucratic organization and the policy and regulations of the University which in most cases are not applicable to graduate programs. F

To be creative--to enable creativity while exercising management responsibility. M

Maximizing a learning milieu. M

Helping a faculty develop an innovative and experimental approach to social services and social work education. Developing a range of special resources to finance new approaches. M

Juggling constituencies

Keeping people satisfied: students, faculty, University administration. M

The need to juggle faculty, students, curriculum and upper administration demands, interest and needs. M

To maintain support of students, faculty, University administration simultaneously while directly interested in providing training to better services to clients. M

Balance between responsibilities to faculty and responsibilities to University administration. Personnel and fiscal management skills, F
Faculty concerns

Recruiting faculty competencies for multiple goals of University, i.e., research, instruction, community services. In constant quest for quality education balancing traditional with innovative ideas re: education and product, student recruitment. Budget support. F

1. Obtaining a good faculty and holding on to them.
2. Developing new and existing programs in a period of uncertainty about resources (students, $).
3. Handling non-productive faculty--the rigidities induced by the tenure system. M

Building (not just recruiting a faculty of highly qualified professors as role models). F

Faculty recruitment, retention and development. Assisting faculty to become a cohesive, integrated, productive group. M

Relating to faculty members. M

Upgrading the morale of the faculty; resisting retrenchment; shaping a quality program that is useful to students. M

The uncertainly of the profession which makes goal setting difficult because of faculty resistance. M

Student concerns

Recruitment of capable students (including minority students and men). Grantsmanship. Leadership (democratic/autocratic mix). Scholarship. F

Helping faculty and University make transition to part time students and continuing education. Promoting faculty including clinical faculty. Maintaining funding. F

1. To build a sound program on hard money.
2. To encourage scholarship among the faculty.
3. To recruit minority students to a high cost school. M