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CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

In less than a century, the position of dean of instruction\(^1\) has evolved into one of the most significant administrative posts in American higher education (DeVane, 1968). It is an office that is a center of activity in every college and university, and is second only to that of the president in the organization. Because of the centrality of the office and power and influence of the person in the post, the dean serves as an adviser to the president in many matters, although the primary concern of this administrator is the academic program (Dupont, 1968; Hanzeli, 1966; Johnson, 1979). More specifically, the academic dean coordinates the planning, development, implementation and evaluation of all instructional programs. Management of these processes is designed to insure that quality programs are continuously offered to students and to enhance the academic vitality of the institution (Hanzeli, 1966; Johnson, 1979; Thornton, 1972).

One is able to scrutinize the deanship and gain greater insight into the position (as well as the type of individual

\(^1\)
who should occupy it) by inspecting attributed descriptors, qualities, and expectations. Because of the scope, influence and span of control inherent in this position, it is not surprising that the dean of instruction has many descriptors. Some descriptors exalt the dean "first among equals"; others place him in the role of mediator "man in the middle"; still others transmit an image that the role of the dean is ambiguous, "the dean is neither fish nor fowl, neither administrator nor faculty member, yet, one and the same." And, as might be expected, some characterizations make the dean an object of humor: "the man with two hats, but hopefully not two heads" (Cleveland, 1968; Corson, 1960; Enarson, 1968; Feltner & Godsell, 1972; Gould, 1964; Meeth, 1971; Millett, 1962; Roaden, 1970; Shawl, 1974; Woodburne, 1958).

This position is not a superficial one, but one that requires "delicate balance and restraint" (Gould, 1964, p. 7). The person occupying this position should be a leader and possess good communication, managerial, interpersonal, organizational, decision-making, human relations, and political skills (Enarson, 1968; Gould, 1964). It follows, then, that the academic dean has one of the most important and most difficult administrative positions in higher education (McDaniel, 1978; Salmen, 1971).
Background of the Problem

The position of dean of instruction developed quickly in the community college, paralleling the burgeoning growth and development of the college itself. Before a researcher can fully comprehend the position, that person must first understand the nature of the institution where the dean is to serve (Dill, 1980; Finnegan, 1951; Gould, 1964; McDaniel, 1978).

Since the turn of the century, the community college has emerged as a very important and fast-growing higher education institution in America (Blocker, Plummer, & Richardson, 1965; Bushnell, 1973; Cohen, 1969; Foresi, 1974; Medsker & Tillery, 1971; Monroe, 1977; Palenchak, 1973; Sava, 1967). During its development, the two-year college concentrated on two objectives which have distinguished it from other higher education institutions. The first was providing equal access to higher education, thereby fulfilling the goal of egalitarianism. The second was its emphasis and focus upon teaching rather than research. With regard to its egalitarian nature, the community college has been referred to as the "capstone of institutions" promoting the ideal of equal access to education for all individuals and fulfilling the promise of a universal post-secondary education (Foresi, 1974; Monroe, 1977).

With regard to teaching, literature confirms that the mission of the community college is to be identified and
recognized solely as a teaching institution (Hudson, 1978; Robin, 1974). As such, its primary thrust is to promote the teaching/learning process so students' level of learning will increase.

Teaching is one area of major emphasis in the community college which requires more attention than what is required in some other types of higher education institutions. It follows, therefore, that an appropriate administrative position should be identified within this educational structure to insure this objective is fulfilled.

Prior to the growth and development of two-year colleges and the dean's position, presidents had the role academic deans now fill (DeVane, 1968). In 1962, Dodds argued that educational leadership was the "prime function of the president" (p. 366). Subsequent to Dodds' argument, others insist the role of the president as an educational leader is one that is outdated and contend the college presidency, like many other executive positions, has undergone a change (Cohen & Rouche, 1969).

Seldon (1960) supports this by these remarks:

> The principal job of the college president in the 1920s and earlier was the educational concern, the operation of the curriculum. Now the president spends little time on that. A fair share of his time is spent on relations with the attitudes of faculty and other employees, alumni and students. (p. 12)

Another author expands on this idea by reporting the president is immersed in so many administrative tasks that
"the presidency has become more of a social, diplomatic, financial, and administrative post than one of scholarly and educational leadership" (Brickman, 1961, p. 387).

As the presidential role has been redefined, academic deans have become the vanguards for molding the mission and identity of the community college's role within the arena of post-secondary education (Anderson, 1973; Robin, 1974; Shawl, 1974). The position of academic dean is paramount; and the holder of the position has become that of the educational leader "committed to improved education in his institution" (Cohen & Rouche, 1969, p. 11), and is one primarily responsible for effectuating instructional leadership. Therefore, it is comprehensible that the pivotal role of dean must be one that is clearly defined and to which empirical attention must be given.

**Statement of the Problem**

The position of academic dean is one of the most important administrative positions in the community college. Educational leadership that the individual holding this position provides determines to a large extent the quality and direction of the institution. This person must develop and maintain an educational environment where the teaching goal of the institution may be implemented and nourished so the institution may flourish (American Association of University Administrators, 1981; Burns, 1962). The responsibilities held by this individual are not limited to serving
as the academic leader, but include being chief personnel officer (in the academic area), financial manager, mediator, conciliator, and change agent (Enarson, 1968; Feltner & Goodsell, 1972; Fishman, 1963; Horn, 1968; McGrath, 1947; Miller, 1964; Miller & Wilson, 1963; Rosenheim, 1968; Wolotkiewicz, 1980). Because much of the institution's academic direction revolves around this position, it is understandable why there should be an interest in obtaining information about this position and the individual who holds it.

Cyphert and Zimpher (1980) maintain the following:

"... we know virtually nothing about the goals of incumbents (deans) in these leadership positions: where they come from, what their backgrounds are, what their personal characteristics are. Neither do we know who might be potential candidates for these administrative positions. We know more about the processes by which these individuals are selected than we do about the survivors of this screening process. (p. 91)"

Additional support for Cyphert and Zimpher's position is given by Coladarci (1980) who asserts that literature on the deanship can "be read comfortably between a late breakfast and an early lunch--and that the dearth in volume was (is) not compensated for by substance" (p. 125). Dill (1980) also writes, "Although deans and deanships have grown in numbers and influence they still have not been studied extensively as a general ingredient of college and university organization" (p. 264).
If the above authors are accurate in their assertions, we should begin to gather some of the empirical data needed to counter this claim.

The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA)\(^4\) supports the above claims by endorsing the need for research to be focused on the deanship (Griffiths & McCarty, 1980). In outlining the direction this research should take, Culbertson (1980) explains that, although there is a need for theory-oriented research, non-theory based research is also important. He believes this type of research is required in a field's development and adds if the work is carefully done it "can lead to significant generalizations" (p. 15).

Succinctly, the purpose of this study was to investigate the status of the dean of instruction in community colleges and technical colleges\(^5\) in order to increase the knowledge and understanding about the position and the individual who occupies it.

The Research Questions

This investigation sought to provide answers to the following specific research questions:

General Information

1. What are the demographic characteristics of the individuals who hold the dean of instruction position?

2. Is there a difference between the demographic characteristics of deans of instruction in community colleges and those of deans of instruction in technical colleges?
3. What type of academic training do these deans have?

**Attitudes**

1. What attitudes do deans of instruction hold about the mission of their institutions relative to their admission policy, special educational services, and remedial education?

2. What attitudes do deans of instruction hold about governance in their institutions?

3. What is the level of satisfaction deans of instruction receive from their positions?

4. Do deans of instruction in community colleges and technical colleges differ in their attitude toward mission, governance, and level of satisfaction?

**Administration**

1. To what extent do deans of instruction perceive their graduate training as adequately preparing them for their current administrative positions?

2. What type of academic training do these deans of instruction perceive as important for persons aspiring to their positions?

3. Is there agreement between deans of instruction in these colleges as to what they perceive to be their greatest academic concerns?

4. Do deans of instruction in these colleges differ in their perception of their greatest academic concern?

5. What factors do deans of instruction in community colleges and technical colleges perceive to most inhibit their effectiveness as administrators?

6. Do the perceptions of deans of instruction in community colleges differ from the perceptions of deans of instruction in technical colleges with regard to what inhibits their effectiveness as administrators?
Significance of the Research

An extensive search confirms there is a paucity of literature on the academic dean. That which is available is reflective of senior institutions and is definitive, anecdotal, commentative, autobiographical, and dated. Little of the existing literature is based upon empirical research.

This study was undertaken in response to the scarcity of empirical literature on the academic deanship--especially on the dean in two-year colleges. Griffiths and McCarty (1980) state it concisely:

While those who administer higher education are represented by a literature whose chief characteristic is poverty, the least among the poorest is the deanship. There has been so little theoretical, conceptual or research literature published on the deanship as to constitute an embarrassment to both the practitioners and scholars of higher education. (p. v)

This study has significance for higher education generally and for two-year colleges particularly. Culbertson (1980) acknowledges there has been an increase in the number of academic programs designed to prepare leaders in higher education within the last decade and admits that, unfortunately, the knowledge base needed to support these programs has not increased substantially. Also, the results of a UCEA survey indicated professors of higher education rank the creation of new knowledge to be used in higher education as a top priority. Therefore, in a general way, research
on the academic dean will contribute to the literature in the field of higher education administration.

The absence of empirical research on the deans of instruction in the two-year college makes it difficult to understand the nature of the position. This lack of information has inherent problematic implications for identification, recruitment, selection, and retention of deans of instruction in community colleges and technical colleges. Inadequacy of data pertaining to the deanship also results in inconsistent perceptions by governing boards, coordinating councils (both state and local), legislators, the academic community, students, and the community-at-large. Furthermore, for individuals who are pursuing this position, it is imperative that they have some insight and discernment about the post itself and about persons who occupy it.

In summary, individuals in the field of higher educational administration recognize the need for empirical studies on the academic deanship. Aside from the mere acknowledgment of this shortcoming, the volume of substantial research needed to create this knowledge base has not increased. Such scholarly neglect should be corrected. Therefore, the researcher believes this investigation may incite other researchers to empirically examine the position of dean of instruction in the two-year college, as well as in other types of educational institutions.
Definition of Terms

The following definitions were used to explicate terms introduced in this study:

**academic deanship** - The position held by the chief academic and administrative officer who is ultimately responsible for the educational program.

**community college** - A two-year post-secondary educational institution typically set up to meet educational needs of a particular community. It is publicly supported and designed to carry on three levels of educational functions: transfer, vocational and technical, and continuing education.

**dean of instruction** - The chief academic and administrative officer who has responsibility for the educational program of a two-year college. This individual is usually responsible to the president. Common synonyms for dean of instruction include: academic dean, vice president for academic affairs, vice president for academic services, dean of academic affairs, dean of faculty or dean.

**president** - The principal administrative officer responsible for the direction of all operations of an institution of higher education.

**technical college** - A publicly supported post-secondary institution which provides intensive instruction in vocational and technical education which frequently leads to an associate degree.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

One of the obstacles to studying the position of dean of instruction in the two-year college is the absence of pertinent literature. Over the past thirty years neither scholars nor practitioners have produced a single volume on this administrator, and only a few journal articles and topical papers about the position have been published. Literature that is available gives attention to the academic dean in senior institutions, and there is a paucity of it with that focus. From both types of institutions, published information about the deanship is infused by personal accounts of deans emeriti, incumbent deans, and from critiques of other observers and commentators who have not held the position. The literature is dominated by the views of faculty. Such summaries are usually lacking in some elements of empirical investigation.

While it is not suggested that autobiographical and biographical accounts are less of a contribution to the literature than those which are empirically based, it is suggested that the absence of such empirical research on the deanship in two- and four-year colleges leaves the
investigator without one of the traditional points of departure for quantifying that which is known about the dean of instruction. Notwithstanding, the researcher must use the information that is available. It follows, therefore, that the existing literature from secondary and related sources were used in this study.

The review of related literature presented herein is intended to provide some insight into the position of dean of instruction. It is organized to include the following areas: (1) the origin and evolution of the deanship; (2) organizational context in which this position must function; (3) role of the academic dean; and (4) the professional preparation of the dean.

The Origin and Evolution of the Deanship

In the first two centuries following the establishment of higher education institutions, the president was the only administrator, but he served multiple roles—as a professional, a manager, and as a maintenance worker. As a professional, he was a full-time faculty member expected to be qualified to teach every subject offered by the institution. As a manager, he was responsible for all of the administrative duties. With regard to maintenance work, he found himself performing even janitorial duties (Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 1978; Hofstader, 1964).

As student bodies increased, and functions that needed to be performed for the smooth operation of the institution
became more complex, there was a need for additional administrators. First a treasurer and later a part-time librarian were added to the administrative ranks (Rudolph, 1962).

After the Civil War, the functions and scope of higher education institutions expanded. This expansion led to the need for additional administrators. The position of dean was one of the new administrative posts which was added (DeVane, 1968; Dill, 1980; Gould, 1964; Hofstader, 1964; Rudolph, 1962; Ward, 1934). Harvard was the first American institution to appoint a college dean (Ward, 1934). There is some disagreement about the reason the deanship originated. Some authors believe this position was designed to handle discipline and educational duties which the president no longer had time to perform (Corson, 1960; Milner, 1936; Ward, 1934). Another author reports "deans were an effort to maintain collegiate and human values in an atmosphere of increasing scholarship and specialization" (Rudolph, 1962, p. 435). Deferrari (1956) agrees with both, but also suggests that the job was created to deal with emergency situations, reorganizations, and in newly-emerging institutions was simply included from the outset. And yet another observer comments:

The deanship was born out of servile tasks which the registrar no longer had time to perform and the faculty regarded as unworthy of the time needed to assemble for deliberation. (Bevan, 1967, p. 344).
Because of a gap in the literature on the dean, it is difficult to be definite about the evolution of this position. It can be speculated, however, that for decades the dean continued as a faculty member, an administrator, and a disciplinarian. According to Feltner & Goodsell (1972), campus climate prior to the 1960s allowed the dean to remain in this role with very low visibility. During the sixties, societal changes such as student activism, civil rights legislation and demands for accountability from all levels of society and government had significant impacts on higher education institutions. Higher education institutions became more decentralized to adapt to those events. This decentralization process made the position of academic dean more apparent. Until that time the individual who held the dean's position was not widely known as an educational spokesperson or academic leader, but was known more as a disciplinarian. Dill (1980) supports this when he postulates that by the 1960s academic deans, as we know them today, had "arrived" (p. 264). Support can be gained for Dill's position by reviewing the results of a study conducted by Gould (1964) on the evolution and responsibilities of the dean over a 30-year time span. He reported that during this period major responsibilities of the dean shifted from student and curriculum concerns to those of curriculum and faculty.

A hundred years ago, the position of academic dean was rare in the American higher education academic scene.
Although disagreement among authors exists as to why the position originated, few would argue that its proliferation and growth of responsibilities and powers have not been a major development. The academic dean has proven to be an indispensable individual who holds a widely recognized, vital, and important administrative position which articulates the highest goals of the educational enterprise (Conant, 1967; DeVane, 1968; Dill, 1980; Milner, 1936).

Organizational Context

The functions of the academic dean may and do vary from institution to institution. In his study, Finnegan (1951) provides factors that contribute to this variation:

1. the unique aim of an institution;
2. the basic form of institutional control and the organization responsible for it;
3. the type of organization for administrative control;
4. the size of the institution in terms of student population;
5. the number and the varieties of services rendered by the institution;
6. the type of student personnel, viz., men, women, co-educational;
7. the type and number of available teaching and administrative personnel. (p. 3)

According to McDaniel (1978), the dean is a creature of his own context. He asserts the following:

The particular tasks of a dean will vary with the nature . . . of the institution, academic local problems, particular assignments and
written job descriptions, the opinions of other administrators in the college, the influence of chairmen in the various departments, and the dean's own style.
(p. 359)

Gould (1964) agrees with McDaniel and inserts a few factors of his own that he believes influence the role of the dean. They include institution's size, objectives, number of programs, and administrative organization. It can be concluded that it is difficult to understand the academic deanship without first comprehending the organizational context in which this position must function. Therefore, close attention to the two-year college is necessary.

The two-year college context is one that is significantly different from that of the four-year institution. This difference can be made more explicit by comparing two-year colleges with four-year institutions with regard to their settings.

The Two-Year College Setting

Two-year colleges are an intimate part of the community where they are located and, therefore, are reflective of the communities served. They are located in urban, rural, and suburban communities, residents find access easy to them, and are encouraged to visit their campuses, use their facilities, and participate in their activities.

For the most part, their students live in the surrounding community, commute to the campus and are part-timers who hold full-time jobs. They may attend the institution for a
variety of reasons—academic, cultural, and the pursuit of special interests. Doors are open to all persons who wish to attend. As a general rule, individuals who leave the two-year college remain in the community and may participate in its workforce, its political and social life, and cultural activities.

The college draws on the expertise of its community residents, and, therefore, a large number of its faculty, administrators and staff live within the community. Many faculty members are part-time and have master's degrees. Very few have earned the Ph.D. It is also common to find faculty members in these institutions unionized.

The members of the two-year college Board of Trustees also reside in the community. The boards are usually small and representative of the locality. They may either be elected or appointed and may know little about two-year college administration or have special credentials. It is also likely that they have never attended a two-year college. One usually finds the board meets on a regular basis and policies they establish are in response to needs of the community.

Tuition may be free or at a minimal cost. It remains low because it is supplemented by local taxes.

Curriculum in the two-year college is best described as flexible and is designed to solve acute problems and accommodate the diversity found within the student body and the
community. As needs of these groups change, the curricula change.

The two-year college identifies itself as a teaching and service institution; therefore, its major concern is to promote excellence in these areas. Services that are provided are available for immediate consumption of the community.

Tenure, one reward found in higher education, is awarded in the two-year college based on teaching and longevity in the position.

**The Four-Year College Setting**

Four-year colleges are usually not as closely connected to the communities where they are situated. Because these institutions were not established to serve needs of their surrounding communities, they may or may not be convenient or open to residents.

Students attending these institutions may or may not live in close proximity. Most will not. They come to the institution from any and all of the 50 states, as well as foreign countries. As a result, most four-year institutions have a residential component. A larger number of its students are full-time and are generally pursuing an undergraduate degree. These institutions may be selective in their admission policies and few have an open-door component. When students leave, the majority of them will move from the community where the college is located.
Their workers may live in the community or miles away from it. There are more full-time faculty members than part-time, and a large percentage of the faculty have Ph.D.'s.

Four-year college Boards of Trustees are completely different in structure and ideology than those in two-year colleges. They are large, members are influential upper middle or upper class individuals, and may come from all over the country. The distance they must travel to attend meetings may be one of the reasons for infrequent meetings and poor attendance. Policies these boards establish are not usually in response to the local community.

Although these institutions receive state and federal assistance, their tuition is much higher than tuition charged in two-year colleges.

Four-year institutions would shudder at the thought of a curriculum designed like the one found in the two-year college. Four-year college curricula are based more on traditional configurations and generally undergo changes to meet national needs rather than local needs. Generally, these changes only occur after long, careful planning and evaluation, and often take years. On the other hand, they are capable of responding to a crisis.

These colleges are committed to teaching, research, and service, which do not have immediate value and benefits for the community. Also, these institutions charge for services
rendered to the community.

Tenure is also awarded in four-year institutions, but is done so on the basis of teaching, research, and service. Longevity in the position would not automatically award rank or tenure to a faculty member.

Role of the Academic Dean

The academic dean must fill a variety of roles, the most difficult of which is responding to expectations of administration and faculty (Cohen, 1975). Other roles include, but are not limited to, academic leader, mediator or conciliator, chief academic personnel officer, and change agent. The following sections outline these roles.

The Academic Dean as Academic Leader

The perception of the dean as a leader by others is widespread although most deans do not share the same perception. Despite their protestation to the contrary, the very nature of the dean's role calls for leadership (Enarson, 1968; Gould, 1964; Meeth, 1971; Rosenheim, 1963; Schneider, 1970). In their roles as academic leaders, deans must acknowledge the conditions of their positions, be able to persuade, to delegate responsibilities and be good managers.

With regard to the conditions of their responsibilities that deans must acknowledge, Feltner and Goodsell (1972) propose two:

1. Academic deans must recognize that theirs is the role of the academic leader and not faculty servant.
2. As academic leader, the dean must view the management of conflict through the method of confrontation as a primary responsibility. This will require great skill, since the dean's greatest potential for leadership depends upon his ability to exercise influence and suggestion. He must "light the way," as it were. (p. 695)

With regard to persuasion, Enarson (1968) warns:

The dean is likely to persuade only if he has a genuine, and not a feigned, respect for the views of others. His rank will avail him little if he is not, in fact, well-informed and reflective. (p. 68)

This ability to persuade will be needed to affect a number of levels of administration. Conant (1967) shares Enarson's observation when he reports deans must have the ability to influence department chairpersons, important faculty members, and top levels of administration within the institution.

In order to have time available to carry out these functions, deans must also have the ability to delegate routine affairs to others (Selznick, 1957). McGrath (1964) supports this notion when he affirms, "The occupant of the dean's office has to learn how to discharge its varied responsibilities creditably" (p. viii). He adds:

Unless the dean frees himself from the routine chores of the office, however, and reserves some free time for study and reflection on the purposes and the program of the academic body over which he presides his decisions must inevitably be superficial, uninformed, and often inconsistent. (p. ix)

McGrath (1947) also recognizes a change in the traditional role of dean and believes that academic leadership
requires the dean to be a good manager.

This officer (the dean) is rapidly ceasing to be an intellectual leader. More and more he is devoting his time and energy to managerial duties, public-relations activities, and the minutiae of routine administration. (p. 41)

Gould (1964) concludes that the easiest way to understand leadership the academic dean must exhibit is to equate productivity with excellence and outstanding ability. He says, "Leadership amounts to front-ranking skill by virtue of the surpassing quality in the dean's scholarship."

The Academic Dean as Mediator or Conciliator

The academic dean must also fill the role of mediator or conciliator (Feltner & Goodsell, 1972; Fishman, 1963; Rosenheim, 1963). This role can be clearly discerned when looking at the "middleman" metaphor used by Fishman (1963) to describe the academic dean. Because of this middleman position, he contends the academic dean must "gain and maintain the trust and cooperation of his faculty and of higher administration alike" (p. 306). Further, he asserts, the dean is responsible for "representing his school and his faculty to upper administrative authorities" and simultaneously representing "the upper administration on the local scene" (p. 305). Fishman writes:

The dean should be truly bicultural man, fully at home in two neighboring cultures, fully accepted by both, committed to both, and, therefore, able to interpret the one to the other and able to be the instrument of social change between them to the end
that they operate as one rather than two cultures. (p. 306)

This function can be executed only if the dean has the trust and cooperation of faculty as well as higher administration.

McGrath (1964) is also in full agreement with the mediator role the dean must play. He remarks:

The academic commonwealth ought not to be a loose federation of quasi-autonomous subject-matter principalities, but rather a cohesive society in which community interest prevails over individual. The dean by position perspective, and responsibility should be the person qualified to represent and articulate these over-riding interests. If he rejects these responsibilities . . . it is hard to see how the institution can have any clear sense of mission and the education of its students any commonality of purpose or substance. (p. viii)

Feltner and Goodsell (1972) echo this claim when they assert academic deans must be able to present either grievances of the faculty or administration when there is a conflict. In addition, they believe deans must be cautious not to express their personal preferences so they will not be seen as taking sides. A dean, they advise, "must wear two hats equally well, and leave 'causes' to others--a most difficult responsibility" (p. 699). They also hold the opinion that it is wise for a dean to be astute when it comes to negative feelings that may exist between divisions. These feelings may be born out of a variety of decisions--budget allocations, popularity of certain divisions with students, and curriculum thrusts within the institution. In any of
these cases, the dean must take responsibility to clarify positions and act as a conciliator and/or mediator. Unfortunately, this is a role which is often overlooked by the dean (Feltner & Goodsell, 1972).

Miller (1974) is also in full agreement that the role of mediator is a valid one for deans to fill. He sees deans of today inundated with disputes about collective bargaining and identifies them as quasi-lawyers, as they are increasingly called upon to appear before grievance committees to testify on decisions that range from promotions and tenure, to dismissals.

The Academic Dean as Chief Academic Personnel Officer

Although there is usually a personnel officer in higher education institutions who has the job of handling personnel matters for staff members, the academic dean has the ultimate responsibility for faculty personnel matters. This includes faculty recruitment, hiring, dismissal, evaluation and development. In addition, the institution may also employ the same individual or someone else to establish policies and procedures as well as to insure their implementation; however, as chief academic personnel officer the academic dean is also held accountable for these matters.

McGrath (1947) classifies selection of qualified faculty members as one of the major responsibilities of the academic dean. In the 1964 study conducted by Gould, deans were asked to rank, in order of importance, three or four
responsibilities they considered most demanding. Faculty recruitment ranked second on their list.

The academic dean is not a "free agent" in faculty hiring and dismissal, although this individual has influence in the process through advising, counseling and making suggestions (Enarson, 1968). The president always has veto power (Horn, 1968). Miller and Wilson (1963) suggest that during the screening process the academic dean has the responsibility to insure that philosophies of individuals being chosen to fill faculty positions are consistent with institutional purposes. They urge the dean to assist potential faculty members in gaining a total perspective of the institution, its purposes, as well as its problems.

Another major responsibility of the academic dean is coordination of faculty evaluation (Wolotkiewicz, 1980). Wolotkiewicz (1980) cites four reasons why it is important to clearly define and establish specific criteria for faculty evaluations. To summarize her observations, it would be appropriate to state that the first purpose of faculty evaluations is to provide objective data which can be utilized when administrative decisions concerning merit, promotions, and salary increases must be made. The second benefit is to obtain data to be used for making teaching assignments on the basis of course and instructor evaluations. Third, these data can also be used to design faculty development programs and give individual faculty members information that will
assist them in improving their performance. Finally, these
data will add to current research on teaching and learning.

Because quality of an institution is closely related to
its faculty, the academic dean is also responsible for fac­
ulty development (Miller, 1974). In recent years, faculty
development programs have been given increasing importance.
Wolotkiewicz (1980) defines it:

Faculty development may be described as
an institutional process which seeks to
modify the attitudes, skills, and behavior
of faculty members toward greater competence
and effectiveness in meeting student needs,
their own needs, and the needs of the
institution. (p. 103)

The academic dean must also make certain that academic
due process is followed when making tenure and promotion
decisions. Wolotkiewicz (1980) admonishes that guidelines,
rules and regulations for appointing, tenuring and dismissing
faculty should be published. She adds:

Rules, policies, and procedures must be
administered uniformly since handling
each case or situation individually will
ultimately lead to chaos. (p. 22)

Enarson (1968) underscores this premise when he warns
that policies made through individual decisions are likely
to lead to poor decisions and poor policies. He also urges
the dean to "concentrate on policy rather than on individual
cases, on orderly procedures rather than impromptu decisions"
(p. 60). He further states, "The dean has (should have) an
enduring concern for quality, which forces him into a constant
search for standards" (p. 60).
Rosenheim (1968) also stresses the importance of acting from policy when faced with making appointments and promotions. Marshall (1968) supports Rosenheim's idea when he emphasizes that a dean must have strong policies, state them, and follow them, regardless of the consequence.

**The Academic Dean as a Change Agent**

The major lesson that should have been learned by administrators in the 1960s is change will always play a major role in higher education (Feltner & Goodsell, 1972). As such, academic deans should recognize conflict as a major ingredient for change. Therefore, in institutional management, conflict must not be suppressed, avoided, or ignored, but managed (Feltner & Goodsell, 1972).

Feltner and Goodsell (1972) provide the following caveats for academic deans about their performance and role expectations:

1. Academic deans must recognize institutions of higher education as changing organizations and must embrace change as fundamental to vital, quality education.

2. Change often is accompanied by conflict, which when managed properly is healthful to the institution. (p. 695)

They warn that when attempting to manage a conflict situation, it is imperative for the academic dean to recognize each party enters the confrontation with a certain amount of distrust of others. As managers of this situation, the role
of dean is to create an atmosphere of mutual trust and good faith.

Miller (1974) depicts the role of the dean as a change agent when he asserts:

The academic dean occupies the key role of change agent for the academic institution. Whether it be behind the scenes, through persuasion, through stimulating and provoking, through providing faculty development opportunities, through bringing in recognized authorities, or through many other approaches, the academic dean is responsible for improving the overall educational program. (p. 234)

**Relationship with Others in the Institution**

The academic dean is expected to possess the necessary interpersonal skills to maintain good relationships with all components of the institution. Another way of viewing the dean's responsibilities is to examine the relationships that must be maintained with specific individuals within the organization. This section will review relationships that must be maintained with the president, division chairpersons, faculty and students.

**The Academic Dean's Relationship with the President**

Enarson (1968) observes the following:

The academic dean is or should be the president's strong right arm in all matters which touch upon the vigor, the vitality and the direction of the intellectual life of a campus. (p. 57)

As the president's right arm, it is of utmost importance for the dean and the president to have a harmonious relationship. Horn (1968) agrees:
Today in a college—at least in a small one, an institution basically with a single type of objective—the dean must be in harmony with the president. The president of a liberal arts college must be the academic leader of that institution; the dean must act as his chief assistant. If harmony does not exist, the president should get a new dean. . . . there is no question at any time that both president and dean are on the same team, have the same ultimate interests and must work amicably together. (p. 109)

In any work situation differences are unavoidable and an important part of the environment (Miller, 1974). A relationship based on confidence, trust, and support, however, must be developed between the dean and the president within a reasonable time-frame, or, as Miller (1974) puts it, "it is time for the dean to move on" (p. 233). Miller further states, in the president/dean relationship, the dean should have weekly-scheduled conferences with the president and some of this time should be devoted to planning for the future. He also believes the dean should have access to the president during emergency situations.

Gibson (1964) explains that the academic dean should serve the president by fulfilling duties which guarantee the welfare, professional growth and advancement of faculty. To quote Gibson:

He (the dean) also serves the president by keeping him informed of faculty activities, problems, and achievements; and he serves the president by implementing the policies of the board of trustees and the president, policies which concern the faculty. (p. 160)
The Academic Dean's Relationship with Division Chairpersons

Just as the academic dean must work closely and in accord with the president, this person must also be able to have a similar relationship with division chairpersons. The academic dean must recognize that the president is ultimately responsible for all matters concerning the university, as the division chairperson must recognize the academic dean is responsible for directing the educational matters of the institution.

The Assembly on University Goals and Governance (1971) asserts:

... in the American pattern of academic organization, either strong academic deans or strong department chairmen are required. If neither is strong, the institution will suffer; if both are, conflict is likely. In most cases, it is desirable to strengthen the deans as against the department chairmen, lest excessive compartmentalization takes place. (p. 26)

Sandefur and Oglesby (1982) describe the relationship that should exist between the academic dean and division chairpersons by categorizing it into three areas—friendship (social), professional (one-on-one), and administrative team (member). They urge these individuals to begin at the social level by communicating an acceptance of each other "as individuals of equal worth" (p. 5). They stress social relationships that may develop should not be allowed to "block or interfere with administrative judgment and action" (p. 5).
With regard to the professional aspect of the relationship, the authors acknowledge that the dean gives authority to the position of chairperson to fulfill responsibilities of the job, as well as the university's administrative line relationships. They caution the dean to never approve any action that would be detrimental or destructive to the institution or the division. It is inevitable that errors in judgment will occur from time to time, but mistakes should not only be corrected in a professional, cooperative, and supportive manner, but should also be forgotten (Sandefur & Oglesby, 1982).

With regard to the administrative aspect of the division chairperson/dean relationship, Sandefur and Oglesby (1982) classify the chairperson as one who is willing to participate as an administrative team member. They underscore this premise by further stating participation will be shown when a division chairperson:

1. Supports adopted college-wide policies and procedures;

2. Follows established administrative line and staff procedures in transacting departmental affairs;

3. Works actively toward the achievement of departmental, college and university goals as an administrative team member. (p. 6)
They give the dean responsibility for providing leadership to the college and its division in establishing goals, admitting "the college and its departments, like people, will flounder in mediocrity without goals" (p. 6). They describe the goal-setting process as one of the most important functions of the dean's administrative council. The dean is responsible for leading the college and its divisions in the goal-setting process. The division chairperson must support the dean in this effort by holding faculty accountable for achieving goals through the evaluation process (Sandefur & Oglesby, 1982).

Dressel, Johnson, and Marcus (1969) refer to the relationship between division chairpersons and academic deans as "a confidence game." Two key objectives of this gamesmanship relationship are (1) the acquisition of resources, and (2) the freedom to use them. To this end, a high degree of autonomy is necessary; however, "autonomy is meaningless without adequate resources" (p. 274). These resources are dependent upon the existence of both division self-confidence and mutual confidence among chairpersons, the dean, and the institution.

Gould (1964) claims the relationship that exists between academic deans and division chairpersons is closely correlated with the size of the institution. In small colleges, academic deans give equal importance to their relationships with division chairpersons as well as the president and informal
faculty leaders; whereas, academic deans who work in larger institutions place more significance on their relationships with division chairpersons than with the president and informal faculty leaders.

Miller (1974) holds the view that relationships between individuals in these two groups vary "according to the interplay of institutional traditions as well as contemporary personalities" (p. 233). He argues that "the institutional tradition of strong or weak departmental structures . . . will influence how the dean will conduct his affairs" (p. 233).

The academic dean should see that leadership training is provided for division chairpersons (Millett, 1978). Millett (1978) sees division chairpersons as going through the ranks from division chairpersons to deans and then advancing up the higher education administrative ladder. At the division level, a chairperson is responsible for program planning and program management. Because of these roles, academic deans should provide an appropriate amount of training in these areas so that these chairpersons can acquire skills to perform these tasks. As a result, annual workshops are now being conducted for them and "some colleges and universities have entered into consortium arrangements for the managerial orientation of new department chairpersons" (Millett, 1978, p. 54).

Wolotkiewicz (1980) summarizes the role the dean should play when she states this individual should be able to
interpret administrative views to division chairpersons; stimulate their growth, and act as an observer and resource person for program development; look for ways to strengthen division functions; and simultaneously resolve competition between divisions.

The Academic Dean's Relationship with Faculty

Gibson (1964) renders the following explanation concerning the relationship the dean should have with faculty:

The dean of faculties should serve as a liaison person between the president and the faculty. . . . He also serves the faculty by presenting their requests, opinions, and problems to the president. He also creates for them a climate conducive to intellectual and professional achievement and removes, insofar as he is able, the elements of insecurity. (p. 160)

His observation confirms the findings of the Carnegie Commission (1973) that also reports that the dean is inextricably involved with the faculty.

Ciardi (1968), Clark (1961) and Marshall (1968) speak to tension that inevitably exists between faculty and administration and describe it as natural. These writers suggest to deans that there are no cure-all solutions or resolutions, and the problems do not require that they achieve either containment or victory, but that they devise an approach of living with these tensions.

An examination of the literature reveals the notion that academic deans usually move through the faculty ranks to
this position (Anderson, 1981; Dearing, 1963; Marshall, 1963; Millett, 1968). Although deans possess a professional background similar to faculty, the faculty need an individual to whom they may look for leadership.

Faculties do, however, need advice and leadership which they often do not generate by themselves; and for this role the well-chosen administrator (dean), stimulating the faculty and proposing measures to it, is in an ideal position. (Fuch, 1962, p. 106)

The dean's colleague relationship with faculty is the most difficult, complex, rewarding, and sometimes the most frustrating of all roles. Trying to keep the process going is one of the heaviest drains on energy and psyche, but this partnership is the key to quality of program and quality of job satisfaction (Jarrett, 1981).

Regardless of the relationship that exists between them, the dean should acquaint the faculty with institutional information, encourage faculty to expand their competency areas and satisfy institutional requirements, and provide leadership and resources for faculty development activities (Wolotkiewicz, 1980).

The Academic Dean's Relationship with Students

Findings in the literature vary on the type of relationship the dean should have with students. On the one hand, it is reported that deans in larger institutions have a counterpart position often referred to as dean of students or dean of student affairs. Deans or their delegates have
responsibility for many of the problems experienced by students—"counseling, contacts with parents and with employers" (Corson, 1960, p. 254). There is also a director or dean of admissions to handle responsibilities of student selection, in addition to a position of registrar that is ultimately responsible for keeping student records. This frees the academic dean of these burdens (Corson, 1960).

On the other hand, literature on smaller institutions indicates that the academic dean may have all of these responsibilities—academic and personal counseling of students, registration, keeping student records, contacting parents, student financial matters, and the duty to perform a wide range of correspondence to a variety of individuals (Corson, 1960).

Another observer sums it up when he states the amount of time which the academic dean will devote to students is dependent upon the institution's size and organizational structure (Dupont, 1968). He admonishes the dean who delegates "problems of recruitment, admissions, guidance, selection of courses, registration, records, advice, discipline, housing, feeding, class schedules, etc." (p. 14) to understand the ultimate responsibility for these services remains in the dean's office.

In describing the relationship between the dean and students, Wolotkiewicz (1980) indicates deans should make all attempts to understand students in terms of their
surroundings and needs and guarantee that appropriate services are provided.

Functions and Responsibilities of the Academic Dean

Just as the academic dean has many roles, this individual also has many functions. In 1929 and 1932, Reeves and Russell made the earliest attempts to determine the functions of the academic dean. Their 1929 study surveys 16 independent and state colleges. The second study in 1932 looks at administrative conditions in 35 Methodist Episcopal Church colleges. Major functions assigned to deans in the Reeves and Russell studies and in other literature include: academic functions, personnel functions, and student-related functions. This section will review these functions.

Academic Functions

The study by Reeves and Russell (1929) posit six academic functions the dean should perform:

1. Direct educational activities of the college.
2. Act as chief advisor to the president in matters pertaining to policies of the college.
3. Compile reports relating to the work of the college.
4. Serve as a member of the administrative council.
5. Represent the college at meetings of educational institutions.
6. Direct the attention of faculty members to changing educational thought and practices, particularly as they affect higher education.
First and foremost, the academic dean is to provide the educational institution with academic leadership. Sandin (1969) embraces this idea when he reports the primary function of administration is:

1. To create a climate of internal security, through organizational engineering, which will encourage productive imagination.

2. To assemble the information required for collective planning and to make that information available to staff.

3. To create conditions which allow the realization of collective purpose—i.e., to make possible in the future what is not possible today. (p. 27)

He summarizes the task of the administrator by saying, "Never be a bottleneck" (p. 27).

Dupont (1968) believes one of the academic functions of deans is to keep abreast of educational developments in order to evaluate their institution, and use good judgment to advise the president and faculty.

The academic dean is expected to be an effective academic leader. Corson (1960) maintains:

... there are some academic deans who measure up to the functions which are theirs, who regularly meet with and stimulate the departmental faculties, who press successfully for building up the membership of weak departments, and who bring members of departments together in fruitful exploration of opportunities for interdepartmental teaching and research, and in consideration of the students' and society's needs. (p. 79)
Administrative Functions

Reeves and Russell's (1929) list contains three administrative functions:

1. To formulate educational policies and present them to the president and faculty for consideration.

2. To transmit to the president budget recommendations for academic activities after details have been worked out with department chairpersons.

3. To classify students and assign them to classes.

They gain support for the foregoing from Salmen (1971) who considers academic deans as the most vital group of administrators in American higher education, since it is their responsibility to "translate the aspirations of teachers into an organized program which will fall within the necessities of the budget" (p. 63).

Salmen (1971) believes the dean must also have the acumen to recommend to faculty the most efficient organization of degree programs and appoint committees to investigate and report on specific problems.

Barzun (1968) notes functions of the academic dean as insuring:

... that scholarship funds keep up with inflation and student needs; that the quality of applicants to the school remains high and his admissions office chooses the best; [and] that his graduates obtain good posts and ripen into generous alumni. (p. 115)
Institutional Functions

Reeves and Russell (1929) describe the institution-related function assigned to the academic dean as "The supervision of curricula, courses, and methods of instruction" (p. 74). In agreement, Barzun (1968) explains the dean is responsible for insuring that course offerings are sufficient, current, and properly instructed and students are somewhat satisfied.

Nichols (1980) recognizes the chief academic officer as responsible for "enhancement of the intellectual climate of the institution" (p. 164). He acknowledges:

In most situations, academic deans also are held responsible for the curriculum and instruction within their schools, and they are expected to see to the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of their curricular programs and instructional practices. (p. 180)

DeVane (1968) aligns himself with the above authors when he asserts:

The dean must think of the curriculum in its totality and proportion as well as piecemeal, and must scrutinize the quality and appropriateness of each course, and if possible curb the endless proliferation of courses.

Personnel Functions

A function of the academic dean cited in the Reeves and Russell (1929) study is to work closely with division chairpersons in the submission of candidates to be considered for the faculty, and make recommendations to the president concerning faculty members' promotion, demotion or dismissal.
Additional support for Reeves and Russell is offered by Gibson (1964):

. . . record keeping and official procedures connected with all faculty appointments; . . . resignations, leaves-of-absence, and sabbatical leaves; records of personnel data and vital statistics concerning the faculty; administering the budget for faculty salaries, and the issuance of salary letters; record keeping and official procedures concerning approved and official faculty travel; compiling and editing a faculty bibliography; requiring yearly professional activity reports from each member of the faculty and compiling the data from them into a report for the president . . . (p. 161)

Wolotkiewicz (1980) aligns herself with Gibson when she assigns similar functions to the dean:

He shall be responsible for recommendations on salaries, salary changes, appointments, reappointments, terminal appointments, decisions not to reappoint, post-retirement appointments, promotions, and granting of tenure for members of his college or for ultimate action thereon when such authority has been delegated to him by the vice president to whom he reports or the President. (p. 26)

Blackwell (1966) ranks "the attraction and retention of the best faculty the institution can support" (p. 24) as two chief responsibilities of deans. He admits that in larger institutions deans may be able to delegate responsibility of recruitment and screening to others; whereas, in smaller colleges they may be required to take full responsibility. "But in either case," Blackwell advises, "he should exert every effort to see that faculty appointments that he approves are in the best interest of the institution" (p. 24).
Dodds (1962) states:

An alert academic dean will be conferring all through the years regarding personnel needs, plans for the future, qualifications of those on the job, and bright prospects elsewhere. (p. 133)

**Student Related Functions**

Reeves and Russell's (1929) list contains the following student-related functions:

1. To study the programs and academic welfare of students.
2. To serve as chief disciplinary officer of the college.

Some observers have suggested beliefs contrary to what Reeves and Russell report. They explain that the academic dean has been forced to give up these functions and they are now being handled by dean's assistants, dean of students, and registrar (Corson, 1960; McVey & Hughes, 1952).

**Professional Preparation of the Dean**

There is a consensus in the literature that those appointed to the academic deanship have received little, if any, formal training for that post. Agreement also exists on the diverse professional experiences, educational backgrounds, and qualifications individuals bring to these jobs. Academic deans are classified as a hybrid group of individuals who vary in age and in number of years they usually occupy these positions (Cyphert & Zimpfer, 1980; Enarson, 1968; Gould, 1968; McGrath, 1947; Moore, 1971). McGrath (1947) refers to
them as "a miscellaneous collection of academic specimens"  
(p. 40).

For the most part, however, deans in colleges and  
universities ascend to these appointments from academic ranks.  
Moore (1971) believes this is done under the assumption that  
"academic accomplishments qualify academicians to serve as  
administrators" (p. 28). Unfortunately, no correlation has  
been found to exist between accomplished academicians and  
skillful administrators (Ingraham & King, 1968).

Enarson (1968) illuminates the dilemma of the dean's  
preparation in this passage:

The academic dean is not "trained" in any  
sense for the job. He may have served an  
apprenticeship as assistant to the presi­
dent; more commonly he will have been a  
successful departmental chairman or dean  
of the college. In any event he is picked  
because it is felt, always on the basis of  
too little evidence, that he has administra­
tive ability. . . . We can be certain about  
one thing: the gap between what he has done  
and what he is now expected to do is a big  
one. (p. 69)

A conclusion made by McGrath (1947) about the group of  
aademic deans is they are "above the average in scholarly  
interest and reputation, and, on the whole, have been drawn  
from traditional and older, rather than from newer disci­
plines" (p. 41).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides a description of the research procedures followed to obtain answers to the research questions posed in this study. These procedures are presented under four major headings: (1) design of the study; (2) instrumentation; (3) selection of the sample; and (4) data analysis procedures.

Design of the Study

The following provides a description of the research methodology employed in this study. This study was descriptive in nature and used a survey research design. Two legitimate questions may be asked about this study. First, why descriptive research? And second, why survey research? Van Dalen (1970) answers the first question best when he notes:

Before much progress can be made in any field, scholars must possess descriptions of the phenomena with which they work. Early developments in educational research, therefore, as in other disciplines, have been concerned with making accurate assessments of the incidence, distribution, and relationships of phenomena in the field. To solve problems . . . investigators ask the question: What exists—what is the present status of these phenomena? Determining the nature of prevailing conditions,
practices, and attitudes—seeking accurate descriptions of activities, objects, processes, and persons—is their objective. (p. 284)

It follows, therefore, that descriptive research was an excellent starting point.

The second question, why survey research? Good (1963) responds to this question by reporting that survey research gives the researcher the means:

1. To secure evidence concerning the existing situation or current condition.
2. To identify standards or norms with which to compare present conditions, in order to plan the next step.
3. To determine how to take the next step after having determined what steps to take. (pp. 244-245)

In addition to what Good reports, survey research also:

1. Provides the researcher with a wide scope so that a great deal of information can be obtained from a large population. (Kerlinger, 1964)
2. Allows for a diversity of respondents who "... can give a remarkably accurate portrait of ... [their] values, attitudes, and beliefs." (Kerlinger, 1964, p. 422)
3. Increases the generalizability of the data collected since it can be sent to a representative sample of respondents.

Although the above information speaks to advantages of descriptive surveys, they are not without limitations. The researcher has an obligation to see that some of these limitations are identified. Good (1963) identifies some of them:
1. Information that is not known to the respondents cannot be obtained in surveys . . .

2. Information that is not salient to the respondents cannot be obtained in a reliable way . . .

3. Information about activities shared by a very small proportion of the population cannot be obtained in a reliable way in cross-section surveys . . .

4. Surveys cannot be aimed at obtaining exact quantitative forecasts of things to come. (pp. 248-249)

Identification of advantages and disadvantages of a particular type of research is what Kerlinger (1964) calls "the principles of symmetry." Notwithstanding well-designed descriptive studies, the strengths and utility of descriptive surveys still outweigh the weaknesses.

Instrumentation

Data for this study were obtained using the questionnaire: "A National Study of Two-Year College Administration." This survey was conducted by William Moore, Jr., Professor of Educational Administration, The Ohio State University. Administrators completing the instrument included presidents, deans, division chairpersons and other selected staff. Administrators were asked to complete the instrument to determine their perception of administration in their respective colleges (see Appendix A).

Specific items used in the questionnaire were developed by the investigator after identifying the elements and
determining the indicators. Questions were then drafted and sent to the Polimetrics Laboratory of The Ohio State University for the development of a format and coding. After the instrument was returned, questions were compiled, typed, and duplicated. While in draft form, the instrument was critiqued via mail by a panel of experts for critical review and recommendations. The panel included twenty selected community college administrators—five presidents, five deans of instruction, five deans of students and five department chairpersons. Panel members were requested to review the instrument giving close attention as to whether questions were clear, concise, appropriate, in logical order, and without discernible bias and omissions. They were also asked to provide suggestions for additional questions. After all panel members returned drafts of the proposed instruments, revisions were made that responded to criticisms and suggestions. Following these revisions, this same group was again given the opportunity to react to the revised instrument.

After additional adjustments were made, the instrument was further scrutinized by a panel of five persons who have expertise in questionnaire construction. When individual written responses about the instrument were received, the questionnaire was further revised. A conference telephone call was then placed to discuss their recommendations and revisions.
Twenty two-year college administrators were then selected to pilot test the instrument. These individuals were requested to complete the questionnaire, supply the investigator with the length of time spent completing it, and to make comments and suggestions.

The instrument was then in final form. It contained a total of 71 items and was divided into eight sections: personal information, career information, institutional characteristics, personal beliefs and opinions, governance, administration, administrative preparation, and career satisfaction. Items on the questionnaire were designed to respond to information concerning each of these categories. Instruments were then coded by the researcher so that a follow-up to non-respondents could be made. All other necessary arrangements were made for mailing the questionnaire to the sample. Each individual was mailed the coded instrument and a business reply envelope. Three weeks after the first mailing of the instrument, follow-up letters were mailed as reminders (see Appendix B). Three weeks after mailing follow-up letters, another instrument, cover letter and business reply envelope were mailed to all who had not responded.

Selection of the Sample

Deans of instruction for this study were taken from a stratified random sample of a population of two-year colleges from 49 of the 50 states. The 147 institutions included in
the sample were stratified according to institutional type, comprising community, technical, and independent and public junior colleges. They were the targeted institutions in "A National Study of Two-Year College Administrators" (Moore, 1982).

After these colleges were selected, a letter was sent to each institution requesting a copy of the current catalogue (see Appendix C). These catalogues were used to generate a roster of names in order that each person in the sample could be addressed by appropriate title.

Data Analysis Procedures

As instruments were returned, they were reviewed for accuracy of completion and coded by administrative position. Responses were recorded from the instrument, transferred to coding sheets and then verified and key punched on IBM cards in preparation for data processing by computer.

Information on deans of instruction in community and technical colleges was extracted from these overall data.

To provide answers to research questions numbers one and three listed under General Information, questions one, two, and three listed under Attitudes, and one, two, three, and five listed under Administration, participant responses to appropriate questions on the questionnaire were analyzed. For each of these items, responses were categorized and frequency and percentage of responses in each category were
computed. This provided a quantitative assessment of the responses. The report of these analyses uses descriptive statistics.

Research questions that looked at comparisons—question two listed under General Information, question four listed under Attitudes, and questions four and six listed under Administration, used a chi square test of independence to examine relationships between type of institution and several variables. These variables included demographic data, attitudes toward mission, governance and level of satisfaction, perceptions on the greatest academic concern, and perceptions on the variable that most inhibits their effectiveness as administrators.

The computer programs used in the statistical analysis were taken from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND FINDINGS

This chapter reports the results of the data analysis of responses received from deans of instruction in community and technical colleges. The research questions investigated in this study were:

1. What are the demographic characteristics of the individuals who hold the dean of instruction position?

2. Is there a difference between the demographic characteristics of deans of instruction in community colleges and those of deans of instruction in technical colleges?

3. What type of academic training do these deans have?

4. What attitudes do deans of instruction hold about the mission of their institutions relative to their admission policy, special educational services, and remedial education?

5. What attitudes do deans of instruction hold about governance in their institutions?

6. What is the level of satisfaction deans of instruction receive from their positions?

7. Do deans of instruction in community colleges and technical colleges differ in their attitude toward mission, governance, and level of satisfaction?

8. To what extent do deans of instruction perceive their graduate training as adequately preparing them for their current administrative positions?

9. What type of academic training do these deans of instruction perceive as important for persons aspiring to their positions?
10. Is there agreement between deans of instruction in these colleges as to what they perceive to be their greatest academic concerns?

11. Do deans of instruction in these colleges differ in their perception of their greatest academic concern?

12. What factors do deans of instruction in community colleges and technical colleges perceive to most inhibit their effectiveness as administrators?

13. Do the perceptions of deans of instruction in community colleges differ from the perceptions of deans of instruction in technical colleges with regard to what inhibits their effectiveness as administrators?

Of the 52 survey questionnaires completed and returned by respondents, 69 percent (36) were from deans of instruction in community colleges and 15.3 percent (8) were from deans of instruction in technical colleges. The remaining 15.3 percent (8) were not included in this study because they represented deans of instruction in private junior colleges.

The data are presented in three sections. Section one reports the demographic profile of 36 community college deans of instruction and 8 technical college deans of instruction who participated in this study. In section two the analyses of data gathered concerning attitudes are presented. Section three describes the data analysis for the questions related to administration.

**Demographic Profile of Respondent Groups**

This section reports the demographic profile of respondents surveyed in this study. Deans of instruction in community and technical colleges provided descriptive
information concerning their age, sex, marital status, ethnic background, years of two-year college administrative experience, other administrative positions held, and experience in the military, businesses/industry, and administrative experience at the secondary level. Information concerning salary and academic training is also reported. The results of the analysis of demographic data are reported in the narrative and tables which follow.

**Age of Respondents**

Of the 36 deans of instruction in community colleges, 30.6 percent (11) ranged from age 31 to 40. An additional 30.6 percent (11) were between the ages of 41 to 50. The age range 51 to 60 encompassed the greater percentage of responding deans with 36.1 percent (13) in that range. Only 2.8 percent (1) were over age 60.

Deans of instruction (8) in technical colleges were between the ages of 35 and 56. Twenty-five percent (2) were 35 years old. Ages 39, 41, 45, 47, 50, and 56 each represented 12.5 percent (1) of the responding deans. With regard to age, there was no significant difference between the ages of deans of instruction in the community colleges and those in technical colleges. Table 1 illustrates the ages of deans of instruction in community and technical colleges surveyed in this study.
TABLE 1

Age Ranges for Deans of Instruction in Community and Technical Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-60</th>
<th>Over 60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11 30.6</td>
<td>11 30.5</td>
<td>13 30.1</td>
<td>1 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Colleges</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 37.5</td>
<td>4 50.0</td>
<td>1 12.5</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14 31.8</td>
<td>15 34.0</td>
<td>14 31.8</td>
<td>1 2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sex of Respondents

Although much is being written about women holding higher ranking positions in education institutions, this does not seem to be the case in two-year colleges. In both community and technical colleges 86.3 percent (38) of the deans of instruction were male with only 13 percent (6) females. Therefore, as indicated in Table 2, the vast majority of the respondents were male.

Marital Status of Respondents

Marital status was considered as a variable. The majority of the respondents indicated that they were married. In community colleges, 86.1 percent (32) of the respondents were married and 87.5 percent (7) of the technical college deans were married. None of the technical college deans were single; however, 8.3 percent (3) in community colleges were single. The divorced/separated category encompassed 5.6 percent (2) of community college deans and 12.5 percent (1) of the technical college deans.

Race of Respondents

The race of the respondents is illustrated in Table 3. The overwhelming majority, 88.9 percent (32), of community college respondents were White, with 8.3 percent (3) Black, and only 2.8 percent (1) Hispanic. All eight of the responding deans of instruction in the technical colleges were White. As these statistics have confirmed, minorities in this study were in a position similar to that of women.
TABLE 2

Sex of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Colleges</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Colleges</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Years of experience as an administrator varied for responding deans. Ranges of these years are depicted in Table 4. The years of experience for community college deans of instruction ranged from one to 18. The range of experience for 25 percent (9) of them was between one to five years. Almost 42 percent of them, 41.7 percent (15) had six to ten years of experience. And the range of experience for 25 percent (9) of them was between 11 to 15 years. Finally, 8.3 percent (3) had over 15 years of experience.

Technical college deans of instruction's years of experience in administration were grouped into the ranges that follow: 12.5 percent (1) had between one to five years of experience; another 12.5 percent (1) were in the range from six to ten years; while the majority, 62.5 percent (5), had between 11 and 15 years of experience. Only one (12.5%) reported more than 15 years of experience.

In sum, a majority of the respondents had been an administrator in two-year colleges a significant period—between six and 15 years.

Other Two-Year College Administrative Positions Held

Table 5 displays a composite list of other administrative positions held by the responding deans in two-year colleges prior to their present positions as deans of instruction. These positions included department chairpersons, 19.4
TABLE 4

Years of Service as an Administrator in Two-Year Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1-5 years</th>
<th>6-10 years</th>
<th>11-15 years</th>
<th>Over 15 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9  25.0</td>
<td>15  41.7</td>
<td>9  25.0</td>
<td>3  8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Colleges</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1  12.5</td>
<td>1  12.5</td>
<td>5  62.5</td>
<td>1  12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10 22.7</td>
<td>16 36.3</td>
<td>14 31.8</td>
<td>4  9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5

Previous Administrative Positions Held in Two-Year Colleges by Deans of Instruction Prior to Present Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Community Colleges (N = 36)</th>
<th>Technical Colleges (N = 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Chairperson</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairperson</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean - Other</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Assistant</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
percent (7), division chairpersons, 16.7 percent (6), directors, 13.9 percent (5), and other positions as dean, 11.1 percent (4). Two (5.6%) deans of instruction had held assistant dean positions, and a like number had held a position as program coordinator; similarly, two had held the position of administrative assistant. In addition, one individual (2.8%) had held the position of vice president, one (2.8%) a dean of students position, one (2.8%) associate dean, one (2.8%) registrar, and one an unspecified position. 8

Deans in technical colleges had held the following administrative positions: 37.5 percent (3) had been department chairpersons, 25 percent (2) had held no other administrative positions, and 12.5 percent (1) had held the positions of president, vice president and division chairperson. These statistics support the literature which indicates that deans of instruction move through the administrative ranks, especially from the division/department chairperson role which on the organizational chart is directly below the position of dean of instruction (Millett, 1978). Of all responding deans 38.6 percent (17) had served as division/department chairpersons. Only 11 percent (5) of the respondents had no previous administrative experience.

Military Service Experience of Respondents

More of the respondents in the community colleges had previous military experience than those who did not. As
shown in Table 6, 44.4 percent (16) of the respondents had between one to five years in the military, 11.1 percent (4) had between six to ten years of experience and 2.8 percent (1) had more than eleven years of experience. Respondents reporting that they had no military experience were 41.7 percent (15).

In technical colleges years of military experience held by respondents were equally divided. Fifty percent (4) of the deans had no military experience, while 50 percent (4) had between one to five years of experience.

Previous Managerial Positions Held in Business/Industry

A considerable number of individuals who have worked in business and industry are said to have migrated to the two-year college setting. While this may be true, the vast majority of respondents in both the community and technical colleges did not have such experience. More specifically, in the community colleges 77.8 percent (28) had no managerial experience in business or industry, while 22.2 percent (8) did. In the technical colleges the statistics were 75 percent (6) and 25 percent (2) respectively.

In sum, one dean in five in the community colleges had spent time in business or industry and one in four had done so in the technical colleges.
### TABLE 6

Years of Military Experience of Two-Year College Deans of Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1-5 years</th>
<th>6-10 years</th>
<th>11-15 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Colleges</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrative Experience in Public or Parochial Schools

During the early years of the community and technical colleges and up to the mid-1960s, most deans of instruction came from public and parochial schools. This no longer seems to be the case. The majority of deans of instruction in community and technical colleges surveyed in this study reported no previous administrative experience in either public or parochial schools, 75 percent (33).

Salary Ranges of Respondents

All deans of instruction in this study were on 12-month contracts. Both community and technical college deans earned salaries that ranged from $25,000 to $45,000 and above. (See Table 7)

Comparison of Demographic Data Between Community and Technical College Deans

The chi square statistic was used to test the relationship between the types of two-year colleges in which the deans of instruction were employed and responses to questions related to demographic characteristics. Only two significant relationships were found. The first was between the type of institution and the length of service as an administrator. At the .05 level of significance, a significant relationship (0.04) was found.

The second significant relationship was found between the type of institution and salary ranges. At the .05 level of significance, a significant relationship (0.05) was found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>25,000-29,999</th>
<th>30,000-34,999</th>
<th>35,000-39,999</th>
<th>40,000-44,999</th>
<th>Over 45,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2 5.6</td>
<td>6 16.7</td>
<td>13 36.1</td>
<td>10 27.8</td>
<td>5 13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Colleges</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 37.5</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>4 50.0</td>
<td>1 12.5</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5 11.3</td>
<td>6 13.6</td>
<td>17 38.6</td>
<td>11 25.0</td>
<td>5 11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deans of instruction in both types of institutions earned salaries that ranged from $25,000 to $45,000 and above, with deans' salaries in the community colleges clustering around $25,000 to $44,999, and at $35,000 to $39,000 in the technical colleges.

**Highest Academic Degree Earned by Respondents**

Table 8 illustrates the academic degrees earned by respondents. Most of the deans of instruction in both community and technical colleges held the Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree, with the percentage slightly higher in the community college. Similarly, the number of deans who held the master's degree was slightly higher in technical colleges. More explicitly, 66.7 percent (24) of the deans of instruction in community colleges held the Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree compared with 62.5 percent (5) of the deans of instruction in technical colleges. With regard to the master's degree, 37.5 percent (3) of the deans in the technical colleges held the master's degree compared with 30.6 percent (11) who held this degree in the community college.

**Academic Background of Respondents**

The academic profile of deans of instruction in two-year colleges looks similar to the academic profile of deans in four-year institutions. An analysis of the findings revealed that these individuals had administrative backgrounds as well as academic backgrounds. This is indicated in Tables 9-12.
TABLE 8

Highest Academic Degree Held by Deans of Instruction in Community and Technical Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Master's Degree</th>
<th>Ph.D./Ed.D. Degree</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Colleges</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9

Major Fields of Study for Community College Deans of Instruction at the Bachelors, Masters and Doctorate Level by Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields of Study Major</th>
<th>B.A./B.S.</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities/Fine Arts</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Engineering</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Degree at This Level</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10

Minor Fields of Study for Community College Deans of Instruction at the Bachelors, Masters and Doctorate Level by Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields of Study Minor</th>
<th>B.A./B.S.</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities/Fine Arts</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Engineering</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Minor Area of Study at This Degree Level</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Degree at This Level</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 11

Major Fields of Study for Technical College Deans of Instruction at the Bachelors, Masters and Doctorate Level by Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields of Study Major</th>
<th>B.A./B.S.</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities/Fine Arts</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Engineering</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Degree at This Level</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields of Study Minor</td>
<td>B.A./B.S.</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities/Fine Arts</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Engineering</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Minor Area of Study at This Degree Level</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Degree at This Level</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the undergraduate level, the deans of instruction in the community colleges majored in the following areas: secondary education 25 percent (9), humanities/fine arts 16.7 percent (6), a like number in science/engineering, and liberal arts 11.1 percent (4). Mathematics majors comprised 8.3 percent (3) and business administration 2.8 percent (1). Approximately 17 percent (6) indicated "other" majors, but did not specify.

The academic minor areas in which community college deans studied as undergraduates included: liberal arts 16.7 percent, humanities/fine arts 11.1 percent (4), science/engineering 11.1 percent (4), secondary education 5.6 percent (2), mathematics 5.6 percent (2), educational administration 2.8 percent (1) and business administration 2.8 percent (1). Approximately 31 percent (11) of the responding deans did not have a minor area of study at the undergraduate level and one dean, 2.8 percent, did not hold an undergraduate degree.

At the graduate level (M.A.), deans of instruction in the community colleges continued their majors in a variety of areas of study. Educational administration, however, attracted almost a third of them, 30.6 percent (11). Science/engineering attracted 16.7 percent (6), and 8.3 percent (3) majored in each of the other areas of secondary education, and humanities/fine arts. Only two (5.6%) majored in business administration and two (5.6%) in liberal arts.
Six (16.7%) deans checked "other" as their academic major, but did not specify.

Although 50 percent of the deans of instruction in the community colleges reported they had no academic minor area of study at the masters level, the remaining 50 percent had a significant distribution of academic minors among them. The percentages of 5.6 (2) were alike in the following fields of study: educational administration, business administration, secondary education, liberal arts, science/engineering, and mathematics. Two (5.6 percent) specified "other."

Of those community college deans who held the terminal degree, 50 percent (18) had majored in educational administration, 8.3 percent (3) in science/engineering, 5.6 percent (2) in humanities/fine arts and 2.8 percent (1) in fine arts.

The technical college deans also reported a variety of undergraduate major areas of study. Twenty-five percent (2) majored in science/engineering and twenty-five percent (2) in liberal arts. The percentages of 12.5 were alike in the following fields of study: business administration, secondary education, humanities/fine arts. One dean (12.5%) indicated "other."

Twenty-five percent (2) of the respondents indicated their undergraduate academic minor areas of study as secondary education, and a corresponding 25 percent (2) as liberal arts. One (12.5%) dean majored in business administration and another in science/engineering. Twenty-five percent (2) of
the deans did not have minor areas of study in their undergraduate programs.

At the masters level, 25 percent (2) of the deans majored in secondary education, with 25 percent (2) indicating "other." Educational administration, business administration, humanities/fine arts and science/engineering were the majors of each of the remaining deans.

Of those deans who held the doctorate degree, 37.5 percent (3) majored in educational administration and 25 percent (2) reported "other."

It is clear from the findings that no distinct pattern of academic major or minor areas of study emerged with the exception of educational administration.

Deans of Instruction in Community and Technical Colleges Attitudes on Certain Variables

This section analyzes the data gathered on deans in the two types of institutions studied on certain variables. These variables included: admissions policy, special educational services, remedial education, and governance. Deans were also questioned about the level of satisfaction they received from their positions. The type of institution in which the respondents worked was then compared to their responses concerning each of these variables to test for significant differences in the relationship.
Respondents' Attitudes Concerning Admissions Policy

Deans of instruction reported they were committed to the "open-door" philosophy. All (36) of the community college deans of instruction indicated that the "open-door" admissions policy should definitely be continued. Fifty percent (18) added, however, if retained there should be some restrictions.

In a like manner, all of the technical college deans of instruction gave their support to the "open-door" admissions concept, with 37.5 percent (3) who added that, if retained, it should have some restrictions.

Respondents' Attitudes Concerning Special Educational Services

With regard to providing special educational services to academically disadvantaged students, 58.3 percent (21) of the responding community college deans of instruction thought such services should be provided only if they are cost effective, 38.9 percent (14) noted such services should be provided regardless of cost and 2.8 percent (1) did not respond to the question.

Approximately 88 percent, 87.5 percent (7) of the responding deans in technical colleges indicated that special educational services to academically disadvantaged students should be provided only if those services are cost effective. Only 12.5 percent (1) expressed the opinion that the services should be provided regardless of the cost.
The overwhelming majority of the deans in both community and technical colleges indicated their institutions currently provided special educational services to academically disadvantaged students. In specific terms, 91.7 percent (33) of the deans in the community colleges and 87.5 percent (7) of deans in the technical colleges indicated that such services were provided at their respective institutions.

Opinions on how successful special educational services have been were positive. In community and technical colleges 88.6 percent (39) reported that these services were successful. Only 2.8 percent (1) of the deans of instruction in the community colleges believed the program was unsuccessful and 2.8 percent (1) indicated no knowledge of the services. Two (5.6%) deans in community colleges and one (12.5%) from a technical college reported that special services programs were not offered in their institutions.

Respondents' Attitudes Concerning Remedial Education

Deans of instruction were asked if remedial education should be restricted to two-year colleges. The responses from 55.5 percent (20) of the community college deans disagreed with such a proposal, while 44.4 percent (16) agreed. Essentially, the deans in the community colleges were split on this item. Of the deans in technical colleges, 87.5 percent (7) disagreed with the opinion that two-year technical colleges should be the only higher education
institution to offer remedial education. Only 12.5 percent (1) agreed.

Given the discretion to either eliminate or retain remedial instruction programs, 91.7 percent (33) of the deans of instruction in community colleges would retain the program. Proposing a cutback on existing programs were 5.6 percent (2) and 2.8 percent (1) indicated "do not know" what action to take.

Deans in technical colleges were equally as supportive, with 87.5 percent (7) indicating that they would retain remedial instruction programs while 12.5 percent (1) would cut back on existing programs.

In sum, the issue of remedial education found strong agreement among the deans from both types of institutions, with 90.9 percent (40) supporting the retention of remedial programs. A small minority, 6.8 percent (3), expressed the opinion that they would retain the programs, but would make some cutbacks, and 2.2 percent (1) reported uncertainty of the action which should be taken.

Respondents' Attitudes Concerning Governance

Opinions concerning shared governance in the management process were mixed. There was almost an even split among deans in the community colleges as to whether shared governance was "more of a political necessity than a managerial necessity," 44.7 percent (15), or whether it was "the most
productive way to make institutional decisions," 38.9 percent (14). A small minority, 13.9 percent (5) saw it as "not a very productive way to make institutional decisions." Two deans (5.6%) reported they "do not know."

There were also varying opinions concerning this issue in technical colleges. Twenty-five percent (2) believed that shared governance was "more of a political necessity than a managerial necessity." A like figure considered it to be "not a very productive way to make institutional decisions," although 37.5 percent (3) thought it to be the most productive. Indicating no knowledge of the process were 12.5 percent (1).

In the area of student participation in the decision-making process within the community colleges, 72.2 percent (26) of the deans considered student participation useful, but they disagreed on the quality of that participation. Viewing student participation in the decision making process as highly useful were 5.6 percent (2), as usually useful were 22.2 percent (8), and as only occasionally useful were 44.4 percent (16). Perceiving student participation as not very useful were 27.8 percent (10).

In like manner, a majority of the deans of instruction in the technical colleges agreed that student participation in the decision-making process was useful, 75 percent (6), but disagreed on its quality. Responding that student participation was highly useful were 12.5 percent (1), usually
useful, 25 percent (2), and only occasionally useful 37.5 percent (3). Twenty-five percent (2) considered student participation not very useful.

Community college deans of instruction gave opinions on the usefulness of board of trustees' participation in the decision-making process at their institutions. Although a large percentage thought such participation was useful, the degree varied. Believing it to be highly useful were 13.9 percent (5), usually useful 27.8 percent (10), and occasionally useful 30.6 (11). Twenty-five percent (9), however, did report that it was not very useful and 28.1 percent (1) indicated "do not know."

All deans in the technical college concurred that board participation in the decision-making process was useful, but in differing degrees. More specifically, 12.5 percent (1) viewed it as highly useful, 75 percent (6) as usually useful and 12.5 percent (1) as occasionally useful.

The usefulness of community participation in the decision-making process was also viewed as useful by the deans of instruction in both community and technical colleges, but in varying degrees. In the community colleges 13.9 percent (5) identified community participation as highly useful, 50 percent (18) believed it to be usually useful and 22.2 percent (8) as occasionally useful. Approximately 14 percent (5) thought it was not very useful.
All of the deans in the technical colleges agreed that community participation was useful. Twenty-five percent (2) described it as highly useful, 62.5 percent (5) as usually useful and 62.5 percent (5) as occasionally useful.

Deans in the community colleges were asked what kind of effect collective bargaining had on shared governance in their colleges. Almost 40 percent (14) reported collective bargaining had no effect on shared governance, 8.3 percent (3) believed it to have a positive effect and 2.8 percent (1) thought it had no effect. Approximately 14 percent (5) responded that they did not know the effects of collective bargaining. Deans in 36.1 percent (13) of the community colleges reported they did not have collective bargaining in their institutions.

The same question was posed to deans in technical colleges. Twenty percent (2) saw collective bargaining as having a negative effect on shared governance, while 37.5 percent (3) responded they "do not know" its effect. Deans in 37.5 percent (3) of the technical colleges indicated there was no collective bargaining in their institutions.

_Deans of instruction in community colleges were asked if they had to do it all over again would they seek or accept a position as an administrator in a two-year college. A majority, 88.9 percent (32) indicated they would definitely_
seek two-year college administration. While 8.3 percent (3) reported they did not know, only 2.8 percent (1) responded "definitely no."

All of the deans in the technical colleges indicated they would definitely seek two-year college administration if they were beginning their careers all over again. These responses are contrary to some of the findings reported in the literature which suggest that administrators who work in higher education institutions are "burned out" and cannot wait to leave the field.

In the community and technical colleges deans were asked how much self-fulfillment do their jobs as administrators provide. In the community colleges more than 90 percent (32) reported they find self-fulfillment in their positions as administrators, 61.1 percent (22) received a "considerable amount of self-fulfillment," 30.6 percent (11) a "moderate amount," and only 8.3 percent (3) felt "little self-fulfillment."

The responses of deans of instruction in technical colleges revealed that their level of self-fulfillment was even higher, although only 50 percent (4) reported a "considerable amount of self-fulfillment," with another 50 percent (4) reporting moderate self-fulfillment.

When requested to rate the material rewards and benefits which accrue to the position of deans of instruction as compared to those which accrue to deans of instruction
in comparable institutions, the majority of responses from deans, 83.3 percent (31), in the community colleges considered their benefits favorable. Only 13.8 percent (6) responded that they were unfavorable, with 2.8 percent (1) indicating "do not know."

In like manner, deans in the technical colleges considered the rewards and benefits as favorable, 62.5 percent (5). Approximately 38 percent, 37.5 percent (3), believed them to be highly unfavorable.

**Comparison of Attitudes between Community and Technical College Deans on Certain Variables**

The relationship between type of institution in which the deans of instruction were employed and their responses concerning their attitudes on "open-door" admissions policy, special educational services, remedial education, governance and level of satisfaction were tested using the chi square statistic. In relation to each of these variables, no significant relationships were found between type of institution and responses at the .05 level.

**Two-Year College Administration**

The section that follows presents data gathered from deans of instruction in community and technical colleges about their attitudes concerning two-year college administration. They were asked to take a stance on several issues which dealt with training and preparation for two-year college administration, make recommendations for the
training needed by those aspiring to deans of instruction positions in two-year colleges and about their administrative concerns. In addition to presenting the issues and analysis of responses provided, responses were also analyzed to determine if there was a significant relationship between the type of institution and responses given.

Training and Preparation for Two-Year College Administration

Deans of instruction in both community and technical colleges were asked to evaluate the academic preparation and training one receives for a career as a two-year college administrator. The following variables were offered for consideration:

1. More attention should be devoted to theory.
2. More attention should be devoted to practice.
3. On-the-job training is the best way to learn.
4. It is important for administrators to receive managerial training.
5. Ph.D.'s should be required for those who hold administrative positions.
6. The program of graduate studies provided excellent preparation for present administrative positions.

Responses are shown in Table 13.

The deans of instruction in the community colleges were almost evenly divided on whether or not more attention should be devoted to theory. Fifty percent (18) agreed that it should, with almost an equal number, 47.2 percent (17),
TABLE 13

Feelings Concerning Training/Preparation Received for a Career as a Two-Year College Administrator (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Do Not Know</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC* TC*</td>
<td>CC TC</td>
<td>CC TC</td>
<td>CC TC</td>
<td>CC TC</td>
<td>CC TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More attention should be devoted to theory.</td>
<td>2.8 0.0</td>
<td>47.2 25.0</td>
<td>44.4 6.25</td>
<td>2.8 0.0</td>
<td>2.8 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More attention should be devoted to practice.</td>
<td>41.7 37.5</td>
<td>52.8 62.5</td>
<td>2.8 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>2.8 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job training is the best way to learn.</td>
<td>19.4 50.0</td>
<td>63.9 37.5</td>
<td>16.7 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 12.5</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for administrators to receive managerial training.</td>
<td>41.7 75.0</td>
<td>55.6 25.0</td>
<td>2.8 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.'s should be required for those who hold administrative positions.</td>
<td>16.7 0.0</td>
<td>22.2 12.5</td>
<td>44.4 62.5</td>
<td>13.9 25.0</td>
<td>2.8 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program of graduate studies provided excellent preparation for present administrative position.</td>
<td>19.4 37.5</td>
<td>52.8 37.5</td>
<td>19.4 25.0</td>
<td>8.3 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* CC denotes Community College
** TC denotes Technical College
disagreeing. A small percent, 2.8 (1), reported "do not know."

In the technical colleges 62.5 percent (5) disagreed with giving more attention to theory, while 25 percent (2) agreed, and 12.5 percent (1) chose not to respond.

Approximately 95 percent (34) of the community college deans and technical college deans believed that more attention should be devoted to practice.

With regard to the value of on-the-job training as the best way to learn administration, 83.3 percent (30) and 87.5 percent (7) of the deans of instruction in community and technical colleges, respectively, felt this type of training to be very important, while 16.7 percent (6) and 12.5 percent (1) of the deans in community and technical colleges, respectively, disagreed.

Deans of instruction in community and technical colleges were asked what importance they attached to managerial training. Responses of deans in both institutions were very positive, with 97.3 percent (35) of the deans in community colleges and all of those in technical colleges reporting that such training was important. One (2.8%) community college dean disagreed.

Deans from both types of institutions expressed their opinions on whether or not Ph.D.'s should be required for those who hold administrative positions. There was a lack of consensus among the respondents on this requirement.
Disagreement was expressed by 58.3 percent (21) of those in the community colleges and a slightly higher number, 62.5 percent (5), of those in technical colleges. Those in agreement included 48.9 percent (14) of the responding community college deans and 12.5 percent (1) of the respondents in the technical colleges. One (2.8 percent) dean in the community college had no opinion.

Deans of instruction from both types of colleges were asked about the quality of their graduate studies programs with regard to preparation for their present administrative positions. Approximately one third of the deans in the community college considered their programs excellent. Almost an identical percentage of technical college deans, 75 percent (6), gave the same response. The remaining deans disagreed.

In summary, deans in the two-year colleges studied attached varying degrees of importance to academic programs with a strong emphasis on theory. It was the consensus of those administrators, however, that programs which devoted more attention to practice than theory and provided the individual with managerial and/or on-the-job training are better for preparation for two-year college administrators. Also, there was a lack of consensus among the respondents as to whether the Ph.D. degree should be a requirement for holding an administrative position in a two-year institution. A majority believed that it should not be required.
In spite of the great variation in their programs of graduate study, there was a consensus among the deans that their programs were excellent preparation for their present administrative positions.

With regard to the major weaknesses of their graduate study programs, deans shared a wide range of opinions which are presented in Table 14. Although approximately one-fourth, 22.2 percent (18), of those in community colleges and slightly more than one-third, 37.5 percent (3), in the technical colleges reported "no weaknesses," among the remaining community and technical college deans there was little consensus on what the weaknesses were. Deans in the community colleges identified the following weaknesses: "poor or irrelevant course offerings in general," "shortcomings in or lack of specific classes," "lack of an internship," "lack of opportunity for full-time study," "poor quality of specific educational administration," "excessive tension," "low quality of professors," and "other" weaknesses which were not specified.

No two deans in the technical colleges agreed on the same weakness. They identified "low quality of professors," "shortcomings in, or lack of, specific classes," "lack of opportunity for full-time study," and "selection of students with inadequate administration" as weak areas in their graduate study programs.
## TABLE 14

Major Weaknesses of Graduate Study Programs as Perceived by Community and Technical College Deans of Instruction (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>Technical College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low quality of professors</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor or irrelevant course offerings in general</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortcomings in, or lack of, specific classes</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of internship</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor quality of specific educational administration</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other departments</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor library facilities</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of opportunity for full-time study</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of students with inadequate administrative experience</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive tension</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No weaknesses</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrative Concerns

Deans were requested to identify items which concerned them most. Community college deans identified four: "instructional support" 52.8 percent (19), "classroom excellence" 25 percent (9), "instructional delivery" 16.7 percent (6), "program evaluation," 2.8 percent (1). One dean (2.8%) indicated "other," but did not specify. Deans in technical colleges identified two, with one (2.8%) dean not responding. Their selections included: "instructional support" 50 percent (4) and "classroom excellence" 37.5 percent (3).

The fact that over 50 percent of the responding deans in both types of institutions selected items related to instruction was not surprising. This could be attributed to their positions as educational leaders for the institution and their commitment to the teaching mission of the two-year college.

A number of variables were considered with regard to whether or not they inhibited administrators' effectiveness. Included among them, but not limited to, were:

a. Too much added responsibility
b. Inadequate financing
c. Too many controls placed on the job
d. Inexperienced, unqualified, or ill-prepared staff members
e. Difficulty in relations with the members of the staff
f. Not enough personnel
g. Racial/ethnic problems
h. Collective bargaining
i. Difficulty in relations with board members
j. Other
One-half, 55.6 percent (20) of those in community colleges and 75 percent (6) of those in technical colleges indicated that "too much added responsibility" inhibited their effectiveness. In the community and technical colleges 44.4 percent (16) and 25 percent (2), respectively, disagreed with this.

Community college deans were equally as divided on the inadequacy of financing as being inhibiting to their effectiveness. More specifically, 50 percent (18) considered "inadequate financing" inhibiting and 50 percent (18) did not. This was the exact distribution found among deans in the technical colleges.

Twenty-five percent (9) of the community college deans felt that there were "too many controls placed on their jobs." The overwhelming majority, 75 percent (27) did not. Slightly more than one-third of the deans in technical colleges felt they had "too many controls placed on their job."

With regard to staff competency, 19.4 percent (7) of the community college deans identified "inexperienced, unqualified, or ill-prepared staff members" as inhibiting their effectiveness. Approximately 90 percent (7) of the technical college deans reported the opposite view.

In like manner, the deans in both community and technical colleges did not find "difficulty in relations with members of the staff" as inhibiting. Only 5.6 percent (2) in the community colleges and 12.5 percent (1) in the
technical colleges considered their effectiveness compro-
mised by difficulty in staff relations.

As might be expected, lack of personnel was identified
as an inhibiting factor by the administrators. Slightly
over half, 55.6 percent (20), in the community colleges and
almost 100 percent in the technical colleges reported that
it did.

Neither group of two-year college administrators iden-
tified race as an inhibiting factor to their effectiveness
as deans. Only one (12.5%) dean in the community college
identified this as a problem and no technical college dean
did so.

Almost 90 percent (31) of the deans in the community
colleges and all of the deans in the technical colleges
indicated "collective bargaining" was not a factor that
inhibited their effectiveness as administrators.

The figures were equally as high with regard to their
relations with board of trustee members. Over 90 percent
(33) community college respondents and all of the technical
college respondents did not find relations with their boards
to be inhibiting to their effectiveness.

Approximately 90 percent, 83.3 percent (30) and 87.5
percent (7), respectively, of the deans in the community and
technical colleges could not identify other problems that
seemed to inhibit their effectiveness as two-year college
administrators.
When requested to identify responsibilities which gave them the greatest amount of frustration, community college respondents reported the following: "being assigned tasks with insufficient resources to carry them out" 33.3 percent (12), "being assigned tasks that involve the contribution of others without the authority to require others to carry out their charge" 22.2 percent (8), "being assigned a task to do without sufficient time to complete the task" 22.2 percent (8), and "the possibility that decisions will be reversed" 13.9 percent (5). Indicating "do not know" were 5.6 percent (2). Also, 2.8 percent (1) did not respond.

The same request made to technical college deans produced the following results: "being assigned tasks with insufficient resources to carry them out" 50 percent (4), "being assigned a task to do without sufficient time to complete the task" 25 percent (2), "the possibility that decisions will be reversed" 12.5 percent (1), "being assigned tasks that involve the contribution of others without the authority to require others to carry out their charge" 12.5 percent (1).

Comparison of Attitudes between Community and Technical College Deans on Variables Concerning Two-Year College Administration

The chi square statistic was used to test the relationship between the type of institution in which the respondents were employed and their responses concerning their attitudes on the following administrative concerns: items
which concerned them most and factors which most inhibited their effectiveness as administrators. There were no significant relationships found at the .05 level.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section contains a restatement of the purpose of this study and conclusions that can be drawn from the findings. Section two offers recommendations regarding the preparation of individuals to serve in dean of instruction positions and research that needs to be done on the dean of instruction in two-year colleges. These recommendations are based upon the findings of this study and are designed to enhance the administration in two-year colleges and provide more rewarding experiences for those individuals who pursue and ultimately hold the office of dean of instruction.

Purpose and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the status of the dean of instruction in community and technical colleges in order to expand the knowledge and understanding about this position and the individual who occupies it. In order to gather information relevant to understanding that status, several research questions were proposed. A questionnaire was sent to randomly selected deans of instruction who completed and returned those instruments to the researcher. An analysis of the data obtained from those
questionnaires provided information related to the status of deans of instruction in community and technical colleges throughout the nation.

Several of the findings from this study were found to be inconsistent with some of the previous findings reported in the literature on two-year colleges. Moreover, several of the findings of this study are inconsistent with some of the findings in the literature about the perceptions and practices of two-year colleges. Other findings, however, confirmed that deans of instruction in two-year colleges hold similar perceptions and are involved in practices that were described in the literature. The following section identifies those areas of inconsistency and consistency related to the literature. Conclusions are then drawn from this analysis.

Findings That Were Inconsistent with the Literature

There were three beliefs concerning the backgrounds of two-year college administrators depicted in the literature which were not supported by the findings of this study. The first belief was that most two-year college administrators have backgrounds, training and experience in public or parochial school systems. The second was that a significant number of administrators in two-year colleges have retired from the military and work as administrators in colleges. The third was related to the belief that the administrative
staff in two-year colleges had previous experience in business or industry. Those beliefs imply that only a small percentage of administrators working in two-year colleges had the academic background training in educational administration and experience in higher education to effectively and efficiently perform in the two-year college. The data gathered in this study can be used to demonstrate the inaccuracies in those beliefs.

During the early years of development of community and technical colleges and up through and including the 1970s, the majority of deans of instruction in two-year colleges either came from public and parochial school systems or were retired individuals from the military, or had worked in business or industry. The data gathered in this study can be used as evidence to document that this is no longer accurate. More specifically, the majority of deans of instruction in this study had no previous experience in either public or parochial schools. In like manner, a majority had neither retired from the military nor held managerial positions in business or industry prior to joining community and technical colleges.

The deans of instruction in this study were well-educated. The majority of them held the terminal degree with the remainder holding the master's degree. Individual areas of academic study were widespread with as many deans trained in educational administration as in other academic
disciplines. Many brought diverse educational administrative experiences to the dean's post. Although the missions, goals, and philosophies of two- and four-year institutions may differ, it appears that the profile of the deans of instruction in those institutions is similar.

There were two additional areas in which the literature was not supported by the findings in this study. They were (1) level of satisfaction deans reported about their positions and (2) the response of deans toward collective bargaining.

Literature related to administration in higher education institutions seems to speak to the issue of professional fatigue and stress commonly referred to as "burn-out." Supposedly, administrators in higher education institutions experience "burn-out" and cannot wait to leave the field of education. When examining deans' level of satisfaction in this study, all but one reported that they did not experience "burn-out" nor were they unduly stressed with their positions. In addition, when asked if they had to do it all over again would they seek or accept a position as an administrator in a two-year college, the response was unanimously in the affirmative. The majority of the responding deans also believed the material rewards and benefits of the post to be comparable to those in other types of institutions and expressed considerable to moderate self-fulfillment in the administrative positions held.
As collective bargaining units have continued to spread in higher education institutions, two-year colleges have not been excluded. A review of literature suggests that most of these unions have been greeted with resentment from the administrative ranks. The two-year college deans of instruction in this study reported no fear of unions. Accordingly, deans believed unions did not in any way inhibit administrative effectiveness.

Findings That Were Consistent with the Literature

In some instances the data suggested that two-year colleges remained consistent with the findings in the literature. For instance, in spite of efforts in the late 1960s and early 1970s to identify, recruit, and hire qualified minorities, both ethnic and women, the data collected in this study can be used to document that these efforts have not been effective in two-year colleges. The two-year college positions of dean of instruction in the institutions investigated were dominated by white males. This result indicated that higher administrative positions in these colleges are very similar to comparable positions in four-year institutions.

Another issue considered was how individuals acquire the dean of instruction position. Millett (1978) contends that increasingly administrators in higher education institutions have moved through the administrative ranks. He
maintains that most deans have been former division or department chairpersons. Findings of this study were consistent with these assertions.

In addition, another area of consistency was in the attitudes expressed by deans of instruction toward the "open-door" admissions philosophy, special educational services, and remedial instruction. Deans of instruction confirmed their beliefs in the philosophy and mission of the egalitarian two-year college (Foresi, 1974; Monroe, 1977). With regard to the "open-door" admissions philosophy, there was unanimous agreement that this philosophy should be continued.

The attitudes deans of instruction hold about providing special educational services to academically disadvantaged students were identical to feelings about the "open-door" admissions philosophy. This issue was given full support by all individuals who worked in colleges where such services were provided. Further, the responding deans of instruction perceived existing programs as successful.

Although opinions on whether two-year colleges should be the only institution to offer remedial instruction varied, deans reaffirmed their commitment to remedial educational programs. The respondents unanimously agreed that they would not eliminate those programs if given the opportunity.

One important note should be made with regard to "open-door" admissions, special educational services and remedial
instruction. Although overwhelmingly supportive of the three areas, the cost effectiveness of each was given some attention by several respondents. This is not an unusual concern especially in times of diminishing resources and a thrust by various segments of society for accountability from all institutions—especially higher education. This concern should not be confused with the ultimate support that was given.

The supportive attitudes expressed by deans were congruent with other findings reported in the literature on two-year institutions. In spite of legislation that may support competency-based programs and some four-year institutions that may eliminate developmental education programs, educational leaders in two-year institutions persist in their support of the original mission and goals of two-year colleges.

The greatest concern of deans of instruction in community and technical colleges was instruction rather than money and financial stability. Since teaching is the primary thrust in the two-year college, it requires more attention than what is required in some other types of higher education institutions. The need that attention be given to instruction is strongly supported in two-year college literature (Hudson, 1978; Robin, 1974). Therefore, it is not surprising that the dean of instruction, who has
been identified as the educational leader of the institution, would focus concern around this critical issue.

**Recommendations**

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following recommendations are posited in regard to both training for two-year college administrators and research to be conducted on two-year colleges.

**Recommendations Related to the Preparation of Community and Technical College Administrators**

It is recommended that provisions for:

1. Persons on the faculties of educational administration programs must work in conjunction with community and technical college administrators, faculty, and boards of trustees to design, implement, and maintain relevant programs for training two-year college administrators.

2. Faculties of educational administration programs work closely with administrators and boards of trustees from two-year colleges to establish and implement administrative internships for potential two-year college administrators.

3. Doctoral students enrolled in higher education administration be required to take an ongoing practicum experience in two-year colleges for the purpose of on-the-job experience, observation and research.

**Recommendations for Additional Research**

1. Because of the paucity of research done on the dean of instruction in two-year colleges, individuals studying in higher educational administration programs must be encouraged to research the deanship.

2. Using this study as a model, other descriptive investigations on various administrative
positions in the two-year college must be conducted.

3. Future research must be conducted related to the following issues which emerged during this investigation:

a. Studies that focus solely on the position of dean of instruction.

b. An analysis of the academic and professional backgrounds of individuals who hold the position of dean of instruction.

c. Studies that explore the issue of job satisfaction which emphasize why deans of instruction are satisfied or dissatisfied.

d. Comparative studies related to two-year colleges which use race and sex as variables.

e. An investigation of the effects of unions in two-year colleges.

f. An analysis of the perceptions of deans of instruction related to theory- versus practical-oriented training.

g. A feasibility study pertaining to "open-door" admission policy, remedial education, and special educational services for the disadvantaged.
APPENDIX A

Instrument
Dear Colleague:

This questionnaire is being sent to presidents, deans, division chairpersons and other staff administrators who serve in two-year colleges.

Your willingness to participate in this project will add immesurably to what we know about administration in two-year college settings and will make a significant contribution to your professional colleagues.

The success of this study can be assured with your help.

Directions

Your questionnaire is identified by a code number to simplify recordkeeping and follow-up procedures. In reporting the results, no individual identity will be divulged. Only group statistical responses will be cited. Respondent confidentiality is assured.

Attempts to answer every question and, please, make every answer a sincere one. In the event none of the alternatives provided for a question correspond exactly to your position or opinion, you are asked to select that alternative which comes closest to the answer you would like to give.

Circle the number of the proper alternative using either pen or pencil. If you change a response please be sure that the change is legible and clear in order to facilitate data processing.

Place your completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and mail it. Your cooperation and assistance in this significant study is greatly appreciated.

I. PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. What is your age? __________ years old.
2. What is your sex? 1. Male 2. Female
3. What is your present marital status:
5. With what ethnic group would you identify yourself?
   1. White (non-Hispanic) 2. Black (non-Hispanic) 3. Chicano/Hispanic
   4. Native American (Indian/Eskimo) 5. Asian/Pacific Islander 6. Other (specify): __________

II. CAREER INFORMATION

6. What is the highest academic degree you have earned? (Select only one)
   1. Associate Degree 2. B.A. or B.S. 3. Master's Degree 4. Ph.D. or Ed.D.
6-8. From the following list, indicate your major and minor fields of study for each degree you've earned. Write the appropriate number in the corresponding blanks.

7/1:12 9/1:14 11/1:16
1. Educational Administration
2. Business Administration
3. Secondary Education
4. Humanities/Fine Arts
5. Liberal Arts
6. Science/Engineering
7. Mathematics
8. Other (specify): __________ Field
9. No graduate degree

8/1:13 10/1:15 12/1:17
B.A./B.S. Master’s Doctorate
Major Field
Minor Field

13/1:18-19
9. Presently, what is your primary administrative position? (Select only one).
01. President (provost, campus director, etc.)
02. Vice President
03. Dean of Instruction
04. Dean of Students
05. Associate Dean (Instruction, Students, etc.)
06. Assistant Dean (Instruction, Students, etc.)
07. Division Chairperson
08. Dean of Vocational Education
09. Other (specify): _______________________

14/1:20-21
10. How long have you been an administrator in a two-year college? ________________ years

15/1:22-23
11. Besides your current position, what other administrative positions have you held in a two-year college?

16/1:24-25

17/1:26-27
12. How many years of military service have you had? ________________ years.

18/1:28
13. Before becoming a two-year college administrator did you hold any managerial positions in business or industry?
1. yes 2. no

19/1:29
14. Were you ever an administrator in either a public or parochial school?
1. Public school administrator
2. Parochial school administrator
3. Never held such a position

20/1:30
15. Do you have a written job description?
1. yes 2. no

21/1:31
16. Who evaluates you?
1. Formal evaluation by peers
2. Formal evaluation by immediate supervisor
3. Formal evaluation by both peers and supervisor
4. No formal evaluation procedures
5. Don’t Know

22/1:32
17. What is your current annual contract salary?
1. Less than $15,000
2. $15,000 to $19,999
3. $20,000 to $24,999
4. $25,000 to $29,999
5. $30,000 to $34,999
6. $35,000 to $39,999
7. $40,000 to $44,999
8. $45,000 and above

23/1:33
18. Is this salary for the 9 month academic year or full calendar year?
1. 9 month academic year
2. 12 month calendar year
III. INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

24/1:34
19. Is your institution primarily:
   1. State supported  2. Privately supported  3. Other(specify):_______

25/1:35
20. Which of the following best describes the type of two-year college where you presently work? (Circle only one answer).
   1. Community College  4. Junior College (public)
   2. Technical College/Institute  5. Other(specify):_______
   3. Junior College(private)

26/1:36-37
21. Approximately how many students attended your institution during this past academic year?
   01. Less than 2,000  06. 10,000 to 12,000
   02. 2,000 to 4,000  07. 12,000 to 14,000
   03. 4,000 to 6,000  08. 14,000 to 16,000
   04. 6,000 to 8,000  09. more than 16,000
   05. 8,000 to 10,000  98. Don't know

27/1:38-39
22. Approximately what percent of the students are enrolled full-time?

27/1:40
23. Which of the following categories best describes the location of your institution?

29/1:41
24. Is your campus part of a multi-campus district?
   1. Yes  2. No

30/1:42-43
25. In what state is your institution located?______________________

IV. PERSONAL BELIEFS AND OPINIONS

We greatly appreciate your thoughtful responses on the following questions. Please feel free to comment further on additional sheets.

31/1:44
26. Which of the following statements comes closest to your position regarding the continuation of the "Open-door" Admissions Policy in two-year colleges? (Select only one).
   1. Open-door admissions should definitely be continued
   2. Open-door admissions should be retained but with some restrictions.
   3. Open-door admissions should be eliminated
   4. My college does not have an open-door policy
   5. Don't know

32/1:45
27. What is your opinion with regard to providing special educational services to academically disadvantaged students? (Select only one).
   1. Such services are too costly and should not be provided
   2. Such services should be provided regardless of cost
   3. Such services should be provided only if they are cost effective
   4. Don't know

33/1:46
28. Does your institution currently provide special educational services for the academically disadvantaged student?
   1. Yes  2. No  8. Don't Know

34/1:47
29. If yes, how successful do you think these special educational services have been?
   1. Very successful  4. Very unsuccessful
   2. Somewhat successful  8. Don't Know
   3. Somewhat unsuccessful  9. Don't offer special program

35/1:48
30. Some suggest that two-year colleges should be the only higher education institutions to offer remedial education. How do you feel about this?
31. If you had the discretion to either eliminate or retain remedial instruction programs what would you do?
32. It has been said that two-year colleges have an identity problem. How do you feel about this assessment?
33. What is your opinion about the usefulness of institutional research?
1. Such research is highly useful
2. Such research is usually useful
3. Such research is occasionally useful
4. Such research is not useful
5. Don't Know
34. Recently, there has been much talk about "burn-out" (professional fatigue and stress). Which of the following statements come closest to your position with regard to administrative "burn-out"? (Select only one).
1. Burn-out is a real condition to which educators should give some attention.
2. Burn-out is a passing fad that will fade
3. Burn-out is a convenient excuse for poor performance
4. Don't know
35. And, what is your opinion concerning faculty "burn-out"? (Select only one).
1. Burn-out is a real condition to which educators should give some attention.
2. Burn-out is a passing fad that will fade
3. Burn-out is a convenient excuse for poor performance
4. Don't know
36. In your opinion, which of the following contribute most to the success of your institution? (Select no more than two).
1. Administrative leadership
2. Quality of the faculty
3. Adequate resources
4. Institutional climate
5. Shared governance
6. None of the above
7. Other (specify):
8. Don't know
37. In your opinion, what has been the result of the increase of Ph.D.'s in two-year colleges? (Check the appropriate responses).
4. The quality of the program has improved
5. Participation of faculty in governance has increased
6. There is more participation in research, writing, and other scholarly activities
7. There does not appear to be much change one way or the other

V. GOVERNANCE
38. Which of the following statements most closely reflects your opinion concerning shared governance in the management process? (Select only one).
1. Shared governance is the most productive way to make institutional decisions
2. Shared governance is not a very productive way to make institutional decisions
3. Shared governance is more of a political necessity than a managerial necessity
4. Don't know
39. Approximately what percent of the faculty participate in institutional decision-making?
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40. In your opinion, how useful is student participation in the decision-making process?
   1. Highly useful 4. Not very useful
   2. Usually useful 5. Don't know
   3. Only occasionally useful

41. How useful is community participation in the decision-making process?
   1. Highly useful 4. Not very useful
   2. Usually useful 5. Don't know
   3. Only occasionally useful

42. What kind of effect does collective bargaining have on shared governance?
   1. Positive effect 4. Don't know
   2. Negative effect 5. No collective bargaining
   3. No effect

43. How would you describe current board participation in the administrative decision-making process?
   1. Very active 4. Not at all active
   2. Somewhat active 5. Don't know
   3. Not at all active

44. What is your opinion about the usefulness of board participation in the decision-making process?
   1. Highly useful 4. Not very useful
   2. Usually useful 5. Don't know
   3. Only occasionally useful

45. Thinking to the future, do you think board participation in administrative decision-making will:
   1. Increase 2. Decrease 3. Remain the same 4. Don't know

VI. ADMINISTRATION

46. Of the following items, which one concerns you the most? (Select no more than two).
   1. Instructional support 4. Program evaluation
   2. Instructional delivery 5. Other(specify):
   3. Classroom excellence

47. With regard to students, which one of the following items is of most concern to you? (Select only one).
   1. Student retention 4. Student relations
   2. Student recruitment 5. Other(specify):
   3. Student behavior

48. From the list of tasks below, select the one that requires the greatest amount of your time. (Select only one).
   1. Fiscal planning and budget preparation
   2. Policy formulation and implementation
   3. Public relations and lobbying
   4. Motivation of faculty and staff
   5. Other(specify):
   6. Don't know

49. As an administrator you must fill many roles. Which one of the following roles listed below do you enjoy most? (Select only one).
   1. Instructional leader 4. Change agent
   2. Manager 5. Other(specify):
   3. Conflict mediator 6. None of these

50. Would you describe your administrative style as:
   1. Primarily task oriented
   2. Primarily people oriented
   3. Both #1 and #2 but more task oriented
   4. Both #1 and #2 but more people oriented
   5. Don't know
51. In your opinion, to what extent are discriminatory hiring and promotional practices a problem in limiting administrative career opportunities for women?


52. In your opinion, to what extent are discriminatory hiring and promotional practices a problem in limiting administrative career opportunities for minorities other than women?


53. Has the "Old Boy/Girl" Network been effective in advancing your career?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know

54. Have you utilized the "Old Boy/Girl" Network in recruiting and selecting other administrators or staff members?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know

55. There are differing opinions about the role of collective bargaining in educational institutions. What is your opinion?

1. Collective bargaining has a definite role to serve in an educational institution 2. Collective bargaining has no place in an educational institution 3. Other (specify): ____________________________ 4. Don't know

56. Which system of providing financial reward to faculty do you most prefer?

1. Merit pay 2. Incremental raises 3. Combination of both 4. DK

57. In your opinion, which of the following would make the faculty more productive? (Select no more than two).


58. For each of the items listed, indicate whether the situation described is of great concern; some concern; or no concern to you.

Great 2 Some 3 No 4 DK

a. What an individual or group may do if I make a decision contrary to their wishes
b. How to deal with non-productive and/or uncooperative staff
c. The quality of the academic program
d. The proliferation of people who must be contacted before a decision can be made

e. Difficulty in relations with the members of the staff
f. Not enough personnel
g. Racial/ethnic problems
h. Collective bargaining
i. Difficulty in relations with board members
j. Other (specify): ____________________________

59. From your perspective which of the following factors most inhibit your effectiveness as an administrator? (Check all that apply).

a. Too much added responsibility
b. Inadequate financing
c. Too many controls placed on the job
d. Inexperienced, unqualified, or ill-prepared staff members
e. Difficulty in relations with the members of the staff
f. Not enough personnel
g. Racial/ethnic problems
h. Collective bargaining
i. Difficulty in relations with board members
j. Other (specify): ____________________________

60. In your experience, how successful is it to concentrate on human relations, persuasion, praise, and other such positive techniques in motivating the professional staff?

61. Which one of the following frustrates you the most in carrying out your responsibilities? (Select only one).

1. Being assigned tasks with insufficient resources to carry them out
2. Being assigned tasks that involve the contribution of others without the authority to require others to carry out their charge
3. The possibility that your decisions will be reversed
4. Being assigned a task to do without sufficient time to complete the task
5. Other (specify):
6. Don't know

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE PREPARATION

62. Listed below are statements concerning the training/preparation one receives for a career as a two-year administrator. For each of the items indicate whether you strongly agree; agree; disagree; or strongly disagree with the statement. Please circle the corresponding number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85/2:27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86/2:28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87/2:29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88/2:30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89/2:31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90/2:32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91/2:33-34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63. What, if any, was the major weakness of your graduate study program? (Select only one).

01. Low quality of professors
02. Poor or irrelevant course offerings in general
03. Shortcomings in, or lack of, specific classes
04. Lack of internship
05. Poor quality of specific educational administration
06. Lack of support from other depts.
07. Poor library facilities
08. Lack of opportunity for full-time study
09. Selection of students with inadequate administrative experience
10. Excessive tension
11. No weaknesses
12. Other (specify):
13. Don't know

VIII. CAREER SATISFACTION

64. In your opinion, what is the status/prestige of the position you hold? (Select only one).

1. Decreasing in importance and influence
2. Increasing in importance and influence
3. Remaining about the same as it was 10 years ago
4. Don't know

65. And, what about the status of the authority and control of administrators?

1. Increasing
2. Decreasing
3. Remaining about the same
4. Don't know

66. If you had to do it all over again, would you seek or accept a position as an administrator in a two-year college?

1. Definitely yes
2. Definitely no
3. Don't know

67. How much self-fulfillment (feeling of being able to use one's unique capabilities, or realizing one's potential) does your position as an administrator provide?

1. Moderate
2. Considerate
3. Little
4. None
5. Don't know
68. How would you assess the level of stress in your position?

1. Highly stressful
2. Usually stressful
3. Occasionally stressful
4. Rarely stressful
5. Never stressful
6. Don’t know

69. How would you rate the material rewards and benefits of your job compared to those in comparable institutions?

1. Highly favorable
2. Favorable
3. Unfavorable
4. Highly unfavorable
5. Never favorable
6. Don’t know

70. As an administrator, how would you rate the general communication in your institution?

1. Very good
2. Good
3. Adequate
4. Poor
5. Fair
6. Don’t know

71. Which of the following best describes, in general terms, the faculty members at your college? (Select no more than two).

1. Commitment to their students
2. Resourcefulness in their teaching
3. Their professionalism
4. Their general apathy
5. Their self-serving activities
6. Other (specify):
7. None of these
8. Don’t know

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION AND PATIENCE IN COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE RETURN IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO:

DR. WILLIAM MOORE
DEPT. OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
301 RANG 10 HALL
29 W. WOODRUFF AVENUE
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43210
APPENDIX B

Follow-up Letter
Dear __________

The questionnaire that I sent to you on October 15, has probably been mislaid. This note is just a reminder that we do earnestly want your response.

In case you have misplaced the questionnaire I am enclosing another for your convenience. I will be most grateful if you would take a few minutes to complete it.

With highest personal and professional regards, I am

Very sincerely,

William Moore Jr.
APPENDIX C

Letter of Request for Catalog
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Dear Colleague:

We are in the process of planning a comprehensive study of two-year college administration. The focus of the study is to determine what working administrators, themselves, identify as their major areas of concern with regard to problems, needs and issues that impact most upon their efforts to carry out their responsibilities.

We are currently building an up-to-date roster of administrators who serve in two-year colleges throughout the nation. The most difficult task is to identify administrators in each college. The only source we know that will provide us with this information is the College Catalog of each college. Your name was taken from the Community, Junior and Technical College Directory.

May we have a copy of your most recent College Catalog. We do not expect you to handle this request yourself. We respectfully ask, therefore, that you forward this request to the appropriate person in your institution.

When the study is complete, we will be happy to send you a copy of the results.

Thank you for your kind attention and with highest personal regards,

I am

Very sincerely,

William Moore, Jr.
Professor
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FOOTNOTES

1 While the label "dean of instruction" is one used in most two-year colleges, "academic dean" and "dean of faculty" are also commonly used.

2 The terms "community college", "two-year college" and "community junior college" will be used interchangeably.

3 The three traditions through which higher education have moved are aristocracy, meritocracy, and egalitarianism (see Rudolph, 1962).

4 The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) is a private, non-profit corporation established to help improve the preparation and inservice training of administrative personnel in education. The Council's membership includes major universities in the United States and Canada. (From UCEA pamphlet 1982-83)

5 The terms "technical college" and "technical institute" will be used interchangeably.

6 South Dakota has no two-year colleges.

7 The term "division chairperson" will be used as frequently as possible instead of "department chairperson" since this is the term most often used in two-year institutions.

8 When "other" is specified in this study, respondents checked "other" on the questionnaire and did not specify an answer.