

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Janet Sue Chopra entitled "A Study of the Perceptions of Deans of Education in Doctoral-Granting Institutions in the United States about the Role and Importance of Scholarship in Administration." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.



Dan R. Quarles
Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:



Accepted for the Council:



Vice Provost and
Dean of The Graduate School

A STUDY OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF DEANS OF EDUCATION
IN DOCTORAL-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS IN THE
UNITED STATES ABOUT THE ROLE AND
IMPORTANCE OF SCHOLARSHIP IN
ADMINISTRATION

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Education
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Janet Sue Chopra

May 1990

Copyright © Janet Sue Chopra, 1989
All rights reserved

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my husband, Prem, my son, Preet and my daughter, Kavita. Their loving patience and understanding have made completion of this graduate program possible. This has become a family project in many ways and their contribution is sincerely appreciated.

Gratitude and love are expressed to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Merle Neagle for imbuing me with a desire to continue lifelong education. I also am grateful to my husband's parents, Dr. and Mrs. G. S. Chopra, for their understanding and support during the duration of this course of study.

Finally, this dissertation is dedicated to friends who have provided encouragement at those times when it was most needed--especially Dr. Elisabeth Craig and Dr. Sarla Murgai.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The assistance and support of many people have made possible the completion of this investigation. Sincere appreciation is expressed to the writer's doctoral committee: to Dr. Norma Mertz, an inspiring mentor who offered encouragement when it was needed; to Dr. Mary Jane Connelly for her thoughtful comments; to Dr. Larry Kleiman for his encouragement and support; and especially to Dr. Dan Quarles, major professor, for his thoughtful guidance of this dissertation and his encouragement to avoid the least traveled path.

I am grateful to the many fine teachers and professors who have helped me develop the curiosity and skills required for graduate study. I especially want to thank Dr. Fran Trusty and Dr. William Coffield for inspiring me to begin this program of study. A special thanks must go to Dr. William Hales who has reviewed and provided feedback on this study since the topic was first proposed. Much gratitude is due the reference library staff at the University of Tennessee in Chattanooga.

Gratitude also is expressed to the employees of Integrated Voice Solutions, especially Mr. David Tanksley. He has put up with, and corrected, my sometimes bumbling efforts to master computer software programs that have been beneficial in the preparation of this dissertation.

ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken in order to investigate the perceptions of current deans of education in doctoral-granting institutions in the United States, about the role and importance of scholarship in the administration of the deanship. The investigation involved a survey of 194 deans of schools of education.

Major findings of the study revealed that:

1. Most activities that deans found acceptable as evidence of administrative scholarship were in the form of traditionally accepted scholarship, excepting an expectation that deans would engage in a program of systematic research. Respondents perceived that the chief academic officers had only limited expectations of scholarship from deans. The greatest differentiation that deans made between faculty and administrative scholarship was quantitative rather than qualitative, although decanal scholarship tended to be more oriented toward application than to the generation of new knowledge.

2. Time considerations made it difficult for deans to pursue scholarship during their tenure as administrators. Deans who desired to continue scholarship activities usually had to utilize free time for this purpose. Deans who had given more time to scholarship, at all stages of their higher education careers, tended to have higher expectations

of time for scholarship from their assistant deans. The deans believed that administrative responsibilities had priority over scholarly pursuit. At the same time, deans believed that, although there was some detracting, decanal scholarship enhanced the performance of administrative duties.

3. Deans did not believe that their performance evaluations were impacted by the presence or absence of continued scholarship. They were willing to see this criterion become a more important factor in their evaluations.

4. Differences in perceptions of the deans could not be explained by Holmes membership, Carnegie Classification, size of institution, type of institutional control, number of doctoral degree programs or other demographic variables.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Statement of the Purpose	4
Importance of the Study	4
Assumptions of the Study	7
Limitations and Delimitations of the Study .	8
Definition of Terms	9
Research Questions	12
Procedures	15
Organization of the Study	16
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH . . .	17
Introduction	17
Scholarship	17
The Deanship	19
The Deanship in Education	32
Scholarship and Administration	34
Summary	39
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	42
Introduction	42
Selection of the Study Population	43
Instrumentation and Collection of Data . . .	45
Tabulation and Analysis of the Data	52

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. FINDINGS AND RESULTS OF THE STUDY	68
Introduction	68
Research Question 1	68
Research Question 2	118
Research Question 3	170
Research Question 4	179
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	190
Summary	190
The Problem	190
The Purpose	190
Procedures	190
Findings	191
Conclusions	196
Recommendations	202
LIST OF REFERENCES	204
APPENDICES	219
APPENDIX A. PRELIMINARY DRAFTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES	220
APPENDIX B. FINAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES	228
APPENDIX C. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS PROTOCOL	235
APPENDIX D. INITIAL MAILING COVER LETTER	237
APPENDIX E. FOLLOW UP POSTCARD	239
APPENDIX F. SECOND MAILING COVER LETTER	241

CHAPTER	PAGE
APPENDIX G. DISTRIBUTION OF MAJOR AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION OF RESPONDENTS . .	243
VITA	245

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Comparison Between Public and Private Institutions Regarding the Degree of Participation by Deans of Education in Doctoral-Granting Institutions Summer 1989	53
2. Comparison Between Study Population and Respondents by Type of Institutional Control and by Holmes Membership Summer 1989	56
3. Comparison Between Respondents to QI and QII by Type of Institutional Control and by Holmes Membership Summer 1989	58
4. Comparison of Respondents to the Study Population by Type of Institutional Control and by Carnegie Classification Summer 1989	61
5. Comparison of Respondents to the Study Population by Type of Institutional Control and by Size Summer 1989	63
6. Comparison of Respondents to the Study Population by Institutional Control and by Number of Doctoral Degree Programs Summer 1989	64
7. Distributions of Activities that Deans Believed were Acceptable and were not Acceptable as Evidence of Decanal Scholarship Summer 1989	70
8. Distribution of Range of Five Activities that Deans Considered Most Acceptable as Evidence of Scholarship Summer 1989	75
9. Deans' Perceptions about the Chief Academic Officers' Expectations of Time for Scholarship from Deans Summer 1989	83
10. Crosstabulation of Deans' Beliefs about the Chief Academic Officers' Expectations of Time for Scholarship from Deans and Deans' Beliefs that the Chief Academic Officers Expected Deans to Use Free Time for Scholarship Summer 1989	85

TABLE

PAGE

11.	Comparison of Deans' Beliefs about Evidence of Acceptable Decanal Scholarship and Deans' Perceptions about what the Chief Academic Officers would Accept and Expect as Decanal Scholarship Summer 1989	87
12.	Distribution of Assistant Deans in Schools of Education in the Study Group Summer 1989	91
13.	Comparison of Deans' Beliefs about Evidence of Acceptable Decanal Scholarship and Deans' Beliefs about what was Acceptable as Scholarship from Assistant Deans Summer 1989	92
14.	Comparison of Activities that Deans Believed were not Acceptable as Evidence of Scholarship from Themselves and from Assistant Deans Summer 1989	94
15.	Crosstabulation of Deans' Indications that They Used Free Time for Scholarship and Deans' Indications that They Expected Their Assistant Deans to Use Free Time for Scholarship Summer 1989	96
16.	Crosstabulation of Deans' Beliefs that the Chief Academic Officers Expected Them to Use Free Time for Scholarship and Deans' Beliefs that Assistant Deans Should Use Free Time for Scholarship Summer 1989	98
17.	Deans' Expectations of Time for Scholarship from Assistant Deans Summer 1989	99
18.	Crosstabulation of Deans' Beliefs about the Chief Academic Officers' Expectations of Time for Scholarship from Deans and Deans' Time Expectations for Scholarship from Assistant Deans Summer 1989	102
19.	Distributions of Deans' Agreement or Disagreement with Statements Concerning a Shift in Definition of Scholarship Summer 1989	105
20.	Crosstabulation of "Academic Leadership that Creates an Environment Conducive to Faculty Scholarship, is Scholarship" and "There is a Direct Relationship Between the Dean's Continued Scholarship and the Dean's Effectiveness as an Academic Leader" Summer 1989	111

21.	Crosstabulation of "Academic Leadership that Creates an Environment Conducive to Faculty Scholarship, is Scholarship" and "A Dean can be an Effective Leader Without Exhibiting any Continued Scholarship" Summer 1989	112
22.	Distribution of Strategies used by Deans to Implement Their Research Agendas Summer 1989 . . .	120
23.	Distributions of Deans' Degree of Agreement or Disagreement with Questionnaire Items that Concerned Adequacy of Time for Scholarship Summer 1989	125
24.	Crosstabulation of "I have Adequate Time for Scholarship" and "It is Possible to Engage in Substantial Scholarship while Serving as Dean" Summer 1989	127
25.	Crosstabulation of Hours Deans Used for Scholarship After Becoming Dean and "It is Possible to Engage in Substantial Scholarship while Serving as Dean" Summer 1989	129
26.	Distributions of Indications of Time for Decanal Scholarship from Deans Before Entering Administration, After Entering Administration but Before Assuming the Deanship, and After Assuming the Deanship Summer 1989	131
27.	Crosstabulation of Deans' Expectations of Scholarship from Assistant Deans and Time that Deans Gave to Scholarship Prior to Becoming an Administrator Summer 1989	133
28.	Crosstabulation of Deans' Expectations of Scholarship from Assistant Deans and Time that Deans Gave to Scholarship After Becoming an Administrator, but Before Assuming a Deanship Summer 1989	134
29.	Crosstabulation of Deans' Expectations of Scholarship from Assistant Deans and Time that Deans Gave to Scholarship After Assuming a Deanship Summer 1989	136
30.	Distributions of Deans' Agreement or Disagreement with Questionnaire Items that had to do with the Relationship of Past Scholarship to Effectiveness as Dean Summer 1989	139

TABLE

PAGE

31.	Distributions of Deans' Agreement or Disagreement with Questionnaire Items that Concerned the Relationship Between Continued Decanal Scholarship and Effectiveness in the Dean's Office Summer 1989	149
32.	Crosstabulation of "The Most Effective Deans Exhibit Continued Scholarship, After Becoming Dean" and "A Dean can be an Effective Leader Without Exhibiting any Continued Scholarship" Summer 1989	150
33.	Crosstabulation of "There is a Direct Relationship Between the Dean's Continued Scholarship and the Dean's Effectiveness as an Academic Leader" and "A Dean can be an Effective Leader Without Exhibiting any Continued Scholarship" Summer 1989	152
34.	Crosstabulation of "The Most Effective Deans Exhibit Continued Scholarship, After Becoming Dean" and "It is More Important for the Dean to have Excellent Administrative Skills than to Continue Active Scholarship" Summer 1989	153
35.	Distributions of Deans' Agreement or Disagreement with Questionnaire Items Concerning the Use of Scholarship as a Criterion in the Selection of a Dean of Education Summer 1989	155
36.	Distributions of Deans' Agreement or Disagreement with Questionnaire Items that Concerned the Influence of Continued Scholarship Upon the Deans' Performance of Administrative Duties Summer 1989	157
37.	Distributions of Deans' Agreement or Disagreement with Questionnaire Items Concerning the Relationship Between Performance Evaluation and Scholarship Summer 1989	171
38.	Crosstabulation of "There Should be a Direct Relationship Between My Performance Evaluation and My Scholarship" and Deans' Indications of Time for Scholarship After Becoming Dean Summer 1989	174
39.	Distribution of Age of Respondents Summer 1989	184
40.	Distribution of Years of Service as an Administrator Summer 1989	186

TABLE

PAGE

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| 41. | Distribution of Years of Service as a Dean
Summer 1989 | 187 |
| 42. | Crosstabulation of Deans' Indications that the
Chief Academic Officers Expect Deans to Use Free
Time for Scholarship and Deans' Years of Service
in Administration Summer 1989 | 188 |

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

Introduction

We "dean" in an academy, one aspect
of which is the scholarly life.
(Study participant, 1989)

During the last few decades, there has been considerable interest in understanding how higher education in the United States evolved into its present form. Rudolph (1968) described the development of American higher education in the early 1900s by noting that, "the university was an organization that was building its own rationale, its own mores, its own set of peculiarities . . ." (p. 402). Writers and researchers have studied higher education from various perspectives in an attempt to define this "rationale" and these "mores" and "peculiarities." Writers such as Veysey (1965), Jencks and Riesman (1968), Rudolph (1968) and Brubacher and Rudy (1976) utilized a variety of historical approaches in order to understand contemporary higher education. Other researchers such as Goodman (1962), Millett (1962), Stroup (1966), Baldrige (1971), Cohen, March and Olsen (1972), Cohen and March (1974) and Baldrige, Curtis, Ecker and Riley (1977) have proposed a wide spectrum of organizational models and metaphors to

illuminate the increasingly complex structure of higher education.

In recent years, colleges, universities and other interested organizations have engaged in a re-evaluation of the purposes that have undergirded the programs of higher education (Wolotkiewicz, 1980). These purposes have usually been expressed in the "mission" statement of the institution and traditionally have included teaching, service, and research and scholarship. Individuals and organizations have suggested others. For instance, Perkins ("Organization," 1973) added "achievement of an ideal democratic community within the university" as a fourth mission evident in the modern university. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1973) outlined additional purposes of higher education that included advancement of human capability in society at large, enlargement of social justice for the post-secondary age group and critical evaluation for the sake of society's renewal (p. 4).

In discussing the various propelling forces of higher education, Wisniewski (1986, 1989) argued that scholarship was the "most important" because it served as the "fount" for all other activities within higher education. He wrote that, "While a variety of tasks must be done in a college, the common denominator must be participation in the world of scholarship" (1989, p. 137). He went on to state that scholarship was "the fundamental premise of academic life."

Similarly, Gideonse and Joseph (1984) believed that scholarship was the "tap root" and the "essence" of higher education and that only through "strengthening inquiry and scholarship" could other missions and practices in higher education be altered or reformed.

Statement of the Problem

A considerable body of literature has explored the influence that continued, active scholarship has had upon the effectiveness of the professoriate (Schuster, 1986; Wisniewski, 1986). However, there has been virtually no inquiry into the role of scholarship in the administrative life of those who became the academic leaders of higher education. Researchers have not addressed the direct or indirect ways that higher education administration has or has not been influenced or driven by scholarship--the "essence of university life" (Wisniewski, 1986).

The only apparent, universal criterion for an academic leadership position in higher education has been a documented record of past scholarship (Bolman, 1968; Perkins, "Missions," 1973; Dill, 1980; Mertz, 1989). Despite this, there has not been investigation into the significance of continued, active scholarship for those who became administrators. Similarly, there has been no inquiry into what form administrative scholarship should take, and if it should be different from what was acceptable as

traditional evidence of scholarship from faculty members. This lack of investigation represented a gap in the body of knowledge about the philosophical underpinnings of higher education administration.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this research was to investigate the perceptions of current deans of education in doctoral-granting institutions about the role and importance of scholarship in the administration of the deanship.

Importance of the Study

Ideally, the type of inquiry proposed by this researcher would be conducted across all disciplines in higher education. However, an initial step was to locate and study one identifiable and somewhat homogenous population. The deans of schools or colleges of education that engaged in doctoral work were one such population. Schools and colleges of education were especially appropriate for this type of study. They have suffered from unfavorable comparison with other schools in terms of scholarship as well as on other counts (Judge, 1982; Gideonse & Joseph, 1984; Lopez & Balzer, 1984; Rusche, 1984; McCarty & Reyes, 1985, 1987; Schwebel, 1985; Wisniewski, 1986, 1989; Wisniewski & Ducharme, "Where," 1989, "Why Study," 1989). For instance, Lopez and Balzer (1984) wrote

of what "appears as the persuasive, crippling isolation of colleges of education from general American scholarship and from much of the intellectual life of the university" (p. 315).

Such perceptions appeared to be at odds with a philosophical expectation that, because these schools prepared most educators, they should set the standard for "education" and serious research and scholarship in the institution (Clark, 1978; Gideonse & Joseph, 1984).

Wisniewski and Ducharme ("Where," 1989) explained that,

Educationists are unique from other professors in that they are held directly accountable for the performance of their graduates. . . . Teachers are always in the public eye. As a result, professors of education are likely to be blamed whenever the quality of teaching is found wanting. (p. 148)

✓ Salmen (1971) considered deans to be the most important administrators in the university. They usually were significant personages with considerable power and influence on campus (Veysey, 1965; Hanzeli, 1966; Gross & Grambsch, 1974; Dill, 1980), and they often served as the primary agent for change and innovation in the university (Ward, 1934; Riesman, 1958; Enarson, 1962; Gould, 1964; Hanzeli, 1966; Bevan, 1967; Meeth, 1971; Giacquinta, 1980; Wolotkiewicz, 1980). Possibly, this was because many deans retained faculty status, whereas the executive officers of the academy often had made a final commitment to a career in administration (Morris, 1981). In addition, it was not

uncommon for presidents to be absent from their institution for considerable periods of time while deans functioned primarily within the institution, and, thus, routinely interacted with most other constituents (Gould, 1964; Hanzeli, 1966; DeVane, 1968; Mayhew, 1968; Morris, 1981). Because the offices of deans were located at the core of the "academic microcosm," they were "in a better position than anyone else on campus to assure its vitality" (Hanzeli, 1966, p. 421). Similarly, Wolotkiewicz (1980) wrote that, "the dean is the key figure for moving the institution forward" (p. 21).

Gideonse and Joseph (1984) noted that the deanship "is the one academic role that has the greatest potential for supporting inquiry and scholarship" (p. 25). Morris (1981) wrote that the dean was "at the center of a university's raison d'être, i.e. teaching and research" (p. 8). However, in the considerable literature about deans, there was a lack of research that focused on the role and importance of scholarship in the deanship. Similarly, there was a lack of investigation into the relationship between scholarship and the deanship in schools or colleges of education.

There has been increasing concern, expressed in the literature, about the quality and effectiveness of leadership in higher education in general (Morris, 1980; Wolotkiewicz, 1980). This concern has extended to include

those who lead schools and colleges of education (Coladarci, 1980; Culbertson, 1980; Cyphert & Zimpher, 1980; Dill, 1980; Ryan, 1980; Silver, 1980). If the quintessence of higher education, at least in theory, was a commitment to scholarship, there was need to explore this topic. Inquiry of this type would help discover if, and in what ways, scholarship underlaid the education deanship. The results of such an inquiry would serve not only to test a widely held assumption that operated in higher education, but also would contribute to an understanding of the philosophical grounding of the education deanship.

A reasonable first step was to determine what practicing leaders in the schools and departments of education actually believed about the role and importance of scholarship in their administrative careers and in the daily fulfillment of their duties and obligations. The literature included some contradictory opinion and commentary about the value or necessity of continued scholarship on the part of deans. These opinions, however, were not based upon careful research and analysis. There was need for an exploratory and descriptive study that would collect and analyze the perceptions of current deans, and thus, provide some baseline data on this topic.

Assumptions of the Study

The assumptions underlaying this study are enumerated below:

- 1) It was assumed that administrators who were surveyed would be honest in their responses to the questionnaire and interview.
- 2) It was assumed that administrators who were surveyed would be familiar with all information needed to complete the questionnaire and interview.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

There were particular limitations and delimitations which prevented generalization beyond the surveyed population of deans of education in doctoral-granting institutions. Limitations included:

- 1) The questionnaire was not completed by all deans in the schools of education that were surveyed.
- 2) Form II of the questionnaire was not completed by all who returned Form I.
- 3) The interviewing process was dynamic. Thus, even with an outlined protocol of questions, participants did not always choose to answer the questions exactly as they were posed. In

addition, the interviewing process allowed an opportunity for follow-up questions which varied somewhat from dean to dean.

Delimitations included:

- 4) Institutions selected for inclusion in the survey were delimited to those in the United States that included a school or college of education that awarded the Ph.D. and/or Ed.D. degree in traditional areas of education.
- 5) Institutions selected for inclusion in the survey were delimited to those that had a dean (or equivalent director or chairperson) in place to participate in the study.
- 6) The questionnaire was administered only to deans in these schools and colleges of education.
- 7) It was possible to interview only four deans. They were selected from a list of those deans:
 - a) identified as having substantial interest in the relationship of scholarship to the deanship, and,
 - b) who had completed the questionnaire.

Definition of Terms

- 1) Scholarship. Scholarship was defined broadly as all forms of creative and intellectual productivity (Wisniewski, 1986), resulting from association with an institution of higher

education. Terms such as scholarship, scholarly activities, and scholarly pursuit were synonymous for purposes of this study. Activities that were possible evidence of scholarship included (but were not limited to), publications, submitted and/or published; service on the editorial board of a journal; review of proposals for a funding agency; review of articles for a professional journal; academic leadership that created an environment conducive to faculty scholarship; service on an accreditation team; reading to stay current; delivery of colloquium to faculty and/or students; publication or editing of a book or monograph; publication of a book review; delivery of paper at a professional meeting; systematic study designed to gain new knowledge; consultation that included the use of some results of scholarship; development of new processes for use in the school or institution; presentations to local organizations that used some results of scholarship; activities that resulted in the dissemination of new knowledge; library research; development of new pedagogical techniques; other activities that advanced knowledge.

- 2) Administrator. For purposes of this study, this term was restricted to individuals who were associated with schools of education. More specifically, it designated those who served as deans in schools of education.
- 3) Higher Education Institution. Since this study was restricted to doctoral-granting schools and colleges, this term referred primarily to large, comprehensive universities.
- 4) Dean. The chief executive officer in the school or college of education. In a few instances, institutions did not use the title of "dean," but some other designation such as "chair," "chairperson" or "director."
- 5) Deaning. Those behaviors which characterized the activities in which the dean engaged.
- 6) Deanship. A position or role in the institution, as distinct from the individual holding that position.
- 7) Decanal. Of or pertaining to a dean (The Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 1969). In this report, decanal scholarship referred to scholarship activities of the dean.
- 8) Assistant Dean. The immediate administrative subordinate(s) to the dean in the school or college of education. For purposes of this

report, other titles such as "associate dean" were subsumed under this term.

- 9) Chief Academic Officer. Most often, this was the provost of the institution. The term, in some instances, referred to a graduate dean or other executive officer. In all cases, it designated the immediate administrative superior to the dean of education.
- 10) Holmes Group. A consortium of schools and colleges of education whose object is to further the profession of teaching through increased training and research.
- 11) Doctoral-granting schools of education. Those schools or colleges of education in the United States that awarded the Ph.D. and/or Ed.D. degree. Institutions with a primary mission of religious education were omitted as were those that granted a doctorate of Education only in discipline specific areas (i.e., English Education, Music Education, Computer Education). In addition, institutions that used only part-time faculty for instruction, were not included.

Research Questions

The research questions which guided this study were organized around four topics:

- 1) Deans' beliefs about what comprised scholarship from administrators.
 - A) Which of their own activities did deans consider to be evidence of scholarship?
 - B) Did deans believe that they must demonstrate ongoing scholarship to the chief academic officers? If so, what form(s) should it take?
 - C) What evidence of scholarship did deans accept from their assistant deans?
 - D) In what ways did deans differentiate between expectations of scholarship from faculty and from administrators?
 - E) Did deans consider academic leadership that created an environment conducive to faculty scholarship, to be scholarship?
- 2) Deans' perceptions about the role and importance of scholarship in the deanship.
 - A) How did deans implement their own scholarship goals?

- B) Was there a relationship between the scholarly experience of deans and their administrative expectations of scholarship?
 - C) What was the influence of administrative experience upon the deans' scholarship?
 - D) Did deans believe that it was possible to be an academic leader without continuing the practice of scholarship?
 - E) Did deans believe that continuing scholarship inhibited or enhanced the performance of their administrative duties?
- 3) The relationship between the deans' scholarship and the deans' performance evaluations.
- A) Did the current administrative evaluation process include consideration of scholarship?
 - B) Should evidence of scholarship be part of the deans' evaluations?
- 4) Variability among deans.
- A) Could any differences in perceptions of deans be explained by size of institution, type of institutional control, years of service as dean, or other demographic variables?

- B) Were deans in schools of education that were members of The Holmes Group more likely to give greater importance to the role of scholarship in administration?

Procedures

Information and data were gathered through two methods. Survey research methods were utilized to address a general inquiry across the entire population of current deans of education in doctoral-granting institutions. Form I (QI) of the questionnaire consisted of informational, demographic and forced choice questions in a fill-in-the-space or forced-choice format. All respondents were requested to complete this form. Form II (QII) of the questionnaire consisted of similar questions, but with provision for open-ended answers; this form was optional.

The data from the questionnaires were supplemented with four selected interviews that allowed an opportunity to look at a few deanships in more depth. A reputational approach was used to identify individuals to be interviewed. Whereas the focus of QI was upon discovering "what" were the perceptions of these deans about the topic, QII and the interviews allowed a limited opportunity for an explanation of these perceptions. Such a combination of research models has become more common in recent years and often has

resulted in greater depth of understanding (Denzin, 1978; Goetz and LeCompte, 1984).

QI yielded mostly ordinal or nominal data. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences X (SPSS-X) was used for all statistical analyses. Information from QII and the four interviews was categorized whenever possible. This information was principally of an anecdotal nature and was used to enhance the qualitative dimension of the research project.

Organization of the Study

The dissertation is organized in the following chapters format:

- I. Overview of the Study
- II. Review of Related Literature and Research
- III. Methods and Procedures
- IV. Presentation and Discussion of the Findings
- V. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations
- VI. Appendices

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Introduction

The review of related literature and research is divided into four areas. Since the term "scholarship" had been defined in various ways, it was requisite to understand how this term was used in educational literature. It also was useful to review what had been written about the deanship in general and the deanship in education, specifically. Finally, it was necessary to determine what literature existed that investigated the relationship of scholarship and higher education administration.

Scholarship

"Scholarship" is a value-laden term that has been bandied about the halls of academia, usually without precise definition. "Indeed, genuine ambiguity even exists as to what constitutes academic 'scholarship,' . . ." (Pellino, Blackburn & Boberg, 1984, p. 103). Scholarship often had been used as a synonym for research and publication (Pellino, Blackburn & Boberg, 1984; Smart & McLaughlin, 1985). Some writers had distinguished between these two terms. Wisniewski (1984) wrote that research was exemplified by experimental design and statistical analysis,

while scholarship suggested all systematic forms of inquiry. Perkins ("Missions," 1973) differentiated between scholarship which was individually determined and research which required decisions to be made at the college or university level. Henderson (1960) considered research to consist of original investigation while scholarship also included the analysis, organization or synthesis of existing facts or ideas. Whatever the distinction that was drawn between research and scholarship, the terms traditionally referred to a product that materialized in a printed format.

In contrast, there were those in higher education who defined scholarship in broader terms (McGrath, 1959; Gideonse & Joseph, 1984; Pellino, Blackburn & Boberg, 1984; Wisniewski, 1984, 1986, 1989). In their report about increasing the research capabilities of schools of education, Gideonse and Joseph (1984) defined scholarship as, "research, development, evaluation, and dissemination as well as the grounding of academic and professional training programs on the emerging knowledge base" (p. 9). Pellino, Blackburn and Boberg (1984) described it as "research and all other creative professional activities . . . [exclusive of] those hours spent in teaching and immediate classroom preparation" (p. 106). Wisniewski (1986) wrote that "scholarship" included "all forms of creative and intellectual productivity" (p. 4). In another publication, Wisniewski (1984) described scholarship as "a set of values

and attitudes. . . . characterized by intellectual curiosity, skepticism, and a commitment to inquiry that permeates professional deliberations and actions" (p. 3). McGrath (1959) believed scholarship included not only research that resulted in new knowledge, but also other activities that ensured intellectual liveliness (i.e., constant reading, critical evaluation of existing factual material, investigations of new concepts as well as research that involved synthesis of existing data).

The Deanship

Veysey (1965), Rudolph (1968), Witmer (1969), Duryea (1973), Brubacher and Rudy (1976) and Dill (1980) have highlighted the expansion of administration in higher education that occurred after the Civil War. As this occurred, the use of standard operating procedures became commonplace in administrative offices. According to Veysey (1965), the term "administration" began to suggest a "certain state of mind" that concentrated on organizational planning and management. An exception, in some instances, was the dean's office which strove to maintain a link with students (Dill, 1980), to uphold "collegiate and human values" (Rudolph, 1968) and to maintain "the human touch" (Rudolph, 1968) in an environment that was increasingly characterized by professionalism and specialization. Hence, although the deanship emanated from the top as an extension

of the president (Singleton, 1955; Deferrari, 1956; Dupont, 1956, 1957; Doyle, 1957; Corson, 1960, 1975; Gould, 1964; Brown, J., 1969; Salmen, 1971), it also served as the bridge to other administrators, to the faculty and to the students (Thwing, 1926; McGinnis, 1933; Kelley, 1957; Rudolph, 1968; Dill, 1980; Stark, Lowther & Hagerty, 1987).

As deanships proliferated in higher education, they became the focus of inquiry, commentary and criticism. The literature about deans usually differentiated between academic deanships (i.e. dean of liberal arts, academic dean, graduate dean) and non-academic deanships (i.e. dean of students, dean of admissions). Some authors focused their attention upon a specific deanship for discussion or investigation. The academic dean, for instance, served as the subject matter for Milner (1936), Finnegan (1951), Enarson (1962), Joughin (1963), Gould (1964), Dibden (1968) and Miller (1974). Nichols (1959), Whaley (1968) and Hodges and Hodges (1975) brought their attention to the graduate dean. Deans in other, discipline-based schools, have received less particular attention. Often, commentary has been directed rather loosely toward all academic deans, rather than focused upon specific deanships.

Doi (1965) noted that the predominant type of literature in the past about deans was of an anecdotal or advisory nature. For instance, there was a whole genre of humor about deans that existed in faculty folklore

(Cleveland, 1960; Mayhew, 1968). Blewett's (1954) and Ciardi's (1968, Mar. 24 & May 19) pointed remarks exemplified this type of sardonic humor. Cleveland (1960) discussed the mythology about the deanship that had been perpetuated. Part of this mythology concerned statements from faculty-turned-deans as to why they became administrators. It frequently was averred that most faculty entered administration reluctantly only in order to "help out" until they would be able to return to research and teaching (Gross & Grambsch, 1974). This myth usually was accompanied by another that suggested that the university would be best run by professors (Marshall, 1956; ten Hoor, 1959; Henderson, 1960; Dearing, 1963; Rourke & Brooks, 1964; Barzun, 1968; Gross & Grambsch, 1974). Similarly, there was a prevailing myth that deanships went to those who had proven incompetent as teachers or scholars (Lunsford, 1968).

Hawkes and Hawkes (1945), McVey and Hughes (1952), Lee (1959), DeVane (1968) and Brubacher and Rudy (1976) have recounted the virtues of particular, memorable deans. In addition, there have been full-scale biographies of particular individuals (Brown, R., 1926; Hinckley & Benner, 1955; Weld & Sewny, 1958). Horn (1964) reminisced in a chatty fashion about his experience as a dean and as a president working with deans. Randall (1934) and Lee (1959) recounted war stories about their years as dean. Even in current research, it was not unusual to find the systematic

collection of anecdotal material used to make inferences and form conclusions about the deanship (Fullerton, 1978; McCarty & Reyes, 1987).

Other deans, presidents and the faculty all have felt free to dispense advice to those who have served as deans (Marshall, 1956). Most of this type of literature has not been research based, but has taken the form of opinion derived from experience. This "advisory" commentary frequently addressed the type of qualities that were deemed desirable in the deanship. For instance, because faculty do not perceive their role to be "subordinate" to the dean (Millett, 1962), it was considered important that the dean be able to function as a "leader of equals." Such leadership required that the dean be skilled at achieving consensus, at manipulating faculty decision making or at serving as a catalyst for decision making (Cleveland, 1960; Enarson, 1962; Gould, 1964; Barzun, 1968; McGannon, 1973; Corson, 1975). This type of leadership was required because of the "horizontal" structure of authority which characterized the university (Cleveland, 1960; Horn, 1962; Millett, 1962; Gould, 1964; Lunsford, 1968; Henderson & Henderson, 1974; Kapel & Dejnozka, 1979) and allowed the faculty to control or influence particular decisions (Cleveland, 1960; Barzun, 1968).

Although deans usually were selected because of their "academic training, aptitude, and performance" (Besse,

1973), there was no general consensus about what were the desirable and acceptable characteristics for the position (Bolman, 1968). Particular writers stressed one quality or another as desirable, but in general, it was recognized that the dean had two major responsibilities--the exercise of educational leadership and the efficient administration of the dean's office (Duryea, 1962; Gould, 1964; Wolotkiewicz, 1980). In addition, writers noted the necessity for the dean to be a hard worker who was willing to invest more than forty hours per week into the job (Dupont, 1956; Buchen, 1974; McDaniel, 1978).

Many writers bemoaned the overall quality of leadership exemplified by past and current deans. In a study on administrators in education, Morsink (1987) found that leadership that would cause "the unit to focus on its mission by words, personal example, and policy development" (p. 26) was one of two critical functions identified. After recognizing that the dean was midway in the chain of command of president, dean and chair, Hanzeli (1966) suggested that the dean could provide better leadership only if provided with concomitant authority--especially in the areas of appointments, promotions, tenure and research assistance. Conant (1967) wrote that "Most deans believe that they have more responsibilities than power" (p. 278). Joughin (1963) also called for enhanced leadership by the dean, but failed to clarify the concept except to suggest that because most

deans continued in office until retirement or death, they were not exercising leadership. Enarson (1962) believed that effective leadership depended upon the ability to think clearly and deeply on issues and then to persuade others to make correct and appropriate decisions. Morris (1981) suggested that the uniqueness of administration in higher education required a particular model of decanal leadership which relied upon an ability to persuade, to empathize, to listen, and to remain emotionless in decision making.

Efficient administration of office routine required that the dean have adequate managerial and administrative skills (Gould, 1964; Barzun, 1968; Wolotkiewicz, 1980). These skills have become more essential as the dean's office has continued to absorb duties relinquished by the president (Deferrari, 1956; Dorson, 1960; Mayhew, 1968). Some writers lamented the circumstances that have increased the bureaucratic features of the dean's office (McGrath, 1947, 1964; Dupont, 1956; Joughin, 1963). Joughin (1963), for instance, distinguished between the predominant number of deans whom he termed "organization men" and the desired "dean as educator" who combined the qualities of scholarship, educational leadership and candid critic of the institution. McGrath (1947) wrote that higher education would remain responsive and vital "Only if deans are freed from routine administrative duties and only if they have an

abiding interest in the intellectual aspects of administration . . ." (p. 49).

More commonly, the literature delineated a need for deans to enhance their administrative abilities. Morris (1981) wrote of the desirability that the personality of candidates for the deanship be congruent with the office. He found that the primary component of such an administrative temperament was a healthy ego that was rewarded by the prestige of the office and fueled by ambition. Morris also indicated particular administrative skills required by deans--collaborative and integrative skills, a tolerance for chaos, an ability to negotiate, a tough skin, an awareness that the faculty viewed the dean as an adversary, and an ability to maintain an objective and balanced viewpoint.

Despite these attempts to clearly define the type of qualities needed in an effective deanship, many writers have noted that the heterogeneity among institutions of higher education made it difficult to define either the role or the specific qualifications needed for the deanship (Hawkes, 1930; McGinnis, 1933; Ward, 1934; Selznick, 1957; Hamilton, 1962; Gould, 1964; Horn, 1964; Conant, 1967; Gross & Grambsch, 1974; Corson, 1975; McDaniel, 1978; Coladarci, 1980). According to Hawkes (1930), "There is a dean of this and that college, but I have never seen any two deans who could exchange places and retain the same duties" (p. 245).

Similarly, Corson (1975) wrote that "assessing the role of the dean is akin to that of drawing a bead on a moving target . . ." (p. 253). For these reasons, both Wriston (1955) and White (1957) believed that it was not productive to attempt to create a rigid job description for deans or other administrators.

Literature on the deanship frequently included descriptive lists or narratives of the dean's duties. One of the earliest interpretations of decanal duties was in Harvard's President Eliot's 1869-1870 reports (1926) where he listed administrative responsibilities having to do with student discipline, other student affairs, admissions, standards of scholarship, scholarship aid, graduation requirements and other general clerical and administrative business of the institution. The earliest studies undertaken to determine the functions of deans were by Reeves and Russell (1929) and Reeves, et al. (1932). In these limited studies of a total of 51 church related colleges, thirteen primary functions of the dean were identified. Most of these functions related to students or to educational policy. In 1936, Milner reported results of a study based on data from 100 small colleges. Almost all of the 20 functions most often assigned to the dean had to do with students or curriculum.

Ward (1934) discovered eight major responsibilities of the dean. Five were concerned with students or

curriculum while the other three related to faculty or research. Higgins (1947) found a similar range of responses. The results from Higgins' (1947) questionnaire, however, revealed that academic deans had begun to have more supervisory duties, rather than immediate responsibility for the areas of admissions, registration, discipline and student counseling. Finnegan's (1951) study of 34 Catholic men's colleges found the primary functions of deans to be similar to those listed by Reeves and Russell (1929), Reeves et al. (1932), Milner (1936) and Higgins (1947). Similarly, both Woodburne (1950) and Forrest (1951) found that the academic dean's office was a service office that was expected to carry out general institutional objectives concerned with facilitating good teaching (Gould, 1964). Gould (1964) noted that since World War II, the focus of the dean had progressed from almost sole concern with the student to major concern with the faculty.

McDaniel (1978) wrote that the dean's primary responsibilities were to serve, to advise, to communicate and to lead. Englebert (1957) believed that the dean's duties were to maintain in-service training for teachers, to encourage faculty scholarship, to maintain faculty morale, to utilize faculty talent efficiently and to assume responsibility for public relations. Mobberley and Wicke (1962) judged the primary functions of the dean to be the fulfillment of campus objectives, responsibility for

personnel, curriculum and student welfare, and responsibility for institutional research.

Some literature has addressed the particular issues that faced practicing deans. Bevan (1967), for instance, named four challenges facing deans in the mid 1960s--the challenge of change, the challenge of the stresses facing students, faculty and administrators, the challenge of faculty recruitment and retention and the challenge of the budget. Morris (1981) focused on higher education as the center of the "knowledge industry" with an accompanying need for a "cadre of administrators." From his management perspective, the important issues included salary, promotion, tenure, affirmative action, budgeting, public service, governance and the political implications of the office.

DeVane (1968) considered the relationship between the dean and the faculty to be the most important issue--especially in regard to recruitment and hiring. Of second and third importance were educational policy and student policy. Koch (1968) categorized the issues facing deans in terms of "roles." He believed that a dean must be able to assume an authoritative role, a role as judge, a role as chief architect and interpreter of educational philosophy and a role as the interpreter of educational values.

Conflict management also emerged as a significant issue in the deanship literature. Caplow and McGee (1958),

Wriston (1959), Horn (1964) and Mayhew (1968) focused on the conflicts that evolved between the president and the dean because of the need to share responsibilities. Mobberley and Wicke (1962) and Mayhew (1968) believed that part of this conflict resulted from the circumstance that often placed the dean in both a line and staff position.

Many writers recounted the adversarial nature of the faculty-dean relationship (Johnson, 1949; Engelbert, 1957; Caplow & McGee, 1958; ten Hoor, 1959; Galligan, 1960; Euwema, 1961; Goodman, 1962, Nov.; Mobberley & Wicke, 1962; Dearing, 1963; Rosenheim, 1963; Ciardi, 1968; DeVane, 1968; Koch, 1968; McConnell, 1971; Meeth, 1971; Gross & Grambsch, 1974). Parsons & Platt (1973) found that faculty-dean problems developed as a consequence of the "zone of interpenetration" that resulted when the lines of division of labor, power and prestige were not clearly delineated. Johnson (1949) highlighted the conflict potential of this relationship through a series of fictitious letters between "Peter Pert," a recently resigned administrator who had returned to full-time faculty status, and "Dean I. M. Misanthrope." Faculty-dean problems sometimes resulted when the faculty had no voice in the dean's selection (McVey & Hughes, 1952; Mobberley & Wicke, 1962).

Others noted that as the man in the middle (Deutsch, 1952; Keenan, 1957; Kelley, 1957; Caplow & McGee, 1958; Woodburne, 1958; Hanzeli, 1966; Conant, 1967; Wolotkiewicz,

1980), the dean had to balance the needs and wishes of both the faculty and the executive officers of the institution. As noted by Conant (1967), the dean "cannot display a completely different nature when leading his unit as a line officer, and when advising the central administration as a staff officer" (p. 278). Rasmussen (1978) found, for instance, that the dean had to act as an evaluator, a gadfly stimulating faculty productivity and change, a mediator between opposing forces both within the institution and external to the institution and as a conservator of the basic philosophy of the institution. As the middle man, the dean also was subject to conflicts created by overlapping jurisdiction and decision making (MacIntosh, 1948; Deutsch, 1952; Lee, 1959; Ryan, 1980). Meeth (1971) suggested, however, that this assumption of faculty-dean conflict was self-perpetuating. "Perhaps the single most important cause is that the breach has become a self-fulfilling prophecy" (p. 40).

In recent years, the attention to evaluation in higher education has not bypassed the dean's office (Farmer, 1978; Rasmussen, 1978; Morris, 1981; Lasley & Haberman, 1987). Until the 1970s, there was no systematic attempt to evaluate the dean (Rasmussen, 1978). Haberman (1972), Rasmussen (1978) and Morris (1981) have developed evaluation forms to be used in the assessment of the dean's performance in office. Lasley and Haberman (1987) surveyed central

administrators in higher education to determine what types of criteria were being used to evaluate education deans.

According to McCarty and Reyes (1985), "Up until 1970, there was no genuine scholarly interest in the deanship . . ." (p. 2). Since then, there have been a number of empirical studies. Dill (1980) found, however, that most of these studies looked at the dean as a person, rather than focusing on the deanship as a role. Ryan (1980) noted that most descriptions of the dean's role had been through survey techniques that ignored the dynamics of the role, the interrelationships among societal, institutional, and personal variables, and the effect of these variables upon role behavior. Although Cyphert's and Zimpher's (1980) survey was designed to uncover demographic details that would provide a profile of the dean, they too noted the necessity of additional studies to focus on the role responsibilities of deans. Meeth (1971) noted four concepts of the dean's role that have emerged in the literature. These are the dean as autocrat, as servant of the faculty, as academic leader and as change agent. Although much administrative theory stressed the academic leader as the ideal role, Meeth believed that the dean as change agent was the most viable concept in most institutions.

Gould's (1964) empirical study of the academic deanship was a response to Corson's Governance of Colleges and Universities (1960) which raised questions about the

role and influence of the dean. The emphasis of this survey was upon the duties of the dean; the personal, interpersonal, institutional, and extra-institutional factors that affected the dean's role; the relationship of the dean to the president and department chairs; and the problems the dean faced as faculty leader and administrator.

The Deanship in Education

Coladarci (1980) discovered that upon appointment as dean of education, the literature about this position "could be read comfortably between a late breakfast and an early lunch--and that the dearth in volume was not compensated for by substance" (p. 125). In recent years, organizations such as the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), Harvard University, the American Council on Education, the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, and the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education have given high priority to enhancing leadership training in schools and departments of education (Cyphert & Zimpher, 1980). A result of this priority has been recognition that more intense and comprehensive study was needed to increase the body of knowledge upon which this training was to be founded (Culbertson, 1980; Cyphert & Zimpher, 1980).

The major studies that have resulted included Cyphert's and Zimpher's 1975 survey which was designed to

identify baseline information about the personal, professional, and job-related characteristics of deans in all schools, colleges and departments of education in the United States (1980). Similarly, the purpose of Anderson and King's (1987) study was to establish a demographic profile of the typical dean of education. The purpose of Dejnozka's (1978) study was to determine what deans of education considered to be their roles and how these role perceptions compared with role perceptions of the education deanship held by the central administrators, chairs in colleges of education and faculty in colleges of education. Kapel and Dejnozka (1979) extended this study to ascertain if there were significant differences among education deans, central administrators, department chairs and faculty, related to the role norms of the dean of education.

The Dilemma of the Deanship (Griffiths & McCarty, 1980) evolved from a systematic effort by the UCEA to stimulate research about administration in schools of education. The book collected essays and reports from researchers who considered the education deanship in terms of units or "domains." The focus of the intended, longitudinal, inter-institutional research included the domains of: 1) baseline data about the deanship, 2) deans as individuals, 3) deans as individuals-in-organizations, 4) colleges of education as complex organizations, 5) colleges

of education as organizations-in-environments, and 6) organizational change and the deanship (p. 14).

Fullerton (1978) surveyed seventeen deans of education in seven southern states about: 1) issues in education from a dean's point of view, and 2) issues in the role of dean. Giacquinta (1980) reviewed organizational change in schools of education and reported that the dean played a key role in any change that took place within these schools. Depending upon the circumstances of the school, the dean's role was "directive," "supportive" or "reactive."

Scholarship and Administration

Although a search of the literature revealed a number of dissertations about the position of dean, there were none that singularly considered the function or consequence of scholarship in the deanship. There was a lot of interest in the deanship in current literature, but in the main, the subject of scholarship in higher education administration was treated peripherally if at all. There had been limited inquiry into this relationship in some nursing schools. In 1981, the American Association of Colleges of Nursing instituted a continuing educational project for Nurse Academic Administrators that included a consideration of the "Dean as Scholar." This project, for the most part, consisted of opinions from practicing nursing deans (Andruskiw, 1981; Diers, 1981; Douglas, 1981; Ledbetter,

1981; Lindeman, 1981; MacPhail, 1981). There has not been a similar inquiry in schools of education.

A fairly recent article in The Chronicle of Higher Education discussed the identity crisis that some administrators faced when they made the shift from faculty status into full-time administration (Mooney, 1989). One vice-president and dean was quoted in the article as saying, "we've been political scientists or biologists or social scientists for so long, it's difficult to imagine not being an active scholar anymore. . . ." The article went on to discuss how particular individuals managed to implement strategies that allowed them to pursue at least a modicum of scholarly activity.

Despite the paucity of research about the relationship between scholarship and administration, almost the only universal qualification for a deanship has been that of academic and scholarly credibility (Bolman, 1968; Perkins, "Missions," 1973; Dill, 1980; Mertz, 1989). In a study of the academic deanship, Gould (1964) found that this individual was expected to be a leading scholar and a leader of scholars. It was universally expected that the dean would encourage scholarly activity among the faculty (Engelbert, 1957).

The most obvious obstacle to continuing scholarship was that of time (Deutsch, 1952; Enarson, 1962; McGrath, 1964; Hanzeli, 1966; Mollenberg, 1976; Andruskiw, 1981;

Dearing, 1963; Diers, 1981; Ledbetter, 1981; Stinnett, 1989). McGrath (1964) summed up this majority viewpoint by noting that:

most deans find it impossible to continue their research activities, except as they may be related to the functions of their office. They find it increasingly difficult even to keep abreast of the literature in their fields of scholarship. The quicksand of administrative routine so engulfs deans as to preclude contributions to the learned journals. (Foreword, p. vi)

Similarly, DeVane (1968) noted that the dean's daily duties "are antithetical to the scholarly life. His life is harder, more continually demanding, and full of constant crises" (p. 252).

Smart and McLaughlin (1985) considered the issue of sufficient time for scholarship in a study of chemistry faculty who became department chairs. They discovered that the creative productivity (which they defined by publications and doctoral student productivity measures) of these individuals was not necessarily adversely affected by service as department chair, especially in the smaller and larger departments. Like Gould (1964), McGannon (1973) suggested that there always was the "danger of using detail work as an excuse to postpone the jobs that should be the dean's main concern" (p. 279). In the extensive survey of education deans conducted by Cyphert and Zimpher (1980), only one group of questions dealt with scholarship. These questions equated scholarly productivity with publication.

Although the findings indicated that the publication rate of books and articles decreased after assumption of the deanship, the researchers also concluded that deans still were able to engage in as much research and writing as their faculty colleagues.

There was a considerable degree of unanimity that the dean should be appointed from faculty ranks (MacIntosh, 1948; Euwema, 1951; Deutsch, 1952; Singleton, 1955; Mobberley & Wicke, 1962; Robb, 1962; Henderson, 1966; Barzun, 1968; DeVane, 1968; Brown, J., 1969; Salmen, 1971). Barzun (1968) believed this was necessary in order that the dean could understand the "emotions and standards" of academic life which differed from those of business and government. Similarly, DeVane (1968) wrote that "It is well if the dean shall be a scholar in order that he may speak on even terms with the faculty, whose highest respect goes to scholarship" (p. 252). Salmen (1971) believed that administrators with a strong scholarly record received more esteem from their faculties, especially in the early years when they might display weak administrative skills.

Despite this requirement that deans evince past scholarship, there was disagreement about the desirability of remaining a scholar. In the early literature on the deanship, writers deplored what they saw as the gradual erosion of the dean's "intellectual leadership" (McGrath, 1947; Dupont, 1956). Dupont (1956) wrote that deans should

be individuals "of philosophic minds, who have thought deeply about the nature of man, his destiny, and the nature and purpose of the educative process" (p. 18). McGrath (1947) believed that the dean's greatest responsibility was "to consider the ends and means of education and to arouse the faculty to similar activity" (p. 43). He reiterated this belief in his "Foreword" to Gould's (1964) The Academic Deanship. Deutsch (1952) wrote that deans must continue some scholarly activity in order to keep in touch with the basic purposes of the university.

Barzun (1968), however, questioned the usual expectation that the dean be a respected scholar. Because institutions want the prestige that the "respected scholar as dean" offers, they have been resistant to the idea of professional administrators (Henderson, 1966; Barzun, 1968). Barzun, however, believed that "leadership by an administrator is best when it concerns administration" (p. 137). The difficulty of continuing an active scholarly life went beyond the issue of inadequate time. Some writers have questioned the congruence of a scholarly mode of thinking and the requirements of efficient administration. The scholarly temperament required that the scholar conduct an investigation impersonally (Henderson, 1960). Wriston (1959) noted that although the scholar could "wrestle" with problems until convinced of the correct outcome, the

administrator must make decisions in a timely manner, usually upon incomplete evidence. Barzun (1968) wrote,

All things considered, the mixing of scholarly pursuits and administrative responsibility is not to be desired. . . . A scholar wants all the evidence before he reaches a conclusion; he is not to be hurried into a snap judgment. But running an institution calls again and again for intelligent guesses and a sense of timing. . . . The resulting state of mind is the antithesis of respectable scholarship and science; an able faculty group will want a semester to decide what has to be done next Thursday. (pp. 128-129)

Summary

The review of literature revealed that there was a lack of consensus among writers about what constituted scholarship. At one end of the continuum, the term was used to designate a systematic program of research that resulted in the creation and dissemination of new knowledge. At the other end, it was described broadly to include all forms of intellectual creativity.

There was an extensive body of literature about the deanship in institutions of higher education. Much of it was of a historical nature, tracing either the development of the office or the growth of particular types of deanships. There also was much anecdotal material in the literature. There was a wide range of opinion about the personal and professional criteria that would be needed to

administer the dean's office, and there were a variety of beliefs about what constituted leadership by the dean. More recent literature discussed the types of administrative skills needed in the deanship and some writers regretted the increasingly bureaucratic nature of the position.

Past research studies of the deanship tended to center upon the duties and responsibilities of the dean. More recent studies have continued this type of inquiry, but also have focused upon contemporary issues that face deans, the need for evaluation of deans, and investigations that attempted to study the "role" of the dean within the institution.

Historically, there has been little attention in the literature to the education deanship. In recent years, some individuals and organizations have attempted to foster interest in planned programs of empirical research into the education deanship. Similarly, there has been very little in the literature that investigated the relationship between scholarship and higher education administration. It was not surprising then that there has been no inquiry into the role and importance of scholarship in the office of the dean of education.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study developed from concern over the apparent lack of inquiry into the role of scholarship in higher education administration. The theoretical framework for the research derived from a fundamental, underlying assumption that supposedly anchored, directed and explained the activities of higher education. This assumption was that scholarship was the philosophical touchstone for higher education and that behaviors throughout the institution reflected this orientation. If so, it followed that scholarship should, in some way, guide and influence not only the faculty, but also those who governed the institution (Ness, 1971; Salmen, 1971; Andruskiw, 1981; Diers, 1981; Douglas, 1981; Lindeman, 1981; MacPhail, 1981; Silber, 1988).

Although there had been much discussion and inquiry into the role of scholarship in the professoriate (Wisniewski, 1984, 1986, 1989; Schuster, 1986; Burch, 1989; Schwebel, 1989; Wisniewski & Ducharme, "Where," 1989, "Why," 1989), a preliminary review of the literature substantiated the observation that there was little investigation into its role in administration. Therefore, there was need for a

systematic inquiry into the appropriate role of scholarship in the careers of academic administrators.

Selection of the Study Population

Among those who had studied the administration of higher education, considerable attention had been directed toward the dean's position (Ward, 1934; Riesman, 1958; Enarson, 1962; Gould, 1964; Veysey, 1965; Hanzeli, 1966; Bevan, 1967; Meeth, 1971; Salmen, 1971; Gross & Grambsch, 1974; Dill, 1980; Giacquinta, 1980). Deanships were considered to be "middle management" in the administrative structure of the university (Deutsch, 1952; Keenan, 1957; Kelley, 1957; Caplow & McGee, 1958; Woodburne, 1958; Hanzeli, 1966; Wolotkiewicz, 1980). In addition, deans usually continued to engage in considerable interaction with faculty and departmental personnel and activities (Thwing, 1926; McGinnis, 1933; Kelley, 1957; Rudolph, 1968; Dill, 1980; Stark, Lowther & Hagerty, 1987). For these reasons, the dean's office appeared to be an appropriate object of study for this investigation.

In order to establish realistic boundaries for the research, it was determined that the deans in schools of education would serve as the study population. The investigation was delimited to doctoral-granting institutions because there was an expectation that active scholarship should be most evident in the nation's leading

research and doctoral-granting institutions (Clark, 1978; Judge, 1982).

Originally, 212 deans were identified as belonging to the proposed subject group. Peterson's Guide to Graduate and Professional Programs: An Overview 1989 (1989) and Peterson's Guide to Graduate Programs in Business, Education, Health, & Law 1989 (1989) were used to identify institutions which included a school of education that offered the Ph.D. or Ed.D. in education, in accordance with the parameters established for the study. The 1988 HEP Higher Education Directory (1988) was used as the source of names of deans of the schools that were determined to belong to the population.

As the preliminary investigation progressed, it was determined that of these 212 schools, eight were not in doctoral-granting institutions. In addition, in eight schools, there was not a dean in place to participate in the study. In two schools, there was no academic leadership role in the school of education that was equivalent to the dean's position. These 18 schools were eliminated from the study, leaving a population of 194 deans. In order to obtain breadth of results, the study utilized a census, rather than a random sample, of the entire population of current deans of education in doctoral-granting institutions in the United States.

Instrumentation and Collection of Data

Data were collected in two ways. A mailed pair of questionnaires were used to address a general inquiry across the entire study population. For evaluation purposes, a preliminary draft of the questionnaires was sent to five deans and professors of education in institutions that were not included in the study. A convenient sample was utilized. These individuals were requested to assess the questionnaires on appropriateness and clarity of questions and instrument design. When applicable, suggestions from these individuals were incorporated into the design of the instrumentation. The preliminary drafts of the two questionnaires are reproduced in Appendix A.

The instrumentation was composed of two questionnaires. Both were formulated to elicit responses to the research questions. Form I of the questionnaire (QI) consisted of informational, demographic and forced choice questions in a fill-in-the-space or forced-choice format. All respondents were requested to complete this part. It was comprised of three main parts.

Part I of QI presented a list of activities suggested as possible evidence of scholarship. The deans were requested to indicate with an "X" those activities that they would accept as evidence of scholarship from their assistant deans, from themselves and those they believed that the

chief academic officer in their institution would accept and expect from them. Space was provided for individuals to list "Other" choices. In addition, the deans were requested to indicate which five of the activities on the list would be most acceptable as evidence of administrative scholarship. Information derived from Part I was expected to aid in understanding how the deans defined administrative scholarship.

Part II of QI consisted of a series of 22 statements. The deans were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with the statements by circling one of the following: SA (strongly agree), A (agree), D (disagree) or SD (strongly disagree). The use of an exact midpoint was avoided deliberately so that the deans would be forced to make a distinct choice between "agree" or "disagree." These statements were constructed to elicit information that would aid in answering the full range of questions in the first three sets of research questions.

Part III of QI had several components. The first section presented a list of ten possible strategies that might be utilized to implement an individual dean's scholarship goals. Space was provided for "Others" to be added. The deans were requested to indicate which of these, if any, they used.

Other items on Part III requested that the deans indicate how many hours per month they expected their

assistant deans to devote to scholarship and how many hours per month that they believed their chief academic officers expected them to engage in scholarly pursuit. The possible answers ranged from a choice of "Less than 10 hours per month" to "More than 40 hours per month." The deans then were asked to indicate (with number of hours per month) whether they expected that their assistant deans would use "free time" for scholarship, and if they believed that the chief academic officers expected them to use free time for scholarship.

Demographic information also was requested on this part of the questionnaire. Items included: number of assistant deans in each dean's school, sex, race, correct designation as dean or acting/interim dean, major area(s) of academic specialization, age, total years of service as an administrator including years as dean, and total years as dean at the current and other institutions.

Space was allowed for the deans to indicate if they believed there were any important issues relating to this topic that were not raised in the questionnaires. The final item requested that the respondents list three current deans of education in doctoral-granting institutions whom they believed to have substantial interest in the relationship between scholarship and administration in schools of education. They could include their own name if desired. Participants were informed that this information

would be used to construct a list of names for possible interviews.

A second, optional, Form II of the questionnaire (QII) consisted of seven questions that provided for open-ended answers. These questions also sought information which would provide insight into the first three sets of research questions. These questions allowed an opportunity for individuals to answer in more depth and to explain the deans' unique points of view. It was believed that by making this second part optional, the overall response rate would be higher, more information would be forthcoming, and that individuals who desired to express their perceptions more completely would have that opportunity. Copies of the pair of questionnaires that were mailed to the study population are reproduced in Appendix B.

In order to enhance the qualitative dimension of the research project, interviews with four deans were conducted. This allowed an opportunity to gather factual and anecdotal data that would provide deeper understanding of the perceptions of four deans. Whereas the focus of QI was upon discovering "what" were the perceptions of these deans about the topic, the responses to QII and to the interviews allowed a limited opportunity to ascertain more clearly an explanation of their beliefs.

A reputational approach was used to identify the individuals to be interviewed. From the responses to the

final item on QI, a list of frequently mentioned names was compiled. Interviews were requested with individual deans whose names appeared often on the list and who had completed and returned the mailed questionnaire.

The protocol for the interviews was founded on the research questions. There were three basic areas of inquiry that were pursued during the interview:

- 1) How did education deans define scholarship?
- 2) What was the role and importance of scholarship in the office of the dean of education?
- 3) What was the importance of scholarship in the performance evaluation of the dean?

A copy of the interview question protocol is reproduced in Appendix C.

The intent of the interviews was to achieve a greater understanding and explanation of the deans' perceptions in these areas. Therefore, the precise questions and order of questions were influenced by the responses on the questionnaires received from the interviewed deans. Information assembled from the completed survey of each interviewee also allowed an opportunity for appropriate follow-up questions. Two of the four interviews were conducted in the deans' schools. Two were by telephone. Permission was obtained to tape record the interviews. All interviews were transcribed so that the content could be

categorized when appropriate, and then analyzed and incorporated into the findings.

The four deans who were interviewed will be identified in this report as Dean A, Dean B, Dean C and Dean D. The brief profile of each that follows will provide information about sex, race, age, years in administration, years as dean and academic specialization(s). A brief description of each dean's institution includes type of institutional control, general geographic location in the United States, affiliation with The Holmes Group, total student enrollment and number of graduate degree programs that were offered in the school of education.

Dean A is male, Caucasian and 58 years of age. He has served 29 years in administration, including 23 years as a dean of education. His academic specializations included Higher Education, Teacher Education, School Reform and Policy Development. He has been dean in more than one institution. His current deanship is in a public institution in the mid-southwestern region of the United States. It is a member of The Holmes Group and has a total enrollment in excess of 36,000 students. The school of education offers 16 programs leading to the doctoral degree and one additional master's degree program.

Dean B is male, Caucasian and 60 years old. He has been in higher education administration for 17 years, including 15 years in the dean's position. His academic

specialization was Educational Sociology. He has been dean in more than one institution. Dean B is employed in a public institution in the southeastern United States. It is a member of The Holmes Group. The student enrollment at the institution exceeds 25,000 and there are 17 doctoral degree and 11 master degree programs in the school of education.

Dean C is male, Caucasian and 48 years of age. His academic specialization was in Educational Administration. He has been in administration for 14 years with six of those as dean. He has been dean in more than one institution. He is associated with a public institution of more than 34,000 students in the north-midwestern part of the United States. His school of education is part of The Holmes Group and it offers 12 doctoral degree and 3 master degree programs.

Dean D is male, Caucasian and 60 years old. His academic specializations included Measurement and Teacher Education. He has been in administration for 25 years and has served as a dean for 20 years. He has been dean in more than one institution. His university is a public institution in the northeastern part of the United States, with a student population of 39,000. The school of education is a member of The Holmes Group and it offered 18 doctoral degree and two additional master degree programs.

Tabulation and Analysis of the Data

The first set of questionnaires was mailed on May 10, 1989 to all deans in the study population. The letter that accompanied this mailing is reproduced in Appendix D. A follow-up postcard was mailed on June 8, 1989, and a follow-up letter with another set of the questionnaires was mailed on June 29, 1989. The postcard and second letter are reproduced in Appendix E and Appendix F.

Of the 194 deans, 118 returned questionnaires which provided the data for the findings presented in this report. This represented a 60.8% rate of return. QII was completed and returned by 46 (39.0%) of the respondents. The interviews took place between July 26, 1989 and September 20, 1989. Data from QII and from the interviews were treated primarily as anecdotal material.

In order to determine to what extent the responding population corresponded to the total population, comparisons were drawn between the two, using the variables of type of institutional control, Holmes affiliation, Carnegie Classification, size of institution, and number of doctoral degree program offerings.

Institutions were differentiated according to type of institutional control. This information is presented in Table 1. The total study population included 140 (72.2%) institutions that were publicly controlled and 54 (27.8%)

TABLE 1

COMPARISON BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS
REGARDING THE DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION BY DEANS
OF EDUCATION IN DOCTORAL-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS
SUMMER 1989

Type of Inst Control	Respondent Institutions	Non-Respondent Institutions	Total Institutions
Public	93 (78.8)	47 (61.8)	140 (72.2)
Private	25 (21.2)	29 (38.2)	54 (27.8)
Totals	118 (100.0)	76 (100.0)	194 (100.0)

institutions that were privately controlled. Among the respondents, 93 (78.8%) were from public institutions and 25 (21.2%) were from private institutions. A slightly higher percentage of deans of education in public institutions were willing to participate in the study than would have been expected from the total population. Correspondingly, there was a slightly lower percentage of returns from deans of education in private institutions.

The Holmes Group began in 1983 with a group of education deans in research institutions interested in conducting a critical analysis of teacher education in order to improve teacher education programs. This consortium of institutions currently has 96 members (information provided by The Holmes Group, East Lansing, Michigan). The twin goals of The Holmes Group were the reform of teacher education and the reform of the teaching profession. Charter members of this consortium of institutions were selected through criteria that, among others, included: reputation for excellence of research and development in education; inclusion of a doctoral program in education; and past record of investment in research and development in the whole institution. The central thrust of The Holmes Group was to further the teaching profession through increased training and research (Holmes, 1986).

The comparison of the respondents to the study population by institutional control and Holmes membership is displayed in Table 2. The study population included 79 (40.7%) deans who were associated with institutions that were members of The Holmes Group and 115 (59.3%) individuals who were deans in non-member institutions. Of the deans who participated in the study, 43.2% were associated with institutions that were members of The Holmes Group while the proportion of member deans in the study group was 40.7%. It appeared that the deans in institutions affiliated with The Holmes were slightly more willing to participate in this study. The largest difference between the two groups was with non-member private institutions which represented 20.6% in the total population, but only 14.4% among the respondents.

The chi-square statistic was utilized to ascertain how well the respondent population corresponded statistically to the total population in terms of Holmes membership. The chi-square value obtained was 4.879 with 1 degree of freedom. This was statistically significant at the .05 level of significance, but not at the .01 level of significance. This finding reinforced the observation that the deans in institutions that were members of The Holmes Group were slightly more likely to participate in this study than non-members.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON BETWEEN STUDY POPULATION AND RESPONDENTS
BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL AND BY
HOLMES MEMBERSHIP SUMMER 1989

Holmes Affili- tion	Study Population			Respondents		
	Pub	Pri	Total	Pub	Pri	Total
Member	65 (33.5)	14 (7.2)	79 (40.7)	43 (36.4)	8 (6.8)	51 (43.2)
Non-Mem	75 (38.7)	40 (20.6)	115 (59.3)	50 (42.4)	17 (14.4)	67 (56.8)
Totals	140 (72.2)	54 (27.8)	194 (100.0)	93 (78.8)	25 (21.2)	118 (100.0)

Respondents to QI also were compared with respondents to QII by institutional control and Holmes membership. This comparison is displayed in Table 3. Comparison of the row and column percentages of responses revealed that there were similarities between the respondents to the two questionnaires. The largest deviation was in the lesser percentage of respondents from private institutions. The chi-square statistic was utilized to compare respondents to the two questionnaires. The chi-square value obtained was 5.654 which was significant at the .05 level of significance but was not significant at the .01 level of significance.

The Carnegie Classification of Institutions was used as another variable that would allow a comparison of the whole population with those who participated in the study. This classification system was developed to categorize institutions according to degree and program offerings, overall mission(s), receipt of federal funds for research and development, and number and type of degrees granted on an annual basis.

The Carnegie Classification of Institutions was redesigned in 1987, and it now encompasses ten institutional categories. The first six categories were of primary interest in this investigation, although a few of the respondents fell into others. For purposes of this investigation, the classifications are collapsed in the following manner:

TABLE 3

COMPARISON BETWEEN RESPONDENTS TO QI AND QII BY
TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL AND BY
HOLMES MEMBERSHIP SUMMER 1989

Holmes Affili- tion	Respondents to QI			Respondents to QII		
	Pub	Pri	Total	Pub	Pri	Total
Member	43 (36.4)	8 (6.8)	51 (43.2)	18 (39.1)	1 (2.2)	19 (41.3)
Non-Mem	50 (42.4)	17 (14.4)	67 (56.8)	18 (39.1)	9 (19.6)	27 (58.7)
Totals	93 (78.8)	25 (21.2)	118 (100.0)	36 (78.3)	10 (21.7)	46 (100.0)

- 1) Research universities I & II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctoral degree. They give high priority to research and receive substantial federal support for research and development. They award at least 50 doctoral degrees each year.
- 2) Doctorate-granting universities I & II: In addition to a full range of baccalaureate programs, these institutions offer graduate education through the doctoral degree. There are minimum numbers of doctoral degrees and minimum numbers of doctoral-granting disciplines needed to be included in these classifications.
- 3) Comprehensive universities and colleges I & II: These institutions offer baccalaureate programs and with few exceptions, graduate education through the master's degree. More than half of their baccalaureate degrees are awarded in two or more occupational or professional disciplines. There are minimum numbers of full-time students needed to be included in this classification.

- 4) Liberal arts colleges I & II: These institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges that award more than half of the baccalaureate degrees in arts and science fields.
- 5) Professional schools and other specialized institutions: These institutions offer degrees ranging from the bachelor's to the doctorate. At least 50 per cent of degrees awarded by these institutions are in a single specialized field. (Information provided in The Chronicle of Higher Education, July 8, 1987)

The comparison of the respondents to the study population by institutional control and by Carnegie Classification is presented in Table 4. There was a somewhat higher percentage of returns from the deans in public Research Universities and Doctorate Universities. There was a lower rate of return from the deans in Liberal Arts Universities and Colleges and Other institutions. This difference suggested that the deans of education in institutions that did not have a primary mission of research and development were less likely to participate in this study.

In order to determine how well the respondents corresponded to the study population in terms of Carnegie

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS TO THE STUDY POPULATION
BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL AND BY
CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION SUMMER 1989

Carnegie Class	Study Population			Respondents		
	Pub	Pri	Total	Pub	Pri	Total
Res Univ I & II	60 (30.9)	14 (7.2)	74 (38.1)	40 (33.9)	7 (5.9)	47 (39.8)
Doct Univ I & II	48 (24.7)	26 (13.4)	74 (38.1)	36 (30.5)	12 (10.2)	48 (40.7)
LA Un/Col I & II & Others	32 (16.5)	14 (7.2)	46 (23.7)	17 (14.4)	6 (5.1)	23 (19.5)
Totals	140 (72.1)	54 (27.8)	194 (99.9)	93 (78.8)	25 (21.2)	118 (100.0)

Due to rounding, percentages do not total 100.0

classification, the chi-square statistic was utilized. The chi-square value obtained was 7.410 with 2 degrees of freedom. This was significant at the .05 level of significance, but not at the .01 level of significance.

Size of institution was defined as total student enrollment. These data were obtained from the 1988 Higher Education Directory. The comparison of respondents to the study population by institutional control and by size is presented in Table 5. The differences that were found were in the middle ranges of size categories. There was a slightly lower percentage of returns from institutions sized 10,000 - 19,999 and a slightly higher percentage of returns from institutions sized 20,000 - 29,999. Because there were five cells that included fewer than five responses, the chi-square statistic was not computed.

The final variable used to compare respondents with the study population was number of doctoral degree programs in education offered in the schools in the study. The comparison of the respondents to the study population by institutional control and by doctoral degree programs is displayed in Table 6. The average number of doctoral degree programs at responding institutions was nine programs. The average at non-responding institutions was six and one-half programs. It is apparent from Table 6, that there was a higher percentage of response from deans in

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS TO THE STUDY POPULATION
BY TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL AND BY SIZE
SUMMER 1989

Enroll- ment	Study Population			Respondents		
	Pub	Pri	Total	Pub	Pri	Total
- 10000	26 (13.4)	33 (17.0)	59 (30.4)	16 (13.6)	20 (17.0)	36 (30.5)
10-19999	57 (29.4)	14 (7.2)	71 (36.6)	35 (29.7)	4 (3.4)	39 (33.1)
20-29999	36 (18.6)	4 (2.1)	40 (20.6)	29 (24.6)	0	29 (24.6)
30000 +	21 (10.8)	3 (1.6)	24 (12.4)	13 (11.0)	1 (0.9)	14 (11.9)
Totals	140 (72.2)	54 (27.8)	194 (100.0)	93 (78.8)	25 (21.3)	118 (100.1)
Due to rounding, percentages do not total 100.0						

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS TO THE STUDY POPULATION
BY INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL AND BY NUMBER OF
DOCTORAL DEGREE PROGRAMS SUMMER 1989

Number of Doctoral Programs	Study Population			Respondents		
	Pub	Pri	Total	Pub	Pri	Total
1 - 5	57 (29.4)	29 (15.0)	86 (44.4)	33 (28.0)	13 (11.0)	46 (39.0)
6 - 10	30 (15.5)	19 (9.8)	49 (25.3)	19 (16.1)	10 (8.5)	29 (24.6)
11 - 15	27 (13.9)	3 (1.5)	30 (15.4)	22 (18.6)	0	22 (18.6)
16 +	26 (13.4)	3 (1.5)	29 (14.9)	19 (16.1)	2 (1.7)	21 (17.8)
Totals	140 (72.2)	54 (27.8)	194 (100.0)	93 (78.8)	25 (21.2)	118 (100.0)

Due to rounding, percentages do not always total 100.0

institutions that offered a larger number of doctoral degree programs. Because there were four cells that included fewer than five responses, the chi-square statistic was not computed.

The validity of the instrumentation was an important consideration. Face validity, as used within the context of this study, referred to how well the instrument measured the perceptions and beliefs it was designed to investigate. The evaluation of the questionnaire by practicing administrators in the field and the incorporation of their suggestions into the final instrumentation was an attempt to increase face validity. In the presentation of data, there always is the possibility that responses from participants are not 100% reliable. However, it is believed that the margin of such error in the data reported is small, and that the information presented is representative of the population that was surveyed.

In addition, an item on QI gave deans the opportunity to indicate if there were significant topics that they believed were not addressed in this investigation. Six deans made one or more suggestions. Two had to do with the role of teaching in the deanship. This topic deliberately was avoided since it was desired that deans focus exclusively upon relationships that they believed existed between scholarship activities and the deanship. One dean suggested that the graduate vs. undergraduate curriculum

should be considered. This topic did not seem to be congruent with the research questions that guided the study.

Similar suggestions were made by three deans. One wrote, "Can, should, does scholarship play a more important role than experience in administrative preparation? Competency?" Another suggested consideration of "scholar values vs. central administration." Another asked whether characteristics that made a good researcher resulted in a bad dean and vice versa. Although the last statement narrowed the definition of scholarship that was operative in the study, it is believed that there were items on QI and QII which allowed deans an opportunity to address these issues. One final suggestion was that the investigation should consider whether administrative salary decisions should include merit awards for those who continued to pursue scholarship. There was one agree/disagree statement that specifically addressed the relationship between salary and decanal scholarship. In addition, question 6 on QII allowed deans the opportunity to discuss this issue in regard to performance evaluation of deans. Overall, there did not appear to be any significant omissions of issues that related to this investigation.

The objective items on the returned questionnaires were coded for computer analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences X (SPSS-X). The SPSS-X subprogram FREQUENCIES was used to obtain frequency

distribution tables for the responses to each survey item. When nominal or ordinal level data were obtained, the SPSS-X subprogram CROSSTABS was used to produce appropriate crosstabulations. A crosstabulation is a joint frequency distribution of cases according to two or more classificatory variables (Nie, 1975). In this study, crosstabulations were performed in order to compare the frequency distribution of responses to various survey items. Significance of results was determined by use of a .05 level of significance.

The Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient, r_s , was developed to measure association between two variables when only rank-order or ordinal data are available (Anderson, Sweeney & Williams, 1987). Spearman's r_s was used to test the relationship of variables whenever comparative data could be ranked.

The content of responses to QII and to the interview questions was categorized whenever possible. In many instances, responses were unique to individuals and these observations were presented as such. This information was integrated into the report and used to substantiate or further interpret the statistical findings. This qualitative data helped to highlight and explain areas of consensus and disagreement.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

A set of questionnaires was mailed to the 194 deans in the study population. This instrumentation was selected to determine the perceptions of these individuals about the role and importance of scholarship in the office of the dean of education in particular, and in higher education administration in general. The research questions which guided this study were delineated in Chapter I. Findings and results of the study will be reported and discussed in this chapter by the consideration of each set of research questions and the questionnaire items which related to them. In most instances, data from QI will be presented first since all respondents returned this form. The data from the optional QII (returned by 46 respondents) and from the four interviews will be analyzed and integrated into the findings, as appropriate.

Research Question 1

The first set of research questions was organized with the goal of discovering how the deans defined decanal and administrative scholarship.

1A) Which of their own activities did the deans consider to be evidence of decanal scholarship?

The first item on QI included a list of 18 activities suggested as possible evidence of scholarship. It allowed space for "Others" to be listed. The instructions requested the deans to indicate which of the listed activities they would accept as evidence of scholarship from themselves, from their assistant deans, and which they perceived that the chief academic officers would accept and expect from them. A blank space was considered to be indicative of the respondent's belief that that particular activity was not an acceptable form of scholarship from or to that administrator.

The activities that were identified as acceptable forms of decanal scholarship are displayed in Table 7. They are listed in order from most frequently to least frequently identified. This information was provided by all the respondents. Nine of these activities were endorsed by more than 60% of the deans. Of these, six activities fell into traditional areas of scholarly publication or research. They included, "Publish in refereed journal," "Present paper at professional meeting," "Publish or edit book or monograph," "Design research to gain new knowledge," "Publish in non-refereed journal" and "Publish book review." Two others involved association with journals in the contexts of service on an editorial board or as reviewer

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTIONS OF ACTIVITIES THAT DEANS BELIEVED
WERE ACCEPTABLE AND WERE NOT ACCEPTABLE
AS EVIDENCE OF DECANAL SCHOLARSHIP
SUMMER 1989

Activity	Accep to Deans	Not Accep to Deans
Publish in refereed journal	97.5%	2.5%
Present paper at professional meeting	91.5%	8.5%
Publish or edit book or monograph	88.1%	11.9%
Serve on editorial board of journal	83.1%	17.0%
Design research to gain new knowledge	77.1%	22.9%
Review articles for professional jour.	72.0%	28.0%
Academic leadership that encourages faculty scholarship	67.8%	32.2%
Publish in non-refereed journal	63.6%	36.4%
Publish book review	63.6%	36.4%
Review proposals for funding agency	55.9%	44.1%
Read to stay current	51.7%	48.3%
Speaking, using results of scholarship	45.8%	54.2%
Consult, using results of scholarship	44.9%	55.1%
Library research	43.2%	56.8%
Participate in faculty/student coll.	42.4%	57.6%
Serve on accreditation team	41.5%	58.5%
Develop new process for use in School	39.8%	60.2%
Develop new pedagogical technique	38.1%	61.9%
Other	8.5%	

of articles. The one activity that reflected a different type of expectation was, "Academic leadership that creates an environment conducive to faculty scholarship." This was perceived to be evidence of decanal scholarship by 67.8% of the respondents.

Two other activities were considered decanal scholarship by more than 50% of the respondents. They were "Review proposals for funding agency" and "Read to stay current." Activities that involved primarily speaking, consultation, service or development were considered evidence of decanal scholarship by less than 50% of the respondents.

Nine deans listed one or two other suggestions of possible scholarship. They were:

- 1) Promote virtues and values of church related education to constituents and public using the results of scholarship.
- 2) Serve on task forces and commissions dealing with education and new materials preparation.
- 3) Develop and test innovative products or practices.
- 4) Community service related to the deans' specializations.
- 5) Develop leadership/management models that reflect best of theory.
- 6) Hold national office.

- 7) Collaborative research with practitioners in elementary and secondary schools.
- 8) Conduct rigorous evaluation of program.
- 9) Published curriculum development projects.
- 10) Conceptual framework development.

Each item on this list of "Others" was selected by only one dean. These same "Others" appear on other tables in this chapter. However, since their incidence was low and their acceptance as scholarship was unique to individuals, this group of "Others" will not be listed or discussed again.

In order to consider the question of what constituted decanal scholarship from another direction, a frequency distribution was constructed of activities that the deans failed to identify as evidence of their own scholarship. This information also was provided in Table 7.

There was no activity that overwhelmingly was rejected by most deans in the population. Activities that were rejected by about 60.0% of the respondents included "Develop new pedagogical technique" (61.9%), "Develop new process for use in School" (60.2%) and "Serve on accreditation team" (59.3%). This finding suggested that, on the whole, deans of education in doctoral-granting institutions were not eager to reject as decanal scholarship even those activities which traditionally have been more closely aligned with service or teaching. For instance, almost 40% of deans failed to reject as scholarly activity,

items such as "Develop new pedagogical technique," "Develop new process for use in School," and "Serve on an accreditation team."

Anecdotal material garnered from QII and the interviews supported this finding. In describing decanal scholarship, more than one dean noted that such scholarship involved more than "research." Dean C stated that scholarship was the "creation of knowledge, through a variety of efforts" and that such efforts were broader than the application of empirical quantitative or qualitative procedures. Dean D also described scholarship broadly and said,

it means creating new knowledge, interpretation of "existing" knowledge, even applications, development work, taking established knowledge, principles, theories and converting that into applications.

One dean wrote that "this type of scholarship [writing activities of deans] is different from but not inferior to the type of scholarship required of faculty." Some comments from the deans also provided the viewpoint that acceptable evidence of decanal scholarship would vary widely according to the particular mission(s) operative in the school and institution.

In order to obtain a perspective on the range of activities that might be defined as administrative scholarship, the last item on Part I of QI asked the respondents to list the five activities that were most

acceptable to them as evidence of scholarship. The activities are presented in Table 8 in order from most often to least often included. Thirty deans did not respond to this item and six deans listed fewer than five activities.

There was little consensus on this item with substantial agreement only about "Publish in refereed journal" (94.3%), "Present paper at professional meeting" (72.7%), and "Publish or edit book or monograph" (63.6%). These three activities all fell within traditional forms of scholarship. Despite the lack of consensus, the first eight items listed are among the top 9 activities selected by the deans as evidence both of decanal scholarship and as evidence of scholarship from their assistant deans.

"Design research to gain new knowledge" received endorsement from 45.5% of respondents. Although this item also fell within the realm of traditional scholarship, there was a fairly low expectation that administrators should be engaged in a structured program of research. Commentary from QII reinforced this idea. One dean wrote of an inability to spend sustained time on scholarship, "I can't write books and the type of scholarship I do is less firmly entrenched in the esoteric reaches of philosophy." Another wrote,

Studies are more fragmented, more self-contained, have narrower scope, make more use of available situations and populations,

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF RANGE OF FIVE ACTIVITIES THAT
DEANS CONSIDERED MOST ACCEPTABLE AS EVIDENCE
OF SCHOLARSHIP SUMMER 1989

Activity	Freq of Response	Percent
Publish in refereed journal	83	94.3
Present paper at professional meeting	64	72.7
Publish or edit book or monograph	56	63.6
Design research to gain new knowledge	40	45.5
Publish in non-refereed journal	32	36.4
Serve on editorial board of journal	32	36.4
Academic leadership that encourages faculty scholarship	32	36.4
Review articles for prof. journal	12	13.6
Read to stay current	12	13.6
Serve on an accreditation team	11	12.5
Publish book review	10	11.4
Develop new pedagogical technique	9	10.2
Consult, using results of scholarship	7	8.0
Develop new process for use in School	7	8.0
Review proposals for funding agency	6	6.8
Speaking, using results of scholarship	6	6.8
Other	6	6.8
Participate in faculty/student colloquium	4	4.6
Library research	4	4.6

easier to do, more pragmatic and less theoretical, less well grounded in literature.

Question 2 on QII included this question, "What activities are on your scholarly agenda?" A wide range of responses to this item were received from 44 (95.7%) of the 46 deans who returned QII. A frequent theme reflected the need for the deans to remain informed about the latest developments and trends in the overall field of education. Eight deans indicated that they accomplished this primarily through reading current journals and new publications. One dean responded, "I read about 10 journals and skim new books regularly." Some deans noted that such reading was about the only scholarly activity that was possible on a regular basis during their tenure as dean. Dean B indicated that scholarly reading included the preview of papers written by others, prior to their submission for publication.

Several deans indicated that scholarship in the form of writing most often materialized as reports, position papers or "think pieces." Other deans observed that their current writing efforts took the form of keeping up-to-date, existing publications. For instance, two deans wrote about the revision of textbooks or chapters in books. One dean noted that he kept three textbooks current. Ten deans indicated that they either had just completed a book or chapter of a book, or that they were involved actively at the current time in such an effort. Although many deans

indicated that they were not able to engage in long-term writing projects, one described the completion of three books in the last 24 months and the commencement of the fourth. Six deans stated that the responsibilities of the deanship meant that any writing efforts were rarely the result of sole authorship, but more often were of a collaborative nature.

Thirteen deans responded that they wrote articles for both refereed and non-refereed journals. Three deans wrote that their current scholarly agenda included writing proposals for funding of research and three deans indicated that they wrote book reviews. Some deans responded that the concentration of their writing for journals had shifted from dissemination of the results of theory-based research to a focus upon articles that developed from activities within the deanship. For instance, one dean commented that articles for scholarly journals "grow out of my administrative role as Dean or activities of professional organizations for which I have special responsibilities." Two other deans wrote, "These days most work relates to higher education issues. . ." and "Current initiatives are focused on college priorities." Similarly, one dean wrote of a shift from narrow to general interests in education, and that such a shift "reflect[s] what I do now and what I know now." Still another dean wrote that "Scholarly endeavors tend to be in issues that are more generic in

nature and whose findings will be more applicable in advocacy areas."

In terms of research, 19 (43.0%) deans indicated that they had some type of involvement in research. This involvement appeared to be most often in the form of survey research that included the collection and analysis of data. The majority of the deans indicated that they were no longer able to engage in longitudinal or "basic" research. One dean wrote, "I work on fewer research questions at one time. I am also working with a team rather than by myself." Another dean wrote of ongoing research into the basic aspects of statistical methods in education research, but noted that there was no longer time to do the type of research that resulted in dissemination in refereed journals. Similarly, Dean C who continues to write on a regular basis, stated that:

As I have moved into the deanship, I don't maintain a program of research. I do a little tinkering here and there, I revise a textbook and I write various pieces for publication and dissemination, but it's not really serious work It's not a program of research systematically trying to pursue knowledge in a long-term way.

There was a fairly strong consensus among the deans who were interviewed and the deans who completed QII, that it would be very unusual to find a dean of education who could continue to conduct a rigorous program of systematic research designed to generate new knowledge and, at the same

time, administer the dean's office in an effective manner. This belief was voiced by Dean C who believed that many deans may be "scholarly," but that most are not "active" scholars. He stated,

some people do a funny sort of scholarship. They do scholarship sort of like I do-- philosophical articles, opinion pieces, or they do review of the literature--not to diminish that--that's very important, but those sorts of pieces are not scholarship.

There were a few responses, however, that portrayed a different kind of decanal research agenda. One dean wrote of "an ongoing basic research lab which requires at least one day per week." Another dean in a research institution with world renown, noted that administrators at that institution were not "professional" administrators, and hence, were expected to exhibit the same rigor of scholarly effort as faculty. Another who supported at least some research effort on the part of all administrators wrote, "I believe administrators should be expected to conduct research, publish, and give papers especially if they expect these activities from faculty."

Particulars of research efforts were specified by some deans. They were categorized as follows:

- 1) Development of new test item formats.
- 2) Research on basic aspects of statistical methods in educational research.
- 3) Soviet education.

- 4) Study of principals.
- 5) Research studies with groups.
- 6) Case studies of teachers of thinking.
- 7) Quality of preparation programs.
- 8) Development of systems and management theory.
- 9) Education reform.
- 10) Leadership styles.
- 11) Teaching reform in higher education.
- 12) Teaching effectiveness in urban settings.
- 13) Relationship between institutional type and quality of teacher preparation.
- 14) Demographics of teacher education. Structure and content of teacher education programs.
- 15) Development of an academic prediction model by studying admissions data for undergraduates.

Nine deans stated the belief that speaking activities and organizational involvement were part of decanal scholarship. Such activities often involved functioning as a consultant or as a member of a commission, a task force or an accreditation team. Three deans indicated that they served either as an editor or as a reviewer for a professional journal. Three deans believed that their leadership and influence over the school of education exemplified a type of decanal scholarship. Three other deans included program evaluation, program development and involvement in graduate education as scholarly activities.

One dean summarized fairly well the variety of activities that other deans included under the rubric of decanal scholarship. These included overall familiarity with the knowledge base of all disciplines in the college; creation of a research agenda in the college; provision of a variety of forums for faculty and practitioners to explore topics of mutual concern; creation of an environment for collaborative scholarship; commentary and chronicling of the results of the foregoing.

The responses about what constituted decanal scholarship were sprinkled with references to the "time" factor. The availability of time seemed to dictate what the dean could accomplish in terms of scholarship. For instance, one dean wrote that service as editor of a journal was "all I have time for." Another dean's scholarship consisted of "Just a bit of reading, but no sustained serious effort is possible." Similarly, another dean noted that administrative responsibilities were "too demanding for me to set aside a specified amount of time to pursue my own scholarship for scholarship sake." The insufficiency of time for scholarship was summed up by one dean in this way:

all the time I have for scholarship is spent on reading and consulting and not as much of these as I would like. Keeping as current as I can in as broad a range of college related subjects as possible takes a lot of time on and off the job.

A few deans made it clear that serious research would have to wait until retirement from the deanship. As one dean responded, "I'm going to retire and hope to get to them [research goals]."

1B) Did the deans believe that they must demonstrate ongoing scholarship to the chief academic officers? If so, what form(s) should it take?

Another method selected to understand how the deans defined administrative scholarship was to obtain their perceptions about whether they believed that the chief academic officers expected them to engage in scholarship and, if so, what form(s) it should take. The deans were queried as to how many hours per month they believed the chief academic officers expected them to engage in scholarship. This information is presented in Table 9. Almost one-half (48.7%) of the 111 respondents believed that this expectation ranged from zero to less than 10 hours per month. Only 10.8% of the respondents perceived that the expectation of scholarship exceeded 25 hours per month. It appeared that although most respondents perceived that the chief academic officers had some expectations of decanal scholarship, the expectation was minimal.

An item on Part III of QI requested that the deans indicate whether they believed that the chief academic officers expected them to use some free time for

TABLE 9

DEANS' PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE CHIEF ACADEMIC
OFFICERS' EXPECTATIONS OF TIME FOR
SCHOLARSHIP FROM DEANS
SUMMER 1989

<u>Range of Time Expectation</u>	<u>Frequency of Response</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
0 - 9 hrs/mo	54	48.7
10 - 25 hrs/mo	45	40.5
26 - 40 hrs/mo	8	7.2
41 + hrs/mo	4	3.6
Totals	111	100.0
7 missing cases		

scholarship. Answers from 94 respondents were split with 49 (52.1%) responding "Yes" and 45 (47.9%) responding "No." There also were some side comments to this item which indicated that the dean was unfamiliar with the chief academic officers' thoughts on this matter.

In an effort to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship between what the deans believed to be the chief academic officers' expectations of time for scholarship from deans and whether the deans believed that the chief academic officers expected them to use free time for scholarship, a crosstabulation was performed. Since only 12 cases fell into the time ranges of "26 - 40 hours per month" and "41 + hours per month," they were subsumed within the category, "10 + hours per month." The results are displayed in Table 10. The chi-square value of 9.915 with 1 degree of freedom was significant. Analysis of this test revealed that the largest percentage of the deans (34.8%) believed that the chief academic officers expected the deans to use free time for scholarship and that the chief academic officers also expected the deans to allow 10 or more hours per month for scholarship. Similarly, it appeared that those deans (32.6%) who did not believe the chief academic officers expected them to use free time for scholarship also tended to believe that the chief academic officers had minimal expectations of time for decanal scholarship.

TABLE 10

CROSSTABULATION OF DEANS' BELIEFS ABOUT THE CHIEF
ACADEMIC OFFICERS' EXPECTATIONS OF TIME FOR
SCHOLARSHIP FROM DEANS AND DEANS' BELIEFS
THAT THE CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS EXPECTED
DEANS TO USE FREE TIME FOR SCHOLARSHIP
SUMMER 1989

CAOs' Expectations of Time for Decanal Scholarship	CAOs' Expectations That Dean Use Free Time for Scholarship		Row Total
	Yes	No	
0 - 9 hrs/mo	17 (18.5)	30 (32.6)	47 (51.1)
10 + hrs/mo	32 (34.8)	13 (14.1)	45 (48.9)
Totals	49 (53.3)	43 (46.7)	92 (100.0)

Chi-square equalled 9.915, 1 degree of freedom
Significance equalled .0016
26 missing cases

A crosstabulation also was performed between the deans' beliefs that the chief academic officers expected the deans to use free time for scholarship and the deans' indications that they did or did not use free time for scholarship. The results were not statistically significant.

Data from Part I of QI also were used to construct a list of acceptable scholarly activities that the deans believed that the chief academic officers expected from the deans. In order to compare this list to findings from Table 7 (p. 70), the distributions of responses from both are displayed, by percentage, in Table 11. More than one-half of the deans identified 11 activities as possible evidence of decanal scholarship in Table 7. There were only five activities that were identified by more than one-half of the deans as scholarly activities that would be expected by the chief academic officers. No item was listed by 70% or more of the respondents. This finding reinforced the previous observation that the deans believed the chief academic officers had only minimal expectations of scholarship activity from the deans.

Of the nine items listed in the top half of Table 7, seven appeared in the top half of activities that the deans perceived to be expected by the chief academic officers.

"Publish in non-refereed journal" and "Publish book review" were replaced by "Read to stay current" and "Speak to local

TABLE 11

COMPARISON OF DEANS' BELIEFS ABOUT EVIDENCE OF ACCEPTABLE
 DECANAL SCHOLARSHIP AND DEANS' PERCEPTIONS ABOUT WHAT
 THE CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS WOULD ACCEPT AND EXPECT
 AS DECANAL SCHOLARSHIP SUMMER 1989

Activity	Accep to Deans	Perceived to be Accep to CAO
Publish in refereed journal	97.5	69.5
Present paper at professional meeting	91.5	67.0
Publish or edit book or monograph	88.1	58.5
Serve on editorial board of journal	83.1	54.2
Design research to gain new knowledge	77.1	44.1
Review articles for prof. journal	72.0	39.0
Academic leadership that encourages faculty scholarship	67.8	68.6
Publish in non-refereed journal	63.6	33.1
Publish book review	63.6	32.2
Review proposals for funding agency	55.9	34.8
Read to stay current	51.7	44.9
Speaking, using results of scholarship	45.8	35.6
Consult, using results of scholarship	44.9	23.7
Library research	43.2	20.3
Participate in faculty/student colloquium	42.4	23.7
Serve on accreditation team	41.5	28.0
Develop new process for use in School	39.8	23.7
Develop new pedagogical technique	38.1	16.1
Other	8.5	4.2

organizations, using results of scholarship." The activities that showed greatest change in placement in the lists were "Academic leadership that creates an environment conducive to faculty scholarship" and "Read to stay current." "Academic leadership" was listed seventh on Table 7, but second on the list of activities that the deans perceived were acceptable to and expected by the chief academic officers. "Reading" was eleventh on Table 7, but sixth on the list of activities that the deans perceived were acceptable to and expected by the chief academic officers. "Academic leadership" was endorsed by about 68.0% of the deans on both tables. The order in which the activities appeared, however, suggested that the activity of "academic leadership" was a more important indicator of scholarship to the chief academic officers than to the deans. Excepting "academic leadership," the frequency of all specific responses was considerably less on the list of activities that deans perceived that the chief academic officers expected of deans.

The findings summarized in Table 11 were ranked and compared using Spearman's r_s . The r_s value obtained was .9 which was significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, there appeared to be a relationship between the deans' indications that an activity was acceptable as decanal scholarship and the deans' indications that an activity was acceptable to the chief academic officers.

In response to Part I on QI, nine (7.6%) deans indicated that the chief academic officers had no expectation of decanal scholarship. Another 20 deans (16.0%) included fewer than five of the listed activities as activities that the chief academic officers might expect as evidence of scholarship. This was congruent with the earlier inference that the deans perceived that the chief academic officers' expectations of decanal scholarship were at a minimal level.

Some responses from the deans that were interviewed and from QII suggested that the chief academic officers' expectations of time for scholarship were related to the particular orientation and mission of the institution and the school of the particular dean. Dean A stated, "every dean fathers scholarship in his or her own discipline--to the degree that they value scholarship in those positions associated with their college." He expanded this thought by pointing out that the value system of a large, land-grant institution could be quite different from a small public or private institution. Similarly, Dean D stated that, "Any dean that is worth his or her salt is going to adopt a set of expectations consistent with the mission of the institution of which they're dean." A few deans indicated that the publication and dissemination of scholarly findings brought recognition not only to the scholar, but also to the institution. In addition, one dean stated that in

institutions and schools with higher expectations of decanal scholarship, the dean would be provided with resources that made scholastic pursuit more feasible.

1C) What evidence of scholarship did the deans accept from their assistant deans?

Information from QI provided the number of assistant deans in the offices of 111 respondents. Of these, 97 deans (87.4%) had at least one assistant dean and 65 (58.6%) deans had two or more assistant deans. At 11 (9.9%) institutions, there were 4 or 5 assistant deans in the school of education. The mean number of assistants per dean was 1.9. The most frequent responses were 1 and 2, and 5 was the maximum number of assistant deans at any institution. The distribution of assistant deans is displayed in Table 12.

The study sought to determine what expectations of scholarship that the deans had of their assistant deans. Information from Part I of QI provided an inventory of activities that the deans considered to be acceptable evidence of scholarship from assistant deans. For purposes of comparison, Table 13 displays the responses, by percentage, from this list and from Table 7 (p. 70). The nine most frequently mentioned activities corresponded with those that the deans accepted from themselves, although in a slightly different order. "Academic leadership" was seventh on the list of decanal scholarship, but ninth on that of

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANT DEANS
IN SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION
IN THE STUDY GROUP
SUMMER 1989

<u>Number of Assistant Deans</u>	<u>Frequency of Institutions</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
0	14	12.6
1	32	28.8
2	32	28.8
3	22	19.8
4	6	5.4
5	5	4.5
Totals	111	99.9

7 missing cases

Due to rounding, percentages do not total 100.0

TABLE 13

COMPARISON OF DEANS' BELIEFS ABOUT EVIDENCE OF ACCEPTABLE
DECANAL SCHOLARSHIP AND DEANS' BELIEFS ABOUT WHAT WAS
ACCEPTABLE AS SCHOLARSHIP FROM ASSISTANT DEANS
SUMMER 1989

Activity	Accep to Deans	Accep from Asst Deans
Publish in refereed journal	97.5%	91.5%
Present paper at professional meeting	91.5%	88.1%
Publish or edit book or monograph	88.1%	81.4%
Serve on editorial board of journal	83.1%	75.4%
Design research to gain new knowledge	77.1%	73.7%
Review articles for prof. journal	72.0%	64.4%
Academic leadership that encourages faculty scholarship	67.8%	50.9%
Publish in non-refereed journal	63.6%	62.7%
Publish book review	63.6%	65.3%
Review proposals for funding agency	55.9%	48.3%
Read to stay current	51.7%	46.6%
Speaking, using results of scholarship	45.8%	43.2%
Consult, using results of scholarship	44.9%	44.1%
Library research	43.2%	39.0%
Participate in faculty/student coll.	42.4%	46.6%
Serve on accreditation team	41.5%	37.3%
Develop new process for use in School	39.8%	39.8%
Develop new pedagogical technique	38.1%	35.6%
Other	8.5%	8.5%

assistant deans. There was a considerably smaller percentage of deans who believed that "academic leadership" was acceptable evidence of scholarship from assistant deans (50.9%) than deans who believed it was acceptable decanal scholarship (67.8%). Overall, there was little difference between the activities that the deans viewed as acceptable scholarship from themselves and from their assistant deans.

The responses from Tables 13 were tested by Spearman's rank-correlation coefficient. The r_s value of .96 was significant. There appeared to be a relationship between the deans' indications that an activity was acceptable as decanal scholarship and the deans' indications that an activity was acceptable as scholarship from their assistant deans.

For purposes of comparison, distributions of activities that the deans believed were not acceptable as evidence of decanal scholarship and activities that the deans believed were not acceptable as evidence of scholarship from their assistant deans were compiled. This is displayed in Table 14. The results were similar to those presented in Table 7 (p. 70). There was no activity that was overwhelmingly rejected by most deans. In addition, the distribution of activities was almost identical. As with acceptable scholarship from themselves, the deans appeared reluctant to totally reject as administrative scholarship, any of the various types of activities included on Part I

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF ACTIVITIES THAT DEANS BELIEVED WERE
NOT ACCEPTABLE AS EVIDENCE OF SCHOLARSHIP FROM
DEANS AND FROM ASSISTANT DEANS
SUMMER 1989

Activity	Not Accep from Deans	Not Accep from Asst Deans
Develop new pedagogical technique	61.9%	64.4%
Develop new process for use in School	60.2%	60.2%
Serve on accreditation team	59.3%	62.7%
Participate in faculty/student coll.	57.6%	53.4%
Library research	56.8%	61.0%
Consult, using results of scholarship	56.8%	55.9%
Speaking, using results of scholarship	55.9%	56.8%
Read to stay current	48.3%	53.4%
Review proposals for funding agency	44.9%	51.7%
Publish book review	37.3%	34.7%
Publish in non-refereed journal	36.4%	37.3%
Academic leadership that encourages faculty scholarship	33.1%	49.1%
Review articles for prof. journal	28.8%	35.6%
Design research to gain new knowledge	25.4%	26.3%
Serve on editorial board of journal	17.0%	24.6%
Publish or edit book or monograph	11.9%	18.6%
Present paper at professional meeting	8.5%	11.9%
Publish in refereed journal	2.5%	8.5%

of QI. In addition, similarities between Table 8 and Table 14 suggested that the deans do not differentiate greatly among the activities identified as decanal scholarship and those recognized as scholarship from assistant deans.

The deans also were asked to indicate whether they expected their assistant deans to devote free time to scholarship. This item received 101 responses (there were no assistant deans at 14 institutions). Of these, 85.1% of the deans indicated that they did expect their administrative assistants to use some free time for scholarship and 14.9% of the deans replied negatively. This finding was compared with the 52.1% of the respondents who indicated that the chief academic officers expected deans to use some free time for scholarship, and the 47.9% of the deans who did not believe that the chief academic officers had this expectation. It can be inferred that the deans' expectations of time for scholarship from their assistant deans are higher than their perceptions of what the chief academic officers expect from the deans.

In order to follow up on this finding, a crosstabulation was performed between the deans' indications that they used free time for scholarship and deans' indications that they expected their assistant deans to use free time for scholarship. This information is displayed in Table 15. The chi-square value obtained was 6.227 with 1

TABLE 15

CROSSTABULATION OF DEANS' INDICATIONS THAT THEY
 USED FREE TIME FOR SCHOLARSHIP AND DEANS'
 INDICATIONS THAT THEY EXPECTED THEIR
 ASSISTANT DEANS TO USE FREE TIME
 FOR SCHOLARSHIP
 SUMMER 1989

Asst. Deans Should Use Free Time For Scholarship	Dean Uses Free Time For Scholarship		Row Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	85 (85.9)	0	85 (85.9)
No	12 (12.1)	2 (2.0)	14 (14.1)
Totals	97 (98.0)	2 (2.0)	99 (100.0)

Chi-square value equalled 6.227, 1 degree of freedom
 Significance equalled .0126
 19 missing cases

degree of freedom. Although this value was significant, one-half of the cells had less than five responses. This finding should be interpreted with care, but there did appear to be a relationship between indications that the deans used free time for scholarship and indications that deans expected their assistant deans to use free time for scholarship.

The deans' beliefs about whether the chief academic officers expected the deans to use free time for scholarship also were crosstabulated with the deans' indications that they did or did not expect their assistant deans to use free time for scholarship. This information is displayed in Table 16. The chi-square value of 5.586 was significant. There was one cell with an observed frequency of less than five. Overall, it could be inferred that there was a relationship between the deans' beliefs about the need for deans to use free time for scholarship and the deans' beliefs about the need for assistant deans to use free time for scholarship.

The respondents were asked to indicate how many hours per month that they expected their assistant deans to devote to scholarship activities. This information is presented in Table 17. Almost one-half of the respondents had expectations that their assistant deans would utilize 10 - 25 hours per month in such activities. At the same time, 37.6% of the respondents indicated that they expected the

TABLE 16

CROSSTABULATION OF DEANS' BELIEFS THAT THE CHIEF
ACADEMIC OFFICERS EXPECTED THEM TO USE FREE
TIME FOR SCHOLARSHIP AND DEANS' BELIEFS
THAT ASSISTANT DEANS SHOULD USE FREE
TIME FOR SCHOLARSHIP
SUMMER 1989

Asst. Deans Should Use Free Time for Scholarship	CAO Expects Dean to Use Free Time For Scholarship		Row Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	42 (50.0)	30 (35.7)	72 (85.7)
No	2 (2.4)	10 (11.9)	12 (14.3)
Totals	44 (52.4)	40 (14.3)	84 (100.0)

Chi-square value equalled 5.586, 1 degree of freedom
Significance equalled .0181
In 14 institutions, there were no assistant deans
34 missing cases

TABLE 17

DEANS' EXPECTATIONS OF TIME FOR SCHOLARSHIP
FROM ASSISTANT DEANS
SUMMER 1989

<u>Range of Time Expectation for Scholarship</u>	<u>Number of Deans</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
0 - 9 hrs/mo	38	37.6
10 - 25 hrs/mo	50	49.5
26 - 40 hrs/mo	8	7.9
41 + hrs/mo	5	5.0
Totals	101	100.0

17 missing cases (at 14 institutions, there were no
assistant or associate deans)

scholarly activities of assistant deans to require from 0 - 9 hours per month. Only 12.9% of the respondents had expectations that their assistant deans would devote more than 25 hours per month to scholarly activities.

The deans' perceptions about what the chief academic officers expected in terms of time for scholarship from deans (Table 9, p. 84) were compared with the time for scholarship that the deans expected from their assistant deans. In the first instance, 89.2% of the deans perceived that they were expected to devote 25 or less hours per month to scholarship and 87.1% of the deans had the same expectation of their assistant deans. However, when the category "10 - 25 hours per month" was examined separately, a larger difference emerged. Almost one-half (49.5%) of the deans expected that their assistant deans would devote 10 - 25 hours per month to scholarship, while only 40.5% of the deans believed that the chief academic officers had that same expectation.

In order to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship between the deans' perceptions about the chief academic officers' expectations of time for scholarship from deans and deans' expectations of time for scholarship from their assistant deans, a crosstabulation was performed. Time categories used were "0 - 9 hours per month" and "10 + hours month" since there were only a few

cases with more than 25 hours per month. The results are displayed in Table 18. The chi-square value equalled 24.710 with 1 degree of freedom and it was significant. This finding suggested that those deans (44%) who had the highest time expectations for scholarship from their assistant deans also perceived that the chief academic officers had higher time expectations for scholarship from them. The deans who perceived that the chief academic officers had lower expectations of time for scholarship from them also were likely to expect less time for scholarship from their assistant deans.

Anecdotal material from QII and the interviews explained why some deans believed that their assistant deans and other administrators should engage in ongoing scholarship. These deans indicated that it was important that administrators continued to be identified as faculty, even when their prime responsibilities were administrative. For instance, one dean wrote that an administrator without a substantial record of scholarship "should be expected to produce at a qualitative and quantitative level that would allow him or her to . . . return from full-time administration to a faculty position." Still another dean wrote that "individuals should assume major administration positions in higher education with the assumption that they will eventually return to teaching and research." This dean proceeded to state that "I'm not convinced that having a

TABLE 18

CROSSTABULATION OF DEANS' BELIEFS ABOUT THE CHIEF
ACADEMIC OFFICERS' EXPECTATIONS OF TIME FOR
SCHOLARSHIP FROM DEANS WITH DEANS' TIME
EXPECTATIONS FOR SCHOLARSHIP FROM
ASSISTANT DEANS
SUMMER 1989

Deans' Beliefs About CAOs' Time Expecta- tions of Scholarship	Deans' Time Expectations for Scholarship from Asst. Deans		Row Total
	0 - 9 hrs/mo	10+ hrs/mo	
0 - 9 hrs/mo	31 (31.0)	19 (19.0)	50 (50.0)
10 + hrs/mo	6 (6.0)	44 (44.0)	50 (50.0)
Totals	37 (37.0)	63 (63.0)	100 (100.0)

Chi-square value equalled 24.710, 1 degrees of freedom
Significance equalled .0000
18 missing cases

career objective as a higher education administrator is an appropriate goal." Dean A stated that the deanship included a requirement to remain a professor.

The possibility of a return to faculty status prompted Dean C to note that because "I'm in the kind of institution I'm in, the next Dean will expect me to be a scholar." He went on to state that out of "self defense" it was necessary to "maintain some viability as a scholar." Dean B also noted that continued visibility through journals and presentations was helpful, not only for a return to faculty status, but also at those times when a dean decided to seek another administrative position.

1D) In what ways did the deans differentiate between expectations of scholarship from faculty and from administrators?

One approach used to understand how the deans differentiated between faculty and administrative scholarship was to determine if their understanding of what comprised scholarship had been modified as they moved into administration and the deanship. Particular items on QI addressed this. One agree/disagree statement was, "My definition of scholarship has been affected by my service as Dean." Responses from 114 deans were fairly evenly split between those who agreed or strongly agreed (48.2) and those who disagreed or strongly disagreed (51.8%). Change in

focus of scholarship was considered to be another possible indication of a shift in what was meant by administrative scholarship. When asked to respond to "I have narrowed the focus of my scholarship since becoming Dean," 73.7% of the 114 respondents agreed or strongly agreed while 26.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The distributions of responses to these items are provided in Table 19.

When requested to identify strategies that they used to implement their scholarship goals, 32.5% of the 111 respondents indicated that one strategy was to "Shift focus of scholarship to issues in administration or higher education." In order to test the independence of these three variables, a series of crosstabulations were performed between the two statements in Table 19 and this strategy. No statistically significant relationships between variables were discovered.

Dean D related an example of the type of shift in definition of scholarship that had occurred as he moved from faculty status into administration. He stated that he had been involved with the development of high school achievement tests and their accompanying manuals throughout almost all of his higher education career--that had remained a constant. When he assumed a deanship position, he became involved with national associations on matters relating to teacher educators, even though he had no prior experience in this area. He discussed additional types of scholarship

TABLE 19

DISTRIBUTIONS OF DEANS' AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT
WITH STATEMENTS CONCERNING A SHIFT IN
DEFINITION OF SCHOLARSHIP
SUMMER 1989

<u>Statement</u>	<u>Agree or St. Agree</u>	<u>Disagree or St. Disagree</u>	<u>Row Total</u>
My definition of scholarship has been affected by my service as Dean.	55 (48.2)	59 (51.8)	114 (100.0)
I have narrowed the focus of my scholarship since becoming Dean.	84 (73.7)	30 (26.3)	114 (100.0)
4 missing cases			

that had evolved out of his position as dean, and concluded, "my writing has broadened to get into policy issues in regard to teacher education. And I didn't do any of that during the first part of my higher education experience."

Similarly, Dean B revealed that, as a faculty member, he had defined scholarship "in terms of my own area of interest . . ." and, that most often this meant an empirical study of some sort, followed by a published report of the findings. After embarking upon an administrative career, he encountered a broader range of faculty and decided that scholarship required more liberal definition.

A question on QII requested that the deans differentiate between scholarship expectations that they had of faculty and those that they had of administrators. Thirty-two (69.6%) of those deans that responded indicated that either there was no difference, or that the only difference was quantity, but not quality of scholarly effort. Only one dean suggested that scholarship of a lesser quality was acceptable from an administrator.

Fourteen deans (30.4%) believed that there was a difference between expectations of scholarship from a faculty member and from an administrator. The deans' descriptions of these differences have been categorized as follows:

- 1) Administrative scholarship was more global and broader. It was not as specialized, and it was more oriented toward application in the field.
- 2) Research projects were of a different nature. They were less sophisticated and were more likely to take the form of survey research. There was less in-depth research and fewer longitudinal studies were possible.
- 3) A vital part of administrative scholarship was familiarity with major developments in the knowledge base of education and the programs within the administrators' responsibilities.
- 4) Writing by administrators was more likely to materialize as reports, position papers or "think pieces."
- 5) It was necessary that deans and administrators provide academic leadership that supported the faculty functions of teaching and scholarship. Part of this responsibility entailed being a "promoter" of the school or college as well as an "enabler" and "stimulator" of activities within it.
- 6) Administrative scholarship included consulting activities and service on commissions and task forces.

- 7) Administrative scholarship was more likely to be of a collaborative rather than of a sole-researcher nature.

The differences between faculty and administrative scholarship were explained by one dean as a difference in "culture."

The culture of "faculty member" embodies scholarship. The culture of "administrator" almost excludes notions of scholarship. "Administrator" is usually thought of as "consumed with activity." It is very hard to over-come expectations of both faculty and administrators that administrators be "do-ers," not thinkers. . . .

As discussed previously (1A, p. 81), many deans indicated that time pressures were responsible for modifications of what the deans considered to be acceptable forms of scholarship. There also was a strong suggestion in these responses that the primary type of scholarship forfeited by administrators was in-depth, longitudinal, or empirically-oriented research that resulted in dissemination in academic journals. For instance, one dean wrote, "faculty members have more time to engage in longitudinal studies as well as being very current on new statistical approaches." Other deans responded that the main difference between faculty and administrative scholarship was "the amount of research to be done" and "More scholarship in the form of research is expected of faculty who are provided time for research." Still another dean wrote, "I expect

that faculty will pursue a depth of knowledge and explore applications in ways that administrators do not."

In regard to time, Dean B and Dean D both indicated that even as they had become more efficient in administering the deanship, an incipient danger was the expectation that deans should assume new responsibilities. Dean B compared the dean's office to a balloon and said, "you know the gases of the institution fill that balloon constantly. Expand it into an all-consuming 60 hours per week job if you let it." He went on to say that anyone who really wanted to maintain an active program of research would have to be very "hard-nosed" about doing it. This "realistic" understanding of administrative priorities was regretted by some deans such as the one who wrote, "I currently have no sponsored research projects. That is a major concession."

1E) Did the deans consider academic leadership that created an environment conducive to faculty scholarship, to be scholarship?

Of the respondents, 80 (67.8%) indicated that the activity of "Academic leadership that creates an environment conducive to faculty scholarship," did qualify as scholarship. This finding was congruent with the 72 (64.9%) respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, "Deans who successfully motivate their faculty to pursue scholarly activities, are scholars."

A minority of deans (39 or 35.1%), however, did not believe that such academic leadership qualified as a form of scholarship. Therefore, a crosstabulation was performed between the "academic leadership" statement and the deans' indications that academic leadership was or was not acceptable evidence of scholarship from deans. No significant findings were discovered.

A crosstabulation also was performed between the responses to the "academic leadership" statement and responses to "There is a direct relationship between the Dean's continued scholarship and the Dean's effectiveness as an academic leader." The findings are presented in Table 20. The chi-square value of 6.599 with 1 degree of freedom was significant. It appeared that the deans who agreed that academic leadership was scholarship also were inclined to agree that more effective deans were those who continued to pursue scholarship (51.4% of respondents).

Similar results were obtained when a crosstabulation was performed between the responses to the "academic leadership" statement and responses to "A Dean can be an effective leader without exhibiting any continued scholarship." This information is presented in Table 21. The chi-square value of 3.992 with 1 degree of freedom was significant. Almost one-half of deans (46.8%) agreed that academic leadership was scholarship and disagreed that effective leadership was possible without continued

TABLE 20

CROSSTABULATION OF "ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP THAT CREATES
AN ENVIRONMENT CONDUCTIVE TO FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP,
IS SCHOLARSHIP" AND "THERE IS A DIRECT RELATION-
SHIP BETWEEN THE DEAN'S CONTINUED SCHOLARSHIP
AND THE DEAN'S EFFECTIVENESS AS AN
ACADEMIC LEADER" SUMMER 1989

Relationship Be- tween Dean's Ef- fectiveness and Scholarship	<u>Acad Leadership is Scholarship</u>		Row Total
	Agree or St. Agree	Disagree or St. Disagree	
Agree or St. Agree	57 (51.4)	15 (13.5)	72 (64.9)
Disagree or St. Disagree	21 (18.9)	18 (16.2)	39 (35.1)
Totals	78 (70.3)	33 (29.7)	111 (100.0)

Chi-square equalled 6.599, 1 degree of freedom
Significance equalled .0102
7 missing cases

TABLE 21

CROSSTABULATION OF "ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP THAT CREATES
AN ENVIRONMENT CONDUCIVE TO FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP,
IS SCHOLARSHIP" AND "A DEAN CAN BE AN EFFEC-
TIVE LEADER WITHOUT EXHIBITING ANY
CONTINUED SCHOLARSHIP" SUMMER 1989

Effective Leader- ship Possible Without Continued Scholarship	<u>Acad Leadership is Scholarship</u>		Row Total
	Agree or St. Agree	Disagree or St. Disagree	
Agree or St. Agree	20 (18.0)	19 (17.1)	39 (35.1)
Disagree or St. Disagree	52 (46.9)	20 (18.0)	72 (64.9)
Totals	72 (64.9)	39 (35.1)	111 (100.0)

Chi-square value equalled 3.992, 1 degree of freedom
Significance equalled .0457
7 missing cases

scholarship. These two crosstabulations reinforced the finding that there was a relationship between the belief that academic leadership was scholarship and that effective deans continued to pursue scholarship. It should be remembered, however, that agreement or disagreement with these statements was conditioned by each individual dean's decision to accept such "academic leadership" as a form of scholarship.

There was a dichotomy of responses from the deans who were interviewed, about the inclusion of academic leadership as scholarly activity. Dean A and Dean B agreed that academic leadership should be properly included as scholarship. Dean A noted that the school of education should be an "inquiry center" where the dean guided the pursuit of knowledge by encouraging individuals or groups of individuals to investigate problems. He included this "leadership by encouragement" as a form of decanal scholarship. Dean C and Dean D sharply disagreed. Dean D responded that "the job of dean includes facilitating scholarship on the part of faculty members," but that such leadership was not a component of scholarship. According to Dean C, academic leadership was not scholarship, but "administrative service," and that individuals who thought otherwise were "whistling Dixie."

1F) Discussion of the findings of the first set of research questions.

Most activities that the deans found acceptable as evidence of decanal scholarship fell into areas of traditionally accepted scholarship. The major difference was that many deans defined academic leadership as a form of decanal scholarship. Activities that were primarily of a speaking, consultation, service or development nature, were endorsed by less than one-half of the respondents. At the same time, deans appeared reluctant to reject as decanal scholarship, almost any activity that was listed. Anecdotal information reinforced the finding that overall, this group of deans considered administrative scholarship in rather broad terms. Responses to QII and the interview questions also clarified some deans' beliefs that it was important to define acceptable decanal scholarship in terms of the overall missions of the school and the institution.

The one form of traditional scholarship that the deans appeared to believe was not consistent with the deanship was a systematic program of theory-based research designed to generate and disseminate new knowledge. Time considerations were the primary explanation for constriction in the quantity and types of scholarship engaged in by deans. Reading and staying current were considered to be essential scholarly activities of the deans. Overall, the focus of decanal scholarship shifted to concerns about

administration itself, higher education or overall issues regarding education. Evidence of decanal scholarship, such as publications or presentations, reflected this shift.

There was great variety in the types of activities that the deans were willing to subsume under the term, scholarship. Similarly, there was much diversity in the intensity of effort that the deans brought to scholarship. This finding suggested that, except for broad categorizations about scholarship, the deans had unique and singular understandings of what comprised decanal scholarship.

The deans believed that the chief academic officers had only minimal expectations of scholarship from them. There was a statistically significant relationship between deans' beliefs about the chief academic officers' expectations of time for scholarship from deans and deans' beliefs that the chief academic officers expected deans to use free time for scholarship.

There was little difference between activities that the deans indicated were acceptable as decanal scholarship and those that they believed were acceptable to and expected by the chief academic officers. The use of Spearman's r_s indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between the activities indicated by deans as evidence of decanal scholarship and those indicated by deans

as acceptable evidence of scholarship to the chief academic officers.

The primary difference was in the importance given to "Academic leadership that creates an environment conducive to faculty scholarship." It appeared that these deans perceived this activity to be more important as evidence of decanal scholarship to the chief academic officer than it was to deans. Anecdotal information also reinforced the idea that the chief academic officers' expectations were related to the overall orientation or mission of the school and institution.

There was little difference between what the deans found acceptable as decanal scholarship and what they would accept as scholarship from their assistant deans. As with decanal scholarship, there was no type of activity that was overwhelmingly rejected by deans as evidence of administrative scholarship.

The deans' expectations that assistant deans would use free time for scholarship were greater than the deans' perceptions that the chief academic officers expected them to use free time for scholarship. The deans' expectations of the time that their assistant deans should use for scholarship were higher than what the deans perceived to be the chief academic officers' expectations of time for scholarship from deans. Those deans who had the highest time expectations for scholarship from their assistant deans

also perceived that the chief academic officers had higher time expectations for scholarship from them. An explanation for this finding seemed to be the deans' beliefs that assistant deans must keep their identification as faculty strong, even during their tenure as administrators. It was envisioned that deans and other administrators might eventually return to the professoriate and that continued scholarship made them more viable as faculty.

When asked to differentiate between faculty and administrative scholarship, about one-half of the respondents indicated that their definition of scholarship had been affected by their service as dean. In addition, almost three-fourths of the respondents indicated that the focus of their own scholarship had been narrowed. These findings were reinforced by anecdotal responses in which the deans discussed how their definition of scholarship had been modified.

Overall, the deans indicated that administrative scholarship was more oriented toward application in the field and that research was less sophisticated and less likely to be of a longitudinal nature. The deans believed that familiarity with trends in the wide spectrum of education was important and that administrative scholarship often included acting as a facilitator of scholarly goals rather than as an active achiever of those goals. Many deans included service and organizational activities as part

of administrative scholarship. Writing and research activities of the deans were more likely to evolve as a result of collaboration, rather than as solitary efforts.

The deans believed that the pressure of time was the main culprit for any shift in their definition of scholarship or change in the type of scholarship activity that they pursued. It was clear that the job of dean could become all-consuming and that deans who wanted to engage in scholarship had to make extra efforts to do so.

A majority of the deans believed that academic leadership that encouraged faculty scholarship was a form of decanal scholarship. However, there was a sizable minority that rejected this idea. There also was a statistically significant relationship between the deans' beliefs about effectiveness in the deanship and deans' acceptance of "academic leadership" as scholarship. Those deans who believed that "academic leadership" was a form of decanal scholarship were likely to believe that there was a relationship between the decanal effectiveness and the deans' continued scholarship.

Research Question 2

The second set of research questions was concerned with the deans' perceptions about the role and importance of scholarship in the deanship.

2A) How did deans implement their own scholarship goals?

An item on Part III of QI asked the deans to indicate which of 10 listed strategies they utilized in order to implement their scholarship goals. Space also was provided for "Other" choices. Responses were received from 111 individuals. Table 22 lists the deans' choices of strategies in order from most often indicated to least often indicated. The strategy that was mentioned most often was "Pursue scholarship on my own time" (87.4% of respondents). This was congruent with the finding that 97.3% of the respondents indicated that they did use at least some free time for scholarship. It also was congruent with the finding that 91.3% of the respondents indicated that they would use most of the time provided by a sabbatical for scholarship.

Strategies that were indicated by more than one-half of the deans were, "Delegate routine administrative duties to others" (66.7%), "Set a definite scholarship agenda" (59.5%), and "Decentralize decision-making" (55.9%).

"Other" strategies that were noted on QI were categorized as follows:

- 1) Use of graduate assistants.
- 2) Narrow focus of scholarship to specific activities of the school or college.

TABLE 22

DISTRIBUTION OF STRATEGIES USED BY DEANS TO
IMPLEMENT THEIR RESEARCH AGENDAS
SUMMER 1989

Strategy	Freq of Response	Percent
Pursue scholarship on my own time	97	87.4
Delegate routine administrative duties to others	74	66.7
Set a definite scholarship agenda	66	59.5
Decentralize decision-making	62	55.9
Keep a superb administrative assistant	48	43.2
Shift focus of scholarship to issues in administration or higher education	37	33.3
Set time limit for meetings	27	24.3
Keep a particular time of day, or day of the week, free from interaction with others	24	21.6
Restrict official evening responsibilities	20	18.0
Restrict number of meetings per day or week	16	14.4
7 Missing Cases		

3) Shift from conducting research to maintaining products of past scholarship (i.e. keeping textbook current).

4) Engage in collaborative scholarship efforts.

Responses from QII included serendipity as an important, unplanned strategy that allowed the deans to take advantage of propitious opportunities. One dean wrote that time for scholarship was on a "catch as catch can" basis. Dean B stated that he could not operate by setting time aside. "Everything for me is on the grab." Similarly, another dean remarked that one had to "find time to take advantage of opportunities." Another dean wrote,

I am curious about many things. I get ideas for studies--I forget ideas--I think about some for years before beginning to study them. I do not budget time--or set agendas. I do what I can, when I can.

One dean noted that the regular maintenance of "files of information" engendered scholarship activity whenever time happened to become available. Dean B remarked that he recorded ideas for future studies or papers on "little scraps of paper." He kept these in order to be able to capitalize on circumstances that might arise that would allow him to implement the investigation or study. These comments suggested that serendipitous opportunities were more likely to be acted upon by deans who were "prepared" for such an event.

Some deans wrote that they somehow wrested time from the regular working day. They tried to "set it aside," "take half or full days away," "set aside certain number of hours per week," "schedule work time for scholarship," or find a "regular time for writing each day." Dean D, for example, said that "Three years ago, I told my secretary to block Thursdays out." He laughed and explained that in the last three years, he had had a free Thursday about three times. "So that means that you either start before other people start or you finish after other people finish or you do it at home. And I do all those." Similarly, Dean B stated that he managed to engage in scholarship because he just "put in longer hours." Dean C indicated that he was successful in blocking out times of the day or days of the week to accomplish scholarship. He added, however, that time-consuming projects (i.e., revision of a textbook) required the use of weekends and other free time.

Other deans wrote of utilizing "weekends," "evenings" or "spare time." A mocking tone was evident in some answers as when one dean wrote of the advantage of "living alone" and another noted the efficaciousness of "locking up the kids." Statements such as these were congruent with the finding that 97.3% of the respondents noted that they used some free time to pursue scholarship.

All deans who were interviewed indicated that delegation of some administrative responsibilities was

necessary in order to pursue scholarship. Dean A responded that he "utilized" people to "put the ball in the court" in order to get the job done. He noted that this required that the dean have confidence in the faculty and staff of the school. Dean D said of staff personnel, "you get good people in, you define their jobs in a way that they understand them. . . . It doesn't have to be always the dean doing it." He also explained,

I think that if you're a good dean that you know how to manage an office so that the needs of the college can be met. It doesn't take me as long to do the requirements of the deanship--name a topic--it just doesn't take as long as it did 15 years ago.

One individual noted that the dean could benefit by a prior scholarship record which led to grants and invitations to collaborate in research or other scholarly activity. Dean A also spoke of the advantage of networking for the same reason. Another dean wrote of using a strategy that obligated oneself to a goal via a written agreement or contract. Similarly, another dean responded, "I set deadlines and then try to carve out time . . . to achieve those goals." Still another dean wrote of looking for funds to hire graduate assistants to help with ongoing research efforts.

Other deans noted that they had shifted their scholarship efforts from specific, discipline-based areas to studies and investigations that focused on the

administrative tasks or responsibilities inherent in the deanship. Dean B, for example, stated that eventually, most deans shifted their scholarly attention to activities that focused upon administrative policies or were related to higher education or teacher education. Interspersed among the returned questionnaires were comments that indicated that some deans thought it was unrealistic to attempt to remain an "active" scholar while serving as dean.

All of the strategies utilized by deans were in some way related to manipulating time so as to make it available for purposes of scholarship. Four items on Part II of QI addressed the issue of adequate time for scholarship. The respondents were asked to express their degree of agreement or disagreement with the statements, "I have adequate time for scholarship," "If I were given a sabbatical, I would use most of the time for scholarship," "There are ways that I can diminish the time required for administrative duties," and "It is possible to engage in substantial scholarship while serving as Dean." The distributions of responses to these statements are displayed in Table 23.

Of the respondents, only 14.8% indicated that they had adequate time for scholarship. At the same time, 60.9% of the respondents noted that there were ways that time for administration could be reduced, and 38.3% of the respondents indicated that "substantial scholarship" was possible while serving as dean. A large percentage of the

TABLE 23

DISTRIBUTIONS OF DEANS' DEGREE OF AGREEMENT
OR DISAGREEMENT WITH QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS
THAT CONCERNED ADEQUACY OF TIME FOR
SCHOLARSHIP SUMMER 1989

Statement	Agree or St. Agree	Disagree or St. Disagree	Row Total
I have adequate time for scholarship.	17 (14.8)	98 (85.2)	115 (100.0)
If I were given a sabbatical, I would use most of the time for scholarship.	105 (91.3)	10 (8.7)	115 (100.0)
It is possible to engage in substantial scholarship while serving as Dean.	44 (38.3)	71 (61.7)	115 (100.0)
There are ways that I can diminish the time required for administrative duties.	70 (60.9)	45 (39.1)	115 (100.0)
3 missing cases			

respondents (91.3%) indicated that most of a sabbatical would be used for scholarship. Perusal of these responses suggested that, although most deans believed that they did not have sufficient time for scholarship, a sizable percentage (38.3%) of deans still believed it was possible to engage in substantial scholarship. A large number of deans also appeared to believe that time for administration could be diminished.

Several crosstabulations were performed between these statements in order to determine if any statistically significant relationships existed. The only significant relationship that was revealed was in the crosstabulation between "I have adequate time for scholarship" and "It is possible to engage in substantial scholarship while serving as Dean". These data are presented in Table 24. The chi-square value obtained was 7.293 with 1 degree of freedom. This finding was significant and it reinforced the suggestion in the previous paragraph, that the deans who believed substantial scholarship was possible would somehow be able to implement that scholarship. The deans who did not believe that they had adequate time for scholarship were less likely to believe that substantial scholarship was possible while serving as dean.

Crosstabulations were performed between the two statements about "adequate time" and "substantial scholarship" and the hours that deans indicated they had

TABLE 24

CROSSTABULATION OF "I HAVE ADEQUATE TIME FOR SCHOLARSHIP"
AND "IT IS POSSIBLE TO ENGAGE IN SUBSTANTIAL
SCHOLARSHIP WHILE SERVING AS DEAN"
SUMMER 1989

Substantial Scholarship Is Possible	<u>Adequate Time for Scholarship</u>		Row Total
	Agree or St. Agree	Disagree or St. Disagree	
Agree or St. Agree	12 (10.4)	32 (27.8)	44 (38.2)
Disagree or St. Disagree	5 (4.3)	66 (57.4)	71 (61.7)
Totals	17 (14.7)	98 (85.2)	115 (99.9)

Chi-square value equalled 7.293, 1 degree of freedom

Significance equalled .0069

3 missing cases

Due to rounding, percentages do not total 100.0

used for scholarship before they became administrators, after they became administrators but before they became deans, and after they became deans. The only statistically significant finding was obtained when the deans' time for scholarship after becoming dean was crosstabulated with the statement that substantial scholarship was possible while dean. Time categories used were "0 - 9 hours per month" and "10 + hours per month" because of the low incidence of cases with more than 25 hours per month. The data are displayed in Table 25. The chi-square value of 6.200 with 1 degree of freedom was significant. It appeared that there was a relationship between the number of hours per month that deans engaged in scholarship after becoming dean and their belief that substantial scholarship was possible while serving as dean. The deans who disagreed with this statement tended to give fewer hours per month to scholarship. Analysis of this crosstabulation also revealed that, of those who indicated that they engaged in scholarship for 10 or more hours per month, almost equal numbers agreed and disagreed that substantial scholarship was possible as dean. The explanation for this may lay in each dean's singular understanding of what comprised scholarship.

TABLE 25

CROSSTABULATION OF HOURS DEANS USED FOR SCHOLARSHIP
 AFTER BECOMING DEAN AND "IT IS POSSIBLE TO ENGAGE
 IN SUBSTANTIAL SCHOLARSHIP WHILE SERVING
 AS DEAN" SUMMER 1989

Time For Schol After Becoming Dean	<u>Substantial Schol is Possible</u>		Row Total
	Agree or St. Agree	Disagree or St. Disagree	
0 - 9 hrs/mo	16 (15.0)	42 (39.3)	58 (54.3)
10 + hrs/mo	26 (24.3)	23 (21.5)	49 (45.8)
Totals	42 (39.3)	65 (60.8)	107 (100.1)

Chi-square value equalled 6.200, 1 degree of freedom

Significance equalled .0128

11 missing cases

Due to rounding, percentages do not total 100.0

2B) Was there a relationship between the scholarly experience of the deans and their administrative expectations of scholarship?

The method selected to approach this question was to determine if a relationship existed between the deans' past and current involvement in scholarship and the deans' expectations of time that their assistant deans should be engaged in scholarship. The deans' past and current involvement in scholarship was measured by the number of hours per month that they indicated that they used for scholarship prior to entering administration, after entering administration but before assuming a deanship, and after becoming a dean. Table 17 (p. 99) displayed the time expectations for scholarship that deans had of their assistant deans. Table 26 displays the hours per month that deans indicated that they gave to scholarship during these three periods of their higher education careers. It should be noted that these three career categories were not all applicable to all deans. Some individuals had gone directly from faculty status into the deanship while others had assumed an administrative or deanship position immediately upon entering higher education.

Table 26 illustrates the steady diminution of time for scholarship that accompanied an individual's movement from faculty status, onto and up the administrative ladder, and into the deanship. Whereas 74.1% of the respondents

TABLE 26

DISTRIBUTIONS OF INDICATIONS OF TIME FOR DECANAL
SCHOLARSHIP FROM DEANS BEFORE ENTERING ADMINI-
STRATION, AFTER ENTERING ADMINISTRATION BUT
BEFORE ASSUMING THE DEANSHIP, AND AFTER
ASSUMING THE DEANSHIP
SUMMER 1989

Time Utilized For Scholarship	Befadm ¹	Afadm ¹	Afdean
0 - 9 hrs/mo	3 (2.9)	16 (18.6)	58 (54.2)
10 - 25 hrs/mo	24 (23.1)	42 (48.8)	36 (33.6)
26 - 40 hrs/mo	37 (35.6)	18 (20.9)	9 (8.4)
41 + hrs/mo	40 (38.5)	10 (11.6)	4 (3.7)
Totals	104 ² (100.0)	86 ³ (99.9)	107 ⁴ (99.9)

Due to rounding, percentages do not total 100.0

¹Not applicable to all respondents

²14 missing cases

³32 missing cases

⁴11 missing cases

indicated that more than 25 hours per month were used for scholarship before they became administrators, only 32.5% of the respondents used this much time for scholarship after entering administration. This percentage fell to 12.1% of the respondents after assumption of the deanship.

A comparison between the time that the deans gave to scholarship prior to entering administration and the deans' expectations of time for scholarship from their assistant deans is displayed in Table 27. These data indicate that the deans who utilized more time for scholarship before becoming administrators were more likely to expect their assistant deans to use more time for scholarship. Of the respondents, 57.0% indicated that they engaged in more than 25 hours per month for scholarship prior to administration and that they expected their assistant deans to use more than 10 hours per month for scholarship.

A crosstabulation was performed between the deans' expectations of scholarship from their assistant deans and the time that deans gave to scholarship after entering administration, but prior to assuming a deanship. The results are displayed in Table 28. The chi-square value of 5.402 with 1 degree of freedom was significant. The deans who engaged in scholarship for 10 or more hours per month after entering administration were more likely to have a similar time expectation of scholarship from their assistant deans.

TABLE 27

CROSSTABULATION OF DEANS' EXPECTATIONS OF SCHOLARSHIP
FROM ASSISTANT DEANS AND TIME THAT DEANS GAVE TO
SCHOLARSHIP PRIOR TO BECOMING AN ADMINISTRATOR
SUMMER 1989

Time Expectation for Scholarship from Assistant Deans	Time for Scholarship Prior To Becoming an Administrator				Row Total
	0 - 9	10-25	26-40	40+	
0 - 9 hrs/mo	2 (2.2)	13 (14.0)	4 (4.3)	13 (14.0)	32 (34.5)
10 - 25 hrs/mo	0	8 (8.6)	24 (25.8)	16 (17.2)	48 (51.6)
26 - 40 hrs/mo	0	0	5 (5.4)	3 (3.2)	8 (8.6)
41 + hrs/mo	0	0	0	5 (5.4)	5 (5.4)
Totals	2 (2.2)	21 (22.6)	33 (35.5)	37 (39.8)	93 (100.0)

25 missing cases (all deans did not have assistant deans and some deans entered higher education directly as

TABLE 28

CROSSTABULATION OF DEANS' EXPECTATIONS OF SCHOLARSHIP
FROM ASSISTANT DEANS AND TIME THAT DEANS GAVE TO
SCHOLARSHIP AFTER BECOMING AN ADMINISTRATOR, BUT
BEFORE ASSUMING A DEANSHIP, SUMMER 1989

Time Expectation for Scholarship from Assistant Deans	Time for Scholarship After Administration, Before Dean		Row Total
	0 - 9	10 +	
0 - 9 hrs/mo	8 (10.7)	15 (20.0)	23 (30.7)
10 + hrs/mo	5 (6.7)	47 (62.7)	52 (69.4)
Totals	13 (17.4)	62 (82.7)	75 (100.1)

Chi-square value equalled 5.402 with 1 degree of freedom
Significance equalled .0201

43 missing cases (all deans did not have assistant deans and
some deans entered higher education directly as deans)
Due to rounding, percentages do not total 100.0

A crosstabulation was performed between the deans' expectations of scholarship from their assistant deans and the time that the deans gave to scholarship after assuming a deanship. The results are displayed in Table 29. The chi-square value of 8.339 with 1 degree of freedom was significant. The deans who engaged in scholarship for more than 10 hours per month were more likely to expect their assistant deans to engage in scholarship for more than 10 hours per month.

Similarly, a crosstabulation was performed between the deans' expectations that their assistant deans should devote some free time to scholarship and the time that the deans gave to scholarship after becoming dean. The analysis of these data revealed no significant relationship.

Of the respondents, 113 deans listed their academic areas of specialization. Thirty deans indicated that they had specialized in educational administration. Nineteen deans had come from educational psychology, clinical psychology or counseling. Eighteen deans were from the field of curriculum and instruction and twelve deans derived from teacher education. The rest were scattered over the many disciplines and sub-disciplines of education with a few from outside education. It was not possible to draw any meaningful inferences about the influence of these backgrounds upon the other variables in the study. A

TABLE 29

CROSSTABULATION OF DEANS' EXPECTATIONS OF SCHOLARSHIP
FROM ASSISTANT DEANS AND TIME THAT DEANS GAVE TO
SCHOLARSHIP AFTER ASSUMING A DEANSHIP
SUMMER 1989

Time Expectation for Scholarship from Assistant Deans	Time for Scholarship After the Deanship		Row Total
	0 - 9	10+	
0 - 9 hrs/mo	26 (27.1)	8 (8.3)	34 (35.4)
10 + hrs/mo	27 (28.1)	35 (36.5)	62 (64.6)
Totals	53 (55.2)	43 (44.8)	96 (100.0)

Chi-square equalled 8.339, 1 degree of freedom

Significance equalled .0039

22 missing cases (not all deans had assistant deans)

frequency distribution of the academic specializations of the respondents is presented in Appendix G.

The responses from the interviews also provided insight into whether the deans believed there was a relationship between their scholarship experiences and their administrative expectations of scholarship. Dean D indicated that individuals from certain disciplines might be more likely to have higher expectations of scholarship than those from some others. He used an example of an individual who came out of science education and became dean of education at a large, midwestern, land-grant university and then at a large, private university that enjoys world renown. This dean had very high expectations of scholarship from both faculty and administrators. However, Dean D went on to state that he did not believe there was a strong correlation between the field from which the dean derived and the expectations that the dean utilized to mold the faculty. Dean C said that there might be a relationship to the extent that on a continuum, an individual deriving from Educational Psychology would be more likely to employ a rigid, research-based definition of scholarship. At the other end of the continuum, he believed that individuals from Educational Administration or Vocational Education would be more likely to include practitioner or field service activities as part of scholarship.

There were three agree/disagree statements that requested the deans to consider the role of past scholarship of deans. The deans were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with the statement, "Most Deanships are filled by those who have exhibited past scholarship." Of the 114 respondents, 88 (77.2%) either agreed or strongly agreed and 26 (22.8%) disagreed (there were none who strongly disagreed). The deans also were asked to indicate degree of agreement or disagreement with the statement, "The most effective Deans exhibited strong scholarship prior to becoming Dean." Of the 113 respondents, 91 (80.5%) agreed or strongly agreed and 22 (19.5%) disagreed or strongly disagreed. To the statement, "My own scholarly background contributes greatly to my effectiveness as Dean," there were 87 (76.3%) deans who agreed or strongly agreed and 27 (23.7%) who disagreed or strongly disagreed. The distributions of responses to these statements are presented in Table 30. Overall, it appeared that there was strong support from the respondents for the role that scholarship had in contributing to the effectiveness of the individual in the deanship. It also was apparent that most deans believed that deanships went to those who had a record of scholarly achievement.

TABLE 30

DISTRIBUTIONS OF DEANS' AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT
WITH QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS THAT HAD TO DO WITH
THE RELATIONSHIP OF PAST SCHOLARSHIP TO
EFFECTIVENESS AS DEAN, SUMMER 1989

Statement	Agree or St. Agree	Disagree or St. Disagree	Row Total
My own scholarly background contri- butes greatly to my effectiveness as Dean.	87 (76.3)	27 (23.7)	114 ¹ (100.0)
The most effective Deans exhibited strong scholarship prior to becoming Dean.	91 (80.5)	22 (19.5)	113 ² (100.0)
Most Deanships are filled by those who have exhibited past scholarship.	88 (77.2)	26 (22.8)	114 ¹ (100.0)

¹4 missing cases

²5 missing cases

2C) What was the influence of administrative experience upon the dean's scholarship?

One way to approach this question was to determine if there was a difference in the time used for scholarship during the three periods in the deans' academic careers that were specified in the discussion of the previous question. Of the 104 respondents, the mean number of hours per month that individuals devoted to scholarship before entering administration (not applicable to all respondents), was 51.26 hours per month. The range was from 5 hours per month to 200 hours per month. The most frequent response was 40 hours per month (22.1% of respondents).

During the time period that the respondent was an administrator but not a dean (not applicable to all respondents), the mean number of hours per month that individuals gave to scholarship was 30.8. The range was from zero to 200 hours per month. The most frequent response was 20 hours per month (17.4% of respondents).

After assumption of the deanship, the mean number of hours per month that individuals used for scholarship was 15.3. The range of responses was from 0 to 60 hours per month. The most frequent response was 10 hours per month (32.7% of respondents).

This information was categorized and displayed in Table 26 (p. 130). Prior to the start of administrative service, 74.1% of the respondents indicated that more than

25 hours per month were devoted to scholarship. This was compared to 32.5% of the respondents, after entering administration and 12.1% of the respondents, after assumption of the deanship. Administrative service clearly was related to a diminution in the time that individual deans utilized for scholarship.

Information from QII also provided insight into the influence of administrative service upon the deans' scholarship. Congruent with Table 24 (p. 127), a common theme expressed by the deans was that the main influence of administrative service had been to reduce the amount of time available for scholarship. This had considerable impact upon the types of scholarship pursued as discussed in question 1D (p. 103). One dean wrote that prior to becoming an administrator, "I was able to read more and did research to gain knowledge." In some instances, deans totally eliminated certain kinds of research efforts. In other instances, the time for scholarship was not only restricted but also more likely to be interrupted. Some deans indicated that administrative service had modified their scholarship, not so much in the specific activities in which they engaged, but in the focus of the activity. For instance, one dean noted that conferences attended by deans were more likely to be organized around administrative concerns and trends, rather than discipline-specific interests.

While agreeing that administrative experience had broadened his definition of scholarship, Dean B did not believe that such experience had made him a better scholar. He stated, "If anything, it has dissipated it because . . . I don't have the time or the thoughtfulness that scholarship requires." Similarly, Dean C stated that, "in a very traditional, strict, scholarly sense, it [administrative experience] doesn't help much." Dean C went on, however, to indicate that his administrative experience had advanced his understanding of the diversity of possible research. Because of this, he believed that he was able to "think of issues in a little bit more concrete terms as I write about them. . . ."

Some individuals believed that service in administration had a strong, positive impact upon their scholarship. For instance, one dean wrote, "My interests reflect my years of experience which have certainly caused me to raise questions I could never have raised years ago." Another dean believed that the dean's position became a power base from which control over the selection of scholarship activities was possible. This dean wrote, "I can now empower myself to create a more flexible work environment; until I had this power, others had a stronger hold on my work agenda."

2D) Did deans believe that it was possible to be an academic leader without continuing the practice of scholarship?

Question 7 on QII asked, "Is it possible to be an academic leader without continuing the practice of scholarship?" The responses were almost evenly split between a fairly definite "No" and a fairly definite "Yes." Most respondents went on to explain their responses.

One theme that emerged from those deans who believed that such academic leadership was possible, was that there was a need for leaders who were skillful in administering the deanship. As one dean wrote,

organizational theory suggests that the successful administrator spends considerable time working with, for and against people to accomplish goals. Probably the bottom line is, "Do you move the organization forward?"

Another dean wrote, "The leader must first be a skilled administrator." Still another respondent wrote that the specific abilities needed by a dean were of a "coordinative, facilitating, motivating and staff development" nature, and another dean noted that of the many skills involved in leading a school of education, "scholarship may or may not be one of them." One dean reasoned that "the skills and competencies of analytical thought, logical reasoning and higher order processes" that are a consequence of

participating in scholarship have transferred to leadership behaviors and are "set" by the time one becomes a dean.

These responses reinforced the responses to the agree/disagree statement which read, "It is more important for the Dean to have excellent administrative skills than to continue active scholarship." Of the respondents, 80 (70.8%) agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. A majority of the respondents appeared to believe that ability to effectively administer their office was the first priority of deans.

Other deans reinforced the thought that academic leadership was independent of decanal scholarship. Some deans noted the social/political contexts of many deanships. One dean wrote of individuals who "specialize in the political and/or social dynamics of the position." Another respondent wrote, "The higher in the organization, the less important the scholarship. Other factors such as politics and representing your unit are more important." Still another respondent wrote about the dean's obligation to respond to the needs of the particular school or institution, "A politician or fund-raiser may be the answer." Another dean wrote, "it seems clear that the contemporary dean of education must relate most directly to external constituencies, particularly practitioners."

In a similar vein, Dean A pointed out the political ramifications of serving as dean in a large, land-grant

institution. "Right now, we're in a situation here where the dean has to find the resources and much of his success depends upon whether or not he can find those resources." He went on to state, "every school has its politics. And, the effectiveness of the dean of education in those universities is how he or she plays the local politics."

Other deans wrote that academic leadership would not suffer under a dean who forfeited scholarship as long as that individual had a prior record of extensive scholarship. One dean wrote,

If one has established him(her) self as a faculty member before administering, the image may persist. I think that an administrator is viewed by faculty as "having a faculty mind-set" or not, and that one can be an effective academic leader if seen as having that mind-set.

Related to this thought was the idea that what was essential was that the dean understood scholarly behavior. One respondent explained, "The relationship calls more for familiarity with and understanding of scholarship as opposed to contributions to it."

Those deans who indicated that it was not possible to be an academic leader without some continuing scholarship, brought up the value of decanal scholarship as a source of credibility, respect, role modeling and mentoring. For instance, one dean wrote of the "need to maintain connections with faculty and students and be judged as they are judged." Another dean wrote, "Not in my book. We

'dean' in an academy, one aspect of which is the scholarly life." Still another respondent wrote, "Only a scholar's judgment about scholarship will be respected by other scholars." Dean A reflected that deans must avoid letting "the politics or demands of the job override the need for a dean to be out front producing knowledge." Still another dean noted that continued scholarship was necessary because, otherwise, "the individual is not current with the intricacies of the scholarship enterprise and the competencies needed for leadership responsibilities."

Several deans who believed in a direct connection between continued scholarship and academic leadership voiced the belief that the dean stayed current in education primarily through ongoing scholarship. One dean wrote, "How else does one keep growing?" Another respondent wrote, "a leader must keep current with the main thrusts of the field so that he or she can be a good spokesperson and make knowledgeable priority decisions." Still another dean wrote,

To lead a group of scholars, one must be in touch with current scholarly developments and the emerging frontiers of knowledge. One cannot anticipate changes if current developments are not known.

Some deans did recognize the existence of effective deans who did not engage in scholarship, but accompanied this recognition by statements such as, "one is a better leader when one can 'feel' the rewards of scholarship and is

therefore much more understanding of faculty and their scholarship pursuits or lack thereof." Similarly, another dean wrote, "leadership will be stronger if scholarship continues." Another respondent wrote that although many deans did little in the way of scholarship, "ideally, all administrators should try to keep alive in some bits of scholarship."

Some deans expressed the thought that the argument about the interrelationship between academic leadership and continued decanal scholarship was dependent upon the individual's definition of scholarship. One dean wrote that it, "Can't be absent, but could just include a lot of reading, attending professional meetings, etc." Another respondent wrote, "At a minimum, an administrative academic leader must be knowledgeable about what conditions enhance scholarship for others. One must at least be scholarly about that."

Another approach to understanding what deans believed to be the connection between academic leadership and continued scholarship was to determine if they believed there was a relationship between effectiveness in the deanship and continued scholarship. There was a fairly large majority of deans who believed that most individuals who became deans were those who already had exhibited substantial scholarship, and that such a background enhanced the effectiveness of the dean's position (Table 30, p. 139).

Therefore, it was desirable to determine whether the deans believed that continued decanal scholarship contributed to overall effectiveness in the deanship. Four agree/disagree statements were concerned with this topic. The frequency of responses to these items is presented in Table 31.

Two of the statements implied that continued decanal scholarship contributed to effectiveness in the deanship. The other two statements suggested that other criteria might be more important. A substantial majority of individuals expressed agreement with all except the statement that effective leadership was possible without any continued scholarship on the part of the dean. Although the majority of deans believed that effectiveness in the deanship was enhanced by decanal scholarship, the deans also believed that excellent administrative skills were more essential than continued scholarship.

A series of crosstabulations were performed between these statements. There were several significant findings. When the statement, "The most effective Deans exhibit continued scholarship after becoming Dean" was crosstabulated with "A Dean can be an effective leader without exhibiting any continued scholarship," the chi-square of 12.476 with 1 degree of freedom was significant. This information is presented in Table 32. Most deans who agreed or strongly agreed with the first statement were likely to disagree with the second.

TABLE 31

DISTRIBUTIONS OF DEANS' AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT
WITH QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS THAT CONCERNED THE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONTINUED DECANAL
SCHOLARSHIP AND EFFECTIVENESS IN THE
DEANSHIP SUMMER 1989

Statement	Agree or St. Agree	Disagree or St. Disagree	Row Total
There is a direct relationship between the Dean's continued scholarship and the Dean's effectiveness as Dean.	81 (71.1)	33 (29.0)	114 ¹ (100.1)
A Dean can be an effective leader without exhibiting any continued scholarship.	39 (34.2)	75 (65.8)	114 ¹ (100.0)
It is more important for the Dean to have excellent administrative skills than to continue active scholarship.	80 (70.8)	33 (29.2)	113 ² (100.0)
The most effective Deans exhibit continued scholarship after becoming Dean.	84 (74.3)	29 (25.7)	113 ² (100.0)

Due to rounding, percentages do not total 100.0

¹4 missing cases

²5 missing cases

TABLE 32

CROSSTABULATION OF "THE MOST EFFECTIVE DEANS EXHIBIT
CONTINUED SCHOLARSHIP, AFTER BECOMING DEAN" AND
"A DEAN CAN BE AN EFFECTIVE LEADER WITHOUT
EXHIBITING ANY CONTINUED SCHOLARSHIP"
SUMMER 1989

Effect. Deans Continue Scholarship	Acad Leadership Possible Without Scholarship		Row Total
	Agree or St. Agree	Disagree or St. Disagree	
Agree or St. Agree	20 (17.7)	64 (56.7)	84 (74.4)
Disagree or St. Disagree	18 (15.9)	11 (9.7)	29 (25.6)
Totals	38 (33.6)	75 (66.4)	113 (100.0)

Chi-square value equalled 12.476, 1 degree of freedom
Significance equalled .0004
5 missing cases

Similarly, when the statement, "A Dean can be an effective leader without exhibiting any continued scholarship" was crosstabulated with "There is a direct relationship between the Dean's continued scholarship and the Dean's effectiveness as an academic leader," the chi-square value of 28.253 with 1 degree of freedom was significant. This information is displayed in Table 33. The deans who believed that continued scholarship was important were likely to question the effectiveness of a dean who did not continue to engage in some scholarly activity.

When the statement, "The most effective Deans exhibit continued scholarship, after becoming Dean" was crosstabulated with "It is more important for the Dean to have excellent administrative skills than to continue active scholarship," the findings were significant with a chi-square value of 5.697 with 1 degree of freedom. These data are displayed in Table 34. The deans who believed that continued decanal scholarship was important also tended to believe that administrative ability was more important in the deanship.

In order to determine the deans' beliefs about the role of scholarship in the process of selecting a new dean, the respondents were requested to express their degree of agreement or disagreement with two items having to do with the use of scholarship as a criterion in this process.

TABLE 33

CROSSTABULATION OF "THERE IS A DIRECT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DEAN'S CONTINUED SCHOLARSHIP AND THE DEAN'S EFFECTIVENESS AS AN ACADEMIC LEADER" AND "A DEAN CAN BE AN EFFECTIVE LEADER WITHOUT EXHIBITING ANY CONTINUED SCHOLARSHIP" SUMMER 1989

Scholarship & Effectiveness Are Related	Acad Leadership Possible Without Scholarship		Row Total
	Agree or St. Agree	Disagree or St. Disagree	
Agree or St. Agree	15 (13.2)	66 (57.9)	81 (71.1)
Disagree or St. Agree	24 (21.1)	9 (7.9)	33 (29.0)
Totals	39 (34.3)	75 (65.8)	114 (100.1)

Chi-square value equalled 28.253, 1 degree of freedom

Significance equalled .0000

4 missing cases

Due to rounding, percentages do not total 100.0

TABLE 34

CROSSTABULATION OF "THE MOST EFFECTIVE DEANS EXHIBIT
CONTINUED SCHOLARSHIP, AFTER BECOMING DEAN" AND
"IT IS MORE IMPORTANT FOR THE DEAN TO HAVE
EXCELLENT ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS THAN TO
CONTINUE ACTIVE SCHOLARSHIP"
SUMMER 1989

Effect. Deans Continue Scholarship	Administrative Skills Are Most Important		Row Total
	Agree or St. Agree	Disagree or St. Disagree	
Agree or St. Agree	53 (47.3)	30 (26.8)	83 (74.1)
Disagree or St. Disagree	26 (23.2)	3 (2.6)	29 (25.8)
Totals	79 (70.5)	33 (29.4)	112 (99.9)

Chi-square value equalled 5.698, 1 degree of freedom

Significance equalled .0170

6 missing cases

Due to rounding, percentages do not total 100.0

Responses are presented in Table 35. It appeared that most of the respondents (85.2%) believed that their institution did give high consideration to a candidate's scholarship when selecting a dean of education. An even larger percentage of the respondents (90.4%) agreed that this was a proper and important criterion for the deanship. This finding reinforced the majority viewpoint that academic leadership and continued scholarship were related.

Dean A was stepping down from the deanship and discussed the search for a new dean at his institution. A successor had been recommended by the search committee and had been approved by the faculty of the school. However, the individual was turned down by the central administration and some other deans because they did not believe that the individual's scholarly reputation was of sufficient renown and prestige. This occurred despite the school's declaration that the most important job for the new dean would be the restructuring of the school's organization, for which proven administrative ability would be required.

Dean D also indicated that an individual who was a candidate for most schools of education would have to demonstrate evidence of considerable scholarship in order to just "get through search committee." Dean C agreed that the criterion of scholarly background was always involved in the selection of a dean. He tempered this by stating,

TABLE 35

DISTRIBUTIONS OF DEANS' AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS CONCERNING THE USE OF SCHOLARSHIP
AS A CRITERION IN THE SELECTION OF A DEAN OF
EDUCATION, SUMMER 1989

Statement	Agree or St. Agree	Disagree or St. Disagree	Row Total
My institution gives high consid- eration to a candi- date's scholarship, when selecting a Dean of Education.	98 (85.2)	17 (14.8)	115 (100.0)
My institution should give high consideration to a candidate's scholar- ship when selecting a Dean of Education.	104 (90.4)	11 (9.6)	115 (100.0)
3 missing cases			

The assessment of that becomes very loose.
. . . by the time you get through the process,
and all the compromises are made, many times
that is not a prime consideration. . . . There
is just a rhetoric in the field that when they
hire academic administrators, they want them
to have been a scholar at some level.

Dean B noted that, despite the prominence of scholarly
background in any deanship position descriptions, "in
reflecting on the deans that I've known and worked with
. . . lots of them don't strike me as being very scholarly
individuals." He also stated that,

every university is in the game of chasing
prestige. . . .I can't imagine a university
appointing someone who hasn't demonstrated a
commitment to scholarship. Now, whether that
person is a "star" in scholarship, that's
another matter.

2E) Did deans believe that continuing scholarship
inhibited or enhanced the performance of their
administrative duties?

Part II of QI asked the deans to indicate the degree
of agreement or disagreement with two statements about the
influence of continued scholarship upon the performance of
administrative duties. The findings are displayed in Table
36. There appeared to be some overlap of deans who believed
that scholarship served both to enhance and detract from the
administrative job. This appeared to be especially true in
the middle ranges of "agree" and "disagree." Thus,
it appeared that, although overall, the deans tended to
agree that scholarship enhanced the performance of their

TABLE 36

DISTRIBUTIONS OF DEANS' AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS THAT CONCERNED THE INFLUENCE
OF CONTINUED SCHOLARSHIP UPON THE DEANS'
PERFORMANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES
SUMMER 1989

Statement	Agree or St. Agree	Disagree or St. Disagree	Row Total
The pursuit of scholarship enhances the performance of my administrative duties.	102 (88.7)	13 (11.3)	115 (100.0)
The pursuit of scholarship detracts from the performance of my administra- tive duties.	31 (27.0)	84 (73.0)	115 (100.0)
3 missing cases			

administrative duties, some of those same deans recognized that engagement in scholarship activities also served to detract from administration.

Question 4 on QII requested that the deans provide a specific explanation of the ways in which the pursuit of scholarly activities enhanced the performance of their administrative duties. Responses were received from 93.5% of those deans who completed QII. There were only four deans who indicated that scholarship did not improve their administrative performance. One dean wrote that scholarship added value only when scholarship evolved directly from performance of administrative duties. The majority of the respondents indicated that scholarship both enhanced and inhibited the performance of their administrative duties.

There were several themes that emerged from the responses of those who did believe that continued scholarship enhanced the performance of their administrative duties. The three most prevalent themes were: credibility and respect from faculty and other campus and off-campus colleagues, role modeling for faculty and keeping current in education.

The respondents appeared to believe that credibility and respect, especially from faculty, were heightened when the dean continued at least some minimum visible scholarship. One dean wrote, "An administrator must have some, limited scholarly endeavors for precisely that reason

[credibility]. Otherwise, a Dean is viewed as a paper pusher." One dean responded that this was especially true if the dean was one who prodded the faculty to do more and better scholarship. Similarly, another dean wrote that his own scholarly pursuit, "Makes it easier to demand scholarship from my professional peers." Dean D stated that deans of comprehensive and doctoral-granting institutions "have to have credibility in the research communities of those colleges. And, they have to establish that credibility in one way or another." Another wrote that continued scholarship enhanced credibility with colleagues outside the school of education and outside the institution.

Closely related to the theme of credibility was the idea that continued scholarship enabled the dean to serve as a viable role model for faculty, students and other administrators. Fifteen deans specifically used the term "role model." For instance, one dean wrote that "I am seen as a role model and consequently taken more seriously by my own faculty as well as other administrators." Another wrote, "I feel it is important for faculty to be aware of my scholarship. I expect it of them." Other comments included, "I am doing what I expect the faculty and graduate students to do" and "the role model thus established does much to establish credibility with the academic community." Still another dean wrote, "I am able to model expected behavior for faculty." Another dean responded that "I am a

professor first--an administrator second (though 90% of my time is in the latter category)." Dean A noted that academic leadership without scholarship was like "administering in a vacuum." He went on to state, "if you're a scholar, you're disciplined. And that governs your behavior. . . . builds confidence for those people that you work with."

Another major theme that came across in responses to this question on QII was that scholarly activity helped to keep administrators in touch with changes and current trends in education. Dean B called this "staying alive" in one's field. Typical responses were, "You keep up with what is going on in education," "Keeps me abreast of new needs, directions and information studies," "Keeps me in touch with the latest administrative skills and concepts," and "It keeps me in contact with many colleagues across the country." Another dean responded that, "In order to initiate as well as support college activities reasonably well requires current knowledge in as many areas as possible." Another respondent noted that ongoing scholarship "Gives me better background in theory and research" and another dean wrote that it "force[s] me to read the literature; keep[s] me aware of issues and/or problems. . . ."

The deans also indicated that continued scholarship enhanced their administrative function because it helped

them to be sensitive to the challenges faced by faculty. As one dean wrote, it "Keeps me aware of faculty concerns." Another dean responded that such activity enhanced the deans' perceptions about "budget/time needs of faculty." Another dean wrote that it "Keeps appreciation for scholarship fresh and alive (enhances sharpness in doing annual evaluations)." Still another dean wrote that continued scholarship, "Keeps one in close contact with one aspect of the 'real' business of a university--generation of knowledge."

Other deans believed that their administrative performance was enhanced by continued scholarship because it helped them function more effectively in their leadership and administrative roles. One dean wrote that continued scholarship provided a base of "expert" power for the dean as leader. Another dean wrote that it "Keeps me in touch with the latest administrative skills and concepts." Specific benefits of continued scholarship that were cited included "It . . . helps me better conceptualize my administrative functions" and "Useful in presenting arguments for budget and resource requests." Other deans noted that they were better leaders because of ongoing scholarship. For instance, one dean wrote that it "sharpens my use of data in decision-making, hypothesis formulation, evaluation of consequences, problem-solving." Similarly, another dean wrote that "my scholarly interests force one to

be careful about general and undocumented answers, decisions, actions." Another respondent wrote that "I stay on task so that I can better use my time." Still another dean wrote that one advantage of continued scholarship was to,

Provide insight into research findings related to my discipline, plus other arenas in teacher education. Also, suggests new areas to compare and contrast what we currently do. Also, helps in reviewing faculty credentials for promotion and tenure.

The final major theme that emerged from these answers was that continued scholarship enhanced administrative performance because it provided for personal satisfaction. One dean wrote,

I am a reflective person by nature. It is natural for me to spend a good portion of my time reflecting on the nature of the workplace, what motivates persons (faculty), how systems become dysfunctional, and the like. I read my field thoroughly. All of the above keep me on cutting edge as practitioner.

Similarly, eight deans described one consequence of scholarly activity as a state of feeling intellectually alive. Four deans wrote that engagement in scholarship also provided an avenue of escape from the rigorous stress of service as dean. Dean C stated that in his case, he engaged in scholarship because it was "a 'sanity' thing or keeping a balance in my personality as opposed to doing it because I think I'll be a good dean." Dean B noted that although at

that moment he was doing no writing, "sometime in the next week or month or two months, I'm going to say to myself, 'God, what a drag this stupid administrative work is. I've got to charge my battery again'."

When asked to describe how continued scholarship detracted from administrative performance, ten deans wrote that there was no detracting. One wrote that, "If I give up on scholarship, I have no business being an administrator in an academic institution." Another wrote that any detracting was "Only as it is unrelated to overall mission of school as it takes the place of other duties/responsibilities necessary for support of school, faculty and students."

Almost all other deans indicated that time considerations were the primary hindrance. As one dean remarked, "Administrative responsibilities are relentless." Another wrote that it is "Just one more thing to take time--always rushing!" Another dean wrote, "On campus the time needed [for scholarship] is used for academic leadership plus desk work (forms, correspondence)." Another noted that scholarly activity required, "Time and mental energy that I do not have. The redirection of efforts to research during the day involves a shifting of gears that is most difficult to do." Still another dean reflected, "Everything about administration seems immediate and critical. Scholarship should be deliberative. It has a different pace and is hard to fit in"

It was apparent that some deans believed that they were successful in juggling the pursuit of scholarship and effective administration. As one dean wrote, "I try to tie the two areas of responsibility together into a single entity. Thus, I look for how policy goals can be researched and work towards publication." Another dean wrote that continued scholarship might mean a "missed meeting or two." Similarly, another dean wrote, "I don't socialize . . . as much as some dean colleagues. I do let others know when I question another meeting." Another dean wrote,

Time is the major problem. If you carve out time for scholarship you are going to experience some frustration in meeting your administrative responsibilities, if, in fact, they are truly demanding and you are trying to exert leadership. It's a balancing act--but an achievable one.

There was a definite indication from these deans that administrative responsibilities had first priority. "They do not [detract] so long as I can accept the limits of my available time. Administrative responsibilities come first." Another wrote that, "No one will care about how good my scholarship is if I don't perform my administrative duties well." Another noted that decanal scholarship may not be recognized as important by the faculty because it "Does not benefit faculty directly as other tasks do." One respondent wrote, "People have difficulty understanding why you are not available," and another dean noted,

All too frequently, the full-time administrators who attempt to stay competitive with

research and scholarship demands will not be able to give the time and attention that is required to carry out a full-time administrative role effectively.

Dean D spoke in the same vein, "I'm afraid sometimes that deadlines on the scholarly side compromise the amount of time on the administrative side." He continued to explain that when he evaluated other administrators,

I look at their scholarship, but if they're deficient in their managerial and leadership functions, either they ought to go back to being a full-time scholar, or they need to shape up in terms of their administrative responsibilities.

2F) Discussion of the findings of the second set of research questions.

The most utilized strategy to implement decanal scholarship goals was the deans' use of free time. Virtually all strategies that deans employed to implement scholarship were related in some way to the manipulation of time. An important strategy that was highlighted in responses to QII and to the interview questions, was serendipity, or the chance discovery of opportunities to pursue scholarship.

Although the majority of respondents indicated that they did not have sufficient time for scholarship, many noted that it was possible to reduce the time required for administrative duties. At the same time, there was a sizable minority of respondents (38.3%) who believed that it

was possible to engage in substantial scholarship even while dean. There was a statistically significant relationship between the deans' beliefs about the possibility of engaging in substantial scholarship while dean and their beliefs that there was sufficient time for scholarship. There also was a statistically significant relationship between the deans' beliefs that substantial scholarship was possible while dean and the number of hours per month that the deans engaged in scholarship after they became deans.

Movement from faculty status into administration and into the deanship was accompanied by a diminution in the time used for scholarship. The deans who used more time for scholarship prior to entering administration were more likely to have higher expectations of time for scholarship from their assistant deans. There were statistically significant relationships between the time that the deans gave to scholarship after becoming administrators and after assuming the deanship, and their expectations that their assistant deans would engage in scholarship. It appeared that the deans who used more time for scholarship were more likely to have higher expectations from their assistant deans than those deans who utilized less time for scholarly activities.

It was not possible to determine if the academic background of the respondents influenced their administrative expectations of scholarship. The deans who

were interviewed indicated that this relationship was only slight. Overall, the deans considered a history of scholarly achievement to be an important factor in the effectiveness of the deanship.

The deans definitely had fewer hours per month available for scholarship as they moved from faculty status into administration and then into the deanship. This appeared to be the primary influence of administrative service upon scholarship. Another impact was upon the types of scholarship that were pursued by the deans. In addition, administrative experience brought about a broadening of the way in which the deans defined scholarship. A few deans believed that administrative experience had a strong, positive effect upon their scholarship. Other deans believed that there was no effect or that it was negative because of the different orientations and responsibilities of scholarship and of administration.

There was disagreement among the respondents to QII about the relationship between continued scholarship and academic leadership. On the one hand, the deans believed that effective administration of the office was of primary importance and was not necessarily dependent upon continued scholarship. Some deans noted that the skills which were sharpened by engagement in scholarship did not disappear, even when one no longer actively pursued scholarship. Similarly, some deans believed that an established

reputation as a scholar was important, but not necessarily the continuation of active scholarship. The importance of the social or political context of many schools of education was highlighted by several deans.

There was equal intensity of argument among the deans about the importance of scholarship to academic leadership. Some deans believed that academic leadership was compromised when the dean did not engage in at least some scholarship. This viewpoint was based primarily upon the need for the dean to establish credibility, to have the respect of students, faculty and colleagues, and to serve as a viable role model and mentor. These deans noted that scholarship was necessary in order for the dean to "stay alive" and to understand current issues and trends in education.

In terms of effectiveness in the deanship, the majority of the respondents believed that continued scholarship on the part of the dean played a role. At the same time, the deans believed that the ability to administer the dean's office was more important than continued decanal scholarship. In regard to the process for selection of a new dean, the deans believed that their institutions gave high consideration to the criterion of scholarship and the majority of deans believed that this was a proper criterion.

The majority of the deans believed that decanal scholarship enhanced the performance of administrative duties. Many of these same deans also believed that it

detracted from administrative performance. Deans identified credibility and respect, role modeling and keeping current as the three primary ways that scholarship enhanced administrative performance. Other valuable benefits of continued scholarship included sensitivity to faculty needs and regular practice of the skills needed by a scholar. Some deans believed that they remained closer to the purposes and mission(s) operative in the school and the university through the pursuit of scholarship. The final reason put forward by deans who believed that continued scholarship enhanced administrative performance, had to do with personal satisfaction. Several deans expressed the sentiment that scholarly activities allowed escape from the grind of administrative responsibilities. Some deans noted that such activity brought balance and perspective to the deanship.

The major detraction to administrative performance because of decanal scholarship was the preemption of time that was required. Time for scholarship often meant that some other activity was postponed or foregone. A few deans indicated that it was possible to balance the requirements of scholarly activity and effective administration. Many deans thought otherwise. Regardless of how deans thought about this relationship, it was clear that administrative responsibilities had first priority.

Research Question 3

The third set of research questions had to do with the relationship between the deans' scholarship and the deans' performance evaluations.

3A) Did the current administrative performance evaluation process include consideration of scholarship?

The deans were asked to indicate degree of agreement or disagreement with the statement, "There is a direct relationship between my performance evaluation and my scholarship." Of the 111 respondents, 33 (29.7%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Seventy-eight (70.3%) of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed. Similar results were obtained with the statement, "There is a strong relationship between my future salary increases and my ongoing scholarship. Of the respondents, 38 (33.1%) agreed or strongly agreed and 77 (66.9%) disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Results were different when the deans were asked to agree or disagree with the statement, "There is a strong relationship between my career growth and my continued scholarship." Of the respondents, 87 (75.6%) agreed or strongly agreed and 28 (24.3%) disagreed (no dean strongly disagreed). The frequency distributions of responses to these three statements are displayed in Table 37. These findings suggested that, in general, the deans did not

TABLE 37

DISTRIBUTIONS OF DEANS' AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS CONCERNING THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND SCHOLARSHIP
SUMMER 1989

<u>Statement</u>	<u>Agree or St. Agree</u>	<u>Disagree or St. Disagree</u>	<u>Row Total</u>
There is a direct relationship between my performance evaluation and my scholarship.	33 (29.7)	78 (70.3)	111 ¹ (100.0)
There is a strong relationship between my future salary increases and my ongoing scholarship.	38 (33.0)	77 (67.0)	115 ² (100.0)
There is a strong relationship between my career growth and my continued scholarship.	87 (75.6)	28 (24.4)	115 ² (100.0)

¹7 missing cases

²3 missing cases

believe that the evaluation of their performance in the deanship was tied to scholarly activities. On the other hand, most deans appeared to believe that continued scholarship did impact on overall career growth.

The deans who were interviewed were asked if evidence of continued scholarship was part of their performance evaluations. Dean A and Dean B did not know if it was part of the evaluation process. Dean B remarked that he, in fact, received very little feedback from his yearly evaluation. Dean C said that it was not part of the performance evaluation. Dean D stated that the administration took pride in the accomplishments in the scholarly arena on the part of the chief administrators, "But I don't know that the reward system is tied to that in any way."

3B) Should evidence of scholarship be part of the deans' evaluations?

The deans were asked to agree or disagree with "There should be a direct relationship between my performance evaluation and my scholarship." Of the respondents, 73 (64.1%) agreed or strongly agreed and 41 (35.9%) disagreed or strongly disagreed. Since only 29.7% of the respondents believed that a direct relationship existed at the current time, the inference was that the deans would be willing to

accept a closer relationship between performance evaluation and continued scholarship than now exists.

A crosstabulation was performed between the deans' agreement or disagreement with "There should be a direct relationship between my performance evaluation and my scholarship" and the number of hours per month that the deans indicated that they used for scholarship after becoming dean. This information is displayed in Table 38. The chi-square value of 5.245 with 1 degree of freedom was significant. This finding suggested that deans who gave more hours per month to scholarship were more likely to agree that scholarship should be an important criterion in the deans' performance evaluations.

Item 6 on QII asked the respondents to explain to what extent scholarship should be considered when the dean was evaluated. Of the 46 individuals who completed QII, 45 (97.8%) provided a response. Of these, two deans indicated that they did not know if it should have a role in the dean's evaluation. Nineteen deans (42.2%) indicated that scholarship was an inappropriate criterion for the evaluation, or only minimally appropriate. This viewpoint was summed up by one dean who wrote, "I am not comfortable using this as a criterion of evaluation." Dean C noted that the performance evaluation of deans was unsystematic and dissimilar from institution to institution, and that scholarship should not be used as a criterion of evaluation.

TABLE 38

CROSSTABULATION OF "THERE SHOULD BE A DIRECT RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN MY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MY SCHOLARSHIP"
AND DEANS' INDICATIONS OF TIME FOR SCHOLARSHIP
AFTER BECOMING DEAN SUMMER 1989

Hours for Schol After Becoming Dean	Perf Eval and Schol Should Be Related		Row Total
	Agree or St. Agree	Disagree or St. Disagree	
0 - 9 hrs/mo	31 (29.2)	26 (24.5)	57 (53.7)
10 + hrs/mo	38 (35.8)	11 (10.4)	49 (46.2)
Totals	69 (65.0)	37 (34.9)	106 (99.9)

Chi-square value equalled 5.245, 1 degree of freedom

Significance equalled .0220

12 missing cases

Due to rounding, percentages do not total 100.0

Another dean indicated that any ongoing scholarship on the part of deans should be recognized, but there should be no penalty for failing to participate in scholarship. Similarly, another dean wrote, "It should probably not be minimally required, but if present it should be a clear plus." Another respondent wrote that it should be "acknowledged as a plus, but it isn't what deans are hired to do by and large." One dean wrote that scholarship should not be considered in the evaluation because "Research is a part of my professional life and it is not a part of my Dean's position description." This statement resembled those that suggested that individual deans should remain scholars, not because of their administrative position, but because of their identification as faculty.

Some deans indicated that the criterion of scholarship should be considered only minimally. One respondent wrote that the significance of scholarship in the evaluation should be, "Not a lot. Performance of the unit and the dean's role in it is what is important." Another dean wrote that scholarship should be considered "In a minor way--administering a college or school has little to do with the success of one's research agenda." Still another responded that "No activity is not acceptable. . . Largest percentage of expectations must be in non-scholarship administrative areas." Similarly, another dean wrote that scholarship should be considered "About 10%--the key

variables related to performance are in program development, budget effectiveness, planning, faculty development."

Another respondent wrote that such evaluation should be "within reason and in relation to what the Dean has done within a two year span. . . ."

One dean wrote that, "Involvement in professional activities and currency in the field are about the only requirements I feel are reasonably a part of a Dean's evaluation." Similarly, another dean noted that scholarship should be considered only to the extent that the dean has or has not kept up "with what is going on in education." He added that "some writing is recognition for the college as well as the Dean." Another dean wrote, "No one can be an effective leader uninformed."

One dean noted that deans typically were not evaluated on scholarship. "In fact, as the dean's role changes and new responsibilities are added, e.g. fund raising, scholarship becomes less valued if not less important." Four deans made similar observations that scholarly activity should not serve to strengthen the evaluation "in lieu of administrative experience." One dean differentiated between evaluations prepared by faculty and by administrators, "Probably to a minor extent if the evaluation is by the faculty. Little or no extent if by central administration."

There were five deans who indicated that the importance of scholarship in the deans' performance evaluations should vary with the institution. One dean wrote that it "Depends on the needs of a school at that point in time." Another agreed that the importance of scholarship in the evaluation depended upon the institution, but noted that "We have no 'professional' administrators except president. All others have regular faculty jobs." Similarly, another wrote, "A dean is a professional--as such it is as important as it is for any professor." Still another dean wrote, "If an institution values scholarship, it should be listed as an expectation when the person is employed. Thus it should be a part of the evaluation process." Another dean wrote, "it . . . depends on the institution and how much support a dean is provided."

Nine deans indicated that scholarship should be of moderate importance and eight deans signified that it should be a major criterion in the evaluation of the dean. Dean A thought it should be given important consideration. Similarly, one dean wrote, "Scholarship is a necessary prerequisite to good standing in the academy. To that extent it should be a significant criterion." Dean B responded that, "A 'goose egg' in that area of responsibility is unacceptable from anyone who purports to be a professor." Similarly, several deans wrote comments such as, "Deans should achieve at least the level considered

satisfactory for faculty," "As any faculty member," and "One part of role/expectations for dean/faculty," and "The same as for full professors except with a bit more understanding of his/her job responsibilities." Still another dean wrote, "Scholarship should be considered in evaluating a dean. Deans are academic deans and, therefore, their leadership should extend beyond their administration." Dean B stated, "I'm not interested in just a manager. This is an academic institution so we have to do academic scholarship."

3C) Discussion of the findings of the third set of research questions.

Consideration of scholarship did not figure prominently, if at all, in the performance evaluations of deans. Three-fourths of the deans did, however, believe that continued scholarship was an important factor in their overall career growth.

A large percentage of the respondents (64.1%) appeared willing to accord scholarship a more important role in the performance evaluation of the dean. The deans who utilized more hours per month for scholarship were more likely to agree that scholarship should be an important criterion in the performance evaluation. Responses to QII revealed that about one-half of the respondents believed that scholarship either should have no role in the

performance evaluation or only a minor role. Arguments supporting this belief were focused around the primary importance of other types of decanal responsibilities. Arguments that supported the use of scholarship as a criterion in the evaluation centered on the importance of the dean as the academic leader of the school. Other responses tied the importance of scholarship in the dean's performance evaluation to the mission(s) of the particular school of education or institution.

Research Question 4

The fourth set of research questions concerned variability among the deans. It was desirable to determine if there were any demographic variables that differentiated those deans who believed that continued scholarship was more important in administration from those who believed it was less important.

4A) Were the deans in schools of education that were members of The Holmes Group more likely to give greater importance to the role of scholarship in administration?

Since The Holmes Group has been prominent in calling for an increased quantity and rigor of research effort in schools of education, it seemed appropriate to determine if deans at member institutions were more likely to give high importance to decanal and administrative scholarship.

Of the respondents, 43.2% were members of The Holmes Group while 40.7% of the study population were non-members (see Table 2, p. 56). Therefore, it appeared that the deans in member institutions were slightly more willing to participate in this research than non-members.

Crosstabulations were performed between Holmes membership and the deans' indications of how much time they expected that their assistant deans should give to scholarship and Holmes membership and how much time they perceived that the chief academic officers expected them to give to scholarship. Similarly, three crosstabulations were performed between Holmes membership and the deans' indications that they did or did not expect their assistant deans to give free time to scholarship, Holmes membership and their beliefs about whether their chief academic officers expected them to use free time for scholarship, and Holmes membership and their indications that they used free time for scholarship. There were no significant findings.

Crosstabulations then were performed between Holmes membership and the deans' indications of time used for scholarship before they became administrators, after entering administration but prior to the deanship, and after becoming dean. The chi-square values obtained were not significant.

Crosstabulations also were performed between Holmes membership and those agree/disagree statements that implied

that scholarship either was or was not very important in the deanship. The statements that were utilized included: "The most effective Deans exhibit continued scholarship after becoming Dean," "There should be a direct relationship between my performance evaluation and my scholarship," "It is more important for the Dean to have excellent administrative skills than to continue active scholarship," and "Deans who successfully motivate their faculty to pursue scholarship activities, are scholars." There were no significant findings.

Although the deans in schools that were members of The Holmes Group were slightly more willing to participate in this study, this variable appeared to be completely independent of other variables in the study.

4B) Could any differences in perceptions of the deans be explained by Carnegie Classification, size of institution, type of institutional control, or number of doctoral degree programs?

A crosstabulation was performed between Carnegie Classification and the deans' expectations of time for scholarship from their assistant deans. A similar crosstabulation was performed with the deans' perceptions about the chief academic officers' expectations of time for scholarship from the deans. Neither generated significant findings. Crosstabulations then were performed between

Carnegie Classification and the deans' expectations that their assistant deans would use free time for scholarship, Carnegie Classification and the deans' beliefs about whether the chief academic officers expected deans to use free time for scholarship, and Carnegie Classification and the deans' indications that they did or did not use free time for scholarship. The analyses of the findings of these tests revealed no significant results.

Crosstabulations were performed between Carnegie Classification and the deans' indications of time used for scholarship after becoming dean. The chi-square value obtained was not significant. Crosstabulations also were performed between Carnegie Classification and the four agree/disagree statements, identified above, that implied that scholarship either was or was not very important in the deanship. There were no significant findings.

Similarly, the same series of crosstabulations were performed using size of institution, type of institutional control and number of doctoral programs as the variable of comparison. No significant findings were discovered.

Comparisons were drawn between the study population and the respondents in Chapter III using these variables of Carnegie Classification, size of institution, type of institutional control, and number of doctoral degree programs. Although those comparisons suggested that a slightly higher proportion of public to private institutions

participated in this research, these variables were statistically independent of other important variables in the study.

4C) Could any differences in perceptions of deans be explained by other demographic variables?

Among the respondents, 114 deans provided demographic data about age, sex and race. Of these, 21 (18.4%) were 45 years of age or younger, 30 (26.3%) were 46 - 50 years of age, 27 (23.7%) were 51 - 55 years of age, 24 (21.1%) were 56 - 60 years of age, and 12 (10.5%) were 61 years of age or older. These data are displayed in Table 39. The mean age of the respondents was 51.9 years with 47 being the most frequent response. The youngest dean was 38 and the eldest was 67.

Among the respondents, 23 (20.2%) were female and 91 (79.8%) were male. In terms of race, 102 (89.5%) were Caucasian, 2 (1.8%) were native Americans, 9 (7.9%) were African Americans and 1 (0.9%) was Hispanic. The respondents included 105 (92.1%) who were deans and 9 (7.9%) who were in the position as acting or interim dean.

A series of crosstabulations were performed between age, sex and race and the variables that were crosstabulated with Carnegie Classification, size, institutional control and number of doctoral degree programs. No significant findings were discovered.

TABLE 39

DISTRIBUTION OF AGE OF RESPONDENTS
SUMMER 1989

Age	Freq of Response	Percent
Less than 46	21	18.4
46 - 50	30	26.3
51 - 55	27	23.7
56 - 60	24	21.1
61 +	12	10.5
Totals	114	100.0

4 missing cases

Information about years of service in administration was received from 114 respondents. This information is presented in Table 40. The mean number of years as an administrator was 14.4 and the most frequent response was 15 years. The minimum service was one year and the maximum was 40 years.

Information about years of service as a dean was received from 112 deans. This information is presented in Table 41. The mean number of years as dean was 6.7 years and the most frequent response was 2 years. The range was from one year to 24 years as dean.

A series of crosstabulations were performed between years of service in administration, years of service as dean and the variables identified above. Analyses of these tests revealed no significant findings, with two exceptions. When years in administration were crosstabulated with the deans' indications that they did or did not use free time for scholarship, the results were significant. However, almost one-half the cells were empty and it was not possible to draw any meaningful inference from the finding.

When years in administration were crosstabulated with the deans' perceptions that the chief academic officers expected the deans to use some free time for scholarship, the chi-square value of 11.172 with 4 degrees of freedom was significant. This information is displayed in Table 42. Although there is one cell with an observed frequency of

TABLE 40

DISTRIBUTION OF YEARS OF SERVICE AS AN
ADMINISTRATOR SUMMER 1989

<u>Years of Service As Administrator</u>	<u>Freq of Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 - 5	18	15.8
6 - 10	20	17.5
11 - 15	27	23.7
16 - 20	28	24.6
21 +	21	18.4
Totals	114	100.0

4 missing cases

TABLE 41

DISTRIBUTION OF YEARS OF SERVICE
AS A DEAN SUMMER 1989

Years of Service As Dean	Freq of Response	Percent
1 - 5	61	54.5
6 - 10	28	25.0
11 - 15	14	12.5
16 +	9	8.0
Totals	112	100.0

6 missing cases

TABLE 42

CROSSTABULATION OF DEANS' INDICATIONS THAT THE CHIEF
ACADEMIC OFFICERS EXPECT DEANS TO USE FREE TIME
FOR SCHOLARSHIP AND DEANS' YEARS OF SERVICE
IN ADMINISTRATION SUMMER 1989

Years As An Administrator	Deans' Beliefs That The CAO Expects Deans To Use <u>Free Time for Scholarship</u>		Row Total
	Yes	No	
1 - 5	7 (7.7)	7 (7.7)	14 (15.4)
6 - 10	6 (6.6)	10 (11.0)	16 (17.6)
11 - 15	9 (9.9)	12 (13.2)	21 (23.1)
16 - 20	11 (12.1)	12 (13.2)	23 (25.3)
21 +	15 (16.5)	2 (2.2)	17 (18.7)
Totals	48 (52.8)	43 (47.3)	91 (100.1)

Chi-square value equalled 11.172, 4 degrees of freedom

Significance equalled .0247

27 missing cases

Due to rounding, percentages do not total 100.0

less than five, it appeared that the deans' beliefs about the chief academic officers' expectations that the deans would use free time for scholarship were related to their years of service as an administrator.

4D) Discussion of the findings of the fourth set of research questions.

The deans' perceptions about the role of scholarship in the deanship did not seem to be related to affiliation with The Holmes Group, Carnegie Classification, size of institution, type of institutional control, number of doctoral programs, age, sex, race or years of service as an administrator or years of service as a dean.

These findings reinforced the inferences and suggestions found in the investigation, that the deans' understandings of what comprised administrative scholarship, were singularly defined.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The Problem

Despite a tacit understanding in higher education that scholarly ends motivated behaviors in the academy, a search of the literature revealed that there had been no systematic inquiry into the role or importance of scholarship in administrative offices in colleges and universities in the United States. Therefore, this study was undertaken in an attempt to obtain a baseline understanding of the beliefs and perceptions of one group of higher education administrators about this topic.

The Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of current deans of education in doctoral-granting institutions, about the role and importance of scholarship in the administration of the deanship.

Procedures

A pair of questionnaires were utilized to garner the beliefs of deans of education about the relationship between scholarship and the deanship. All respondents were requested to complete QI which was of a forced-choice or

fill-in-the-space format. QII was optional and allowed respondents the opportunity to explain their perceptions in more depth. Interviews with four deans of education also were conducted.

Data from QI were coded and subjected to analyses, primarily through the use of the CROSSTABULATIONS sub-program of SPSS-X. Data from QII were categorized whenever possible. Information from QII and the interviews was treated principally as anecdotal material and was used to enhance the qualitative dimension of the investigation.

Findings

Research Question 1--How deans define scholarship.

Most activities that deans found acceptable as evidence of decanal scholarship were in the form of traditionally accepted scholarship. In general, respondents did not believe that decanal scholarship included expectations of a systematic program of research designed to generate new knowledge. However, every activity listed on QI was endorsed by at least 38% of the respondents.

Virtually all deans believed that time considerations served to limit the scholarship agenda of any individual dean. The goal of much decanal scholarship was oriented toward staying current in the field of education and enhancing credibility as an academic leader, rather than scholarship for its own sake.

Overall, respondents believed that the chief academic officers had only limited expectations of scholarship from deans. There was a statistically significant relationship between the deans' beliefs that their chief academic officers did or did not expect them to use free time for scholarship and the number of hours per month that the deans perceived that the chief academic officers expected them to engage in scholarly activities. The deans appeared to believe that academic leadership was a more important indicator of evidence of scholarship to the chief academic officers, than to the deans themselves.

There was virtually no difference in the types of activities that the deans found acceptable as decanal scholarship and those that they found acceptable as evidence of scholarship from their assistant deans. The deans' expectations that assistant deans would use free time for scholarship were greater than the deans' perceptions that the chief academic officers expected deans to use free time for scholarship. Similarly, the deans' expectations of time for scholarship from their assistant deans were greater than the deans' perceptions about the time for scholarship that the chief academic officers expected from deans. The deans believed that their assistant deans must retain a strong identification as faculty.

In general, the deans differentiated between faculty and administrative scholarship by noting that their

definition of scholarship had broadened as a result of administrative service. They also indicated that the focus of their own scholarship had narrowed and tended to be more concerned with matters that related directly to the administration of the deanship. Knowledge of current trends and issues in the overall field of education was considered to be very important as was the ability to facilitate the performance of the faculty within the school of education.

Time was the responsible factor when individual deans decided to forego all scholarship or particular types of scholarship. The job of dean could require more than 40 hours per week and deans who wanted to remain "active" scholars had to make extra efforts to do so. A majority of the deans believed that academic leadership that encouraged faculty scholarship was a form of decanal scholarship. There was a sizable minority of deans who did not accede to this belief.

Research Question 2--Significance of scholarship in the deanship.

The use of free time was the strategy most often indicated by the deans who desired to implement particular scholarship goals. Serendipity was a significant strategy, especially for the deans who recognized that chance opportunities for scholarship might arise.

There was a statistically significant relationship between the deans who believed that they could engage in substantial scholarship and those who indicated that they utilized more time for scholarship activities. Similarly, there was a statistically significant relationship between the deans' beliefs that substantial scholarship was possible while dean and the time that deans used for scholarship after becoming dean.

There was no doubt that these deans utilized less time for scholarship as they moved into and up an administrative career path and into the deanship. The deans who gave more time to scholarship, at all stages of their higher education careers, tended to have higher expectations of time for scholarship from their assistant deans. Overall, the deans believed that a history of scholarly achievement was an important factor in the effectiveness of the deanship.

Administrative service influenced the deans' scholarship primarily through the constriction of time available for such activities. This brought about an impact upon the types of scholarship that could be pursued. It also brought about a broadening of the deans' definitions of scholarship.

There was substantial disagreement about the relationship between continued scholarship and academic leadership. The majority of respondents believed that

continued decanal scholarship played a role in the effective administration of the deanship. At the same time, most deans believed that the ability to administer the deanship skillfully was more important than continued scholarship. The deans accepted the importance given to the criterion of "strong scholarly background" during a search for a new dean.

The majority of the deans believed that decanal scholarship enhanced the performance of administrative duties. Many of these same deans also believed that it detracted from administrative performance, primarily because of the preemption of time that was required. Primary benefits of decanal scholarship that were identified included role modeling, respect, mentoring and keeping current in education. It was clear that the deans believed that administrative responsibilities had priority over the pursuit of scholarship.

Research Question 3--Role of scholarship in the evaluation of the dean's performance.

The majority of the deans did not believe that their performance evaluations included consideration of scholarship. However, they did believe that continued scholarship was important for their career growth. The deans appeared willing to see the criterion of scholarship become a more important part of their performance

evaluations. The deans who utilized the most hours per month for scholarship were most likely to support the increased importance of scholarship in the evaluation process.

Research Question 4--Variability among respondents.

Differences in perceptions of the deans included in this study could not be explained by the variables of Holmes membership, Carnegie Classification, size of institution, type of institutional control, or number of doctoral degree programs. It was found that consideration of the variables of age, sex, race, years of service as an administrator and years of service as dean, also failed to explain any of the differences in perceptions of the deans. It appeared that each dean defined decanal and administrative scholarship on a very unique and individual basis that was independent of externally described conditions.

Conclusions

This investigation was formulated as an exploratory and descriptive study to gather baseline information about the role and importance of administrative scholarship to the deans of doctoral-granting schools of education. The inquiry did not seek to identify causal relationships. However, there were inferences that could be drawn from the findings. These are discussed below.

1. The largest portion of the deans in the surveyed population wished to maintain identities as practicing scholars. Adherence to this scholar-dean model necessitated compromises in terms of what activities were identified as evidence of scholarship. It could be argued that as deans, individuals became cognizant of activities within the disciplines and sub-disciplines of education that differed from those that they had witnessed and experienced within their own faculty specializations. Because they had assumed positions that required them to evaluate the performance of faculty engaged in myriad types of activities, the deans' definitions of what comprised scholarly engagement tended to broaden.

At the same time, the respondents realized that the deanship required a host of responsibilities that demanded most, if not all the time that was available. Therefore, at the same time that the deans accepted a broader vision of the scope of scholarship, their own scholarly focus tended to narrow. The result was that decanal scholarship often centered on activities or functions that were inherent in the deanship. For the same reason, the deans took more frequent advantage of opportunities to be involved in collaborative types of scholarship activity.

As the deans both broadened their general acceptance of what was scholarship and narrowed the focus of their own scholarship interests, there was an inclination to subsume

all these activities within a modified redefinition of scholarship. In this way, the respondents were able to keep alive their notions that, even while serving as deans, they were still "scholars."

2. The deans believed that their assistant deans, even more than themselves, should retain strong identification as faculty. Possibly, this was because the assistant dean position was not considered to be a final commitment to an administrative career. For the most part, this meant that assistant deans should continue a systematic program of research and subsequent publication that gave them visibility in the school and in the literature. Some deans believed that a reputation for scholarship that was established early in an individual's higher education career, might be sufficient to insure credibility after assuming an administrative role.

3. The deans of education were in a quandary about using time for scholarship. There were three major sets of expectations that molded the individual dean's decisions about the use of this time. Faculty expectations regarding decanal scholarship ranged between two extremes. At one end were those faculty who were critical if the dean engaged in scholarship and thereby monopolized time that might have been utilized to further the more direct needs of faculty (i.e. convincing the chief academic officer to budget a greater share of the available resources for the school of

education). At the other end of the continuum, there was sometimes resentment of deans who demanded high faculty productivity, and yet failed to model such behavior. The deans perceived that the chief academic officers also had a particular set of expectations. The most salient expectations were administrative in nature. It was clear that deans who failed to function as effective leaders of their units would not be suffered, even if they were exemplary as scholars.

The third set of expectations were internal to the respondents and brought the most conflict for the deans. Because the deans almost always emerged out of faculty ranks, they shared common assumptions about the purposes and business of higher education. A fundamental belief was that universities existed in order to expedite the generation and transference of knowledge. As faculty, the respondents had engaged in behaviors and activities that had reflected such an orientation. In addition, as faculty, it was likely that they believed that the administration existed to further these purposes of higher education. It also was likely that, as faculty members, the respondents had contributed to the literature, and that this visible evidence of research and publication had weighed heavily when they were evaluated by others.

During this earlier period in their higher education careers, respondents also had become accustomed to

traditional empirical or experimental methods of investigation and analyses. Such procedures usually involved thoughtful deliberation about a problem, thorough investigation of it through some research methodology, and finally, careful discussion of the meaning of the findings.

Upon assumption of the education deanship, the deans were faced with the reality that the job of providing for the needs of the faculty and the school was full-time; therefore time for scholarship was severely limited. Scholarly productivity often necessitated the use of the deans' own free time. Their performance as dean would be judged, not by individual accomplishments, but by the overall achievements of the school. There was no longer time for the deans to engage in long-range and in-depth types of inquiry and to employ the careful and deliberative types of analyses that had brought success as faculty members. Instead, the deans were placed in positions which often required them to make quick decisions based upon incomplete information. It is possible that for deans to whom the research-scholarship-publication mold had brought intangible rewards of self-satisfaction, an inner conflict ensued in determining the proper preemption of time for scholarly pursuit.

4. In regard to the issue of continued decanal scholarship, there appeared to be three general types of responses from deans. There was a group of deans to whom

scholarly activity probably never was personally fulfilling except as it enabled them to maintain satisfactory performance as a faculty member. These deans did little or no writing after entering administration. They did, however, become involved with service and organizational work and they were wont to describe these activities as evidence of scholarship.

The second group of deans had experienced no difficulties with the scholarship requirements of faculty, but were challenged eventually by different interests that led them into administrative career paths. These deans continued to publish as well as engage in other activities. However, they were disinclined to term such efforts as scholarship.

A third type of response came from deans who believed that their position as academic leaders required that they maintain at least a semblance of scholarly activity. More importantly, they believed that scholarly activity brought balance and perspective to their administration, as well as providing them with a needed sense of personal self-satisfaction. They tended to define many types of activities as scholarly but did distinguish between "serious" research and study and other types of efforts.

5. The deans' acceptance or non-acceptance of the need to retain an identity as a practicing scholar was influenced by the particular school and institution with

which they were affiliated. The deans expressed a wide spectrum of perspectives that ranged from close or almost complete identification with the faculty model of high expectations of scholarship to almost complete separation from this faculty model.

6. As the individual left faculty ranks and ascended the administrative ladder, there was a trend for scholarly productivity to become less important, not only to the deans, but also to the higher administrative officials. In the modern university, it has become more common for the central administration to be engaged in an active role in the social and political contexts external to the institution. The deans were not immune to pressures to interface with these other constituencies. Increasingly, they are expected to engage in activities such as fund-raising for the school. It already is difficult and may become impossible for administrators in the larger, research institutions, to retain any identification as administrator-scholars.

Recommendations

This study has provided baseline information about the perceptions of deans of education of doctoral-granting institutions regarding the role of scholarship in the administration of the deanship. Analysis of the findings and conclusions of the study suggested other avenues of

inquiry which might provide additional answers, not only to the research questions that guided this investigation, but to other questions as well.

1. The present study was delimited to investigating the perceptions of deans of education. Similar studies of deans in other professional and academic schools in higher education would provide data which would help to discover any differences and/or similarities between schools.

2. Analysis of data drawn from responses to QII and the interviews revealed that there were many shades of meaning in the answers provided by the deans. For this reason, a study should be initiated in which a series of in-depth interviews are conducted, not only with the dean of education, but also with the assistant deans in the school, and possibly with the chief academic officer of each institution. Better understanding of the nuances of answers could be discovered and understood in face-to-face interviews.

3. Much of the inner conflict for current deans of education evolved from the clash between their identification as faculty and their duties as administrators. There were some deans, however, who entered higher education as administrators. A future study should use this difference in origin as a variable to be tested in regard to the deans' perceptions about the role of scholarship in higher education administration.

4. There was an indication by some deans that the missions(s) of the school and the institution impacted upon the importance and role of scholarship in the deanship. An investigation which specifically explored the relationship between these two variables would provide insight into some reasons for the heterogeneity among institutions, as well as an understanding of just how the institution's mission was internalized by administrators and then put into practice.

5. An investigation should be initiated which attempts to measure the impact that scholarship has upon the performance of administrative duties in the dean's office. Such a study would have to first define effective administration in terms of a particular set of parameters and then discover to what extent the pursuit of scholarship would be involved.

6. Some of the conflict for current deans of education developed from the differing natures of administrative work and the work of a scholar. It would be desirable to learn if there was a relationship between the qualities or skills that lead to successful administration and those that lead to success as a scholar.

LIST OF REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Anderson, D. G. & King, J. P. (1987). The dean of education: A demographic analysis. Journal of Teacher Education, 38 (5), pp. 9-12.
- Anderson, D. R., Sweeney, D. J., Williams, T. A. (1987). Statistics for business and economics, 3rd ed. New York: West Pub. Co.
- Andruskiw, O. (1981). According to Olga Andruskiw. . . . The dean as scholar: clinical competence, teaching, research and publication (Executive Development Series I., pp. 1-17). Continuing Education for Nurse Academic Administrators Project, American Association of Colleges of Nursing. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 210955).
- Baldrige, J. V., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G. P., Riley, G. L. (1977). Alternative models of governance in higher education. In J. V. Baldrige & T. E. Deal (Eds.) Governing academic organizations (pp. 2-25). Berkeley: McCutchan.
- Baldrige, J. V. (1971). Power and conflict in the university. New York: John Wiley.
- Barzun, J. (1968). The American university: How it runs where it is going. New York: Harper & Row, Pub.
- Besse, R. M. (1973). A comparison of the university with the corporation. In J. A. Perkins (Ed.), The university as an organization (pp. 107-120). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Bevan, J. M. (1967). The deanship. Liberal Education, 53, 344-356.
- Blewett, E. Y. (1954). A dean goes to heaven? AAUP Bulletin, 40, pp. 216-225.
- Bolman, F. d. (1968). The administrator as leader and statesman. In G. K. Smith (Ed.), Stress and campus response (pp. 177-184). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Pub.
- Brown, J. D. (1969). The liberal university: An institutional analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brown, R. W. (1926). Dean Briggs. New York: Harper & Brothers, Pub.

- Brubacher, J. S. & Rudy, W. (1976). Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities, 1636-1976. New York: Harper & Row, Pub.
- Buchen, I. H. (1974). The swinging monk, or the dean of the future. Intellect, 102, 497-500.
- Burch, B. G. (1989). Perceptions of the role and scholarly reputation of the education professoriate. In R. Wisniewski & E. R. Ducharme (Eds.), The professors of Teaching (pp. 87-104). New York: State Univ. of New York Press.
- Caplow, T. & McGee, R. J. (1958). The academic marketplace. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1973). Report Card on U. S. Higher Education. Intellect, 102, 4.
- Carnegie Foundation's Classifications of More than 3,300 Institutions of Higher Education (July 8, 1987). The Chronicle of Higher Education.
- Ciardi, J. (1968, March 24). Manner of speaking. To the damnation of deans (a prejudice). Saturday Review, p. 31.
- Ciardi, J. (1968, May 19). Manner of speaking. More deans, more deaneries. Saturday Review, pp. 16-17.
- Clark, D. L. (1978). Research and development productivity in educational organizations. Occasional Paper No. 41, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. Cited in H. D. Gideonse & E. A. Joseph Increasing research capacity in schools of education: A policy inquiry and dialogue, p. 16. Cincinnati: Fleuron Press.
- Cleveland, H. (1960). The dean's dilemma: leadership of equals. Public Administration Review, 20, 22-27.
- Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 1-25.
- Cohen, M.D. & March, J. G. (1974). Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Coladarci, A. (1980). Some notes on deans as individuals and the role of the dean. In D. E. Griffiths & D. J. McCarty (Eds.), The dilemma of the deanship (pp. 125-131). Danville: Interstate Printers & Pub., Inc.

- Conant, M. B. (1967). The academic dean as a subversive bureaucrat. Educational Review, 48, 276-284.
- Corson, J. J. (1960). The governance of colleges and universities. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Corson, J. J. (1975). The governance of colleges and universities: Modernizing structure and processes. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Culbertson, J. (1980). Programmatic research on the deanship: Rationale and strategy. In D. E. Griffiths & D. J. McCarty (Eds.), The dilemma of the deanship (pp. 3-20). Danville: Interstate Printers & Pub., Inc.
- Cyphert, F. R. & Zimpher, N. L. (1980). The education deanship: Who is the dean? In D. E. Griffiths & D. J. McCarty (Eds.), The dilemma of the deanship (pp. 91-122). Danville: Interstate Printers & Pub., Inc.
- Dearing, G. B. (1963). The relation of the dean to the faculty. Journal of General Education, 15, pp. 191-201.
- Deferrari, R. J. (Ed.) (1956). The problems of administration in the American college. Washington D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press.
- Dejnozka, E. L. (1978). The dean of education: A study of selected role norms. Journal of Teacher Education, 29, pp. 81-84.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods. Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co.
- Deutsch, M. E. (1952). The college from within. Berkeley: Univ. of Calif. Press.
- DeVane, W. C. (1968). The role of the dean of the college. In A. J. Dibden (Ed.), The academic deanship in American college and universities (pp. 241-252). Carbondale: Southern Ill. Univ. Press. (Reprinted from Proceedings of the American Conference of Academic Deans, 1964, 186-192).
- Dibden, A. J. (Ed.) (1968). The academic deanship in American colleges and universities. Carbondale: Southern Ill. Univ. Press.

- Diers, Donna (1981). According to Donna Diers. . . . The dean as scholar: Clinical competence, teaching, research and publication (Executive Development Series I., pp. 18 -30). Continuing Education for Nurse Academic Administrators Project, American Association of Colleges of Nursing. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 210955).
- Dill, W. R. (1980). The deanship: An unstable craft. In D. E. Griffiths & D. J. McCarty (Eds.), The dilemma of the deanship (pp. 261-284). Danville: Interstate Printers & Pub.
- Doi, J. I. (1965). Organization and administration, finance and facilities. Review of Educational Research, 35, 347-360.
- Douglas, A. (1981). [Introduction]. The dean as scholar: clinical competence, teaching, research and publication (Executive Development Series I.). Continuing Education for Nurse Academic Administrators Project, American Association of Colleges of Nursing. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 210955).
- Doyle, E. A. (1957). The function of the dean and his office. In R. J. Deferrari (Ed.), Functions of the dean of studies in higher education (pp. 3-14). Washington D.C.: The Catholic Univ. of America Press.
- Dupont, G. E. (1956). The dean and his office. In R. J. Deferrari (Ed.), The problems of administration in the American colleges (pp. 51-73). Wash. D. C.: The Catholic Univ. of Amer. Press.
- Dupont, G. E. (1957). General qualifications of the dean and his professional training. In R. J. Deferrari (Ed.). Functions of the dean of studies in higher education (pp. 15-33). Washington D. C.: The Catholic Univ. of Amer. Press.
- Duryea, E. D. (1962). The theory and practice of administration. In G. P. Burns (Ed.), Administrators in higher education: Their functions and coordination (pp. 28-44). New York: Harper & Brothers, Pub.
- Duryea, E. D. (1973). Evolution of university organization. In J. A. Perkins (Ed.), The university as an organization (pp. 15-37). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Eliot, C. W. (1926). From annual reports of Harvard College for 1869-1870. Quoted in C. F. Thwing, The college presidency, p. 47. New York: The Macmillan Co.

- Enarson, H. (1962). The academic vice-president or dean. In G. P. Burns (Ed.), Administrators in higher education: Their functions and coordination (pp. 111-124). New York: Harper & Brothers, Pub.
- Engelbert, A. F. (1957). The professor looks at the dean. The Educational Record, 38, pp. 316-319.
- Euwema, B. (1951). Some principles of university administration. The Educational Record, 32, pp. 70-80.
- Euwema, B. (1961). Academic tensions. The Educational Record, 42, pp. 187-193.
- Farmer, C. H. (1978). The faculty role in administrator evaluation. In C. F. Fisher (Ed.), Developing and evaluating administrative leadership (pp. 41-49). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Finnegan, D. F. X. (1951). The function of the academic dean in American Catholic higher education. Washington D.C.: The Catholic Univ. of Amer. Press.
- Forrest, A. L. (1951). Some objectives and principles of academic administration. Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 37, pp. 581-585.
- Fullerton, N. H. (1978). Issues in the role of dean. Journal of Teacher Education, 29(5), pp. 23-25.
- Galligan, E. L. (1960). No foul play. AAUP Bulletin, 46, pp. 369-372.
- Giacquinta, J. (1980). Organizational change in schools of education: A review of several models and an agenda of research. In D. E. Griffiths & D. J. McCarty (Eds.) The dilemma of the deanship. Danville: Interstate.
- Gideonse, H. D. & Joseph, E. A. (1984). Increasing research capacity in schools of education: A policy inquiry and dialogue. Cincinnati: Fleuron Press.
- Goetz, J. P. & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. Orlando: Academic Press, Inc.
- Goodman, P. (1962). The academic community. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goodman, P. (1962, November). For a reactionary experiment in education. Harpers, pp. 62-72.

- Gould, J. W. (1964). The academic deanship. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia Univ.
- Griffiths, D. E. & McCarty, D. J. (Eds.). (1980). The dilemma of the deanship. Danville: Interstate.
- Gross, E. & Grambsch, P. V. (1974). Changes in university organization, 1964-1971. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Haberman, M. (1972). Evaluating deans: A guide to the assessment of leadership in schools of education. Journal of Teacher Education, 23(2), pp. 126-128.
- Hamilton, T. H. (1962). The nature and scope of American higher education. In G. P. Burns, Ed., Administrators in higher education: Their functions and coordination (pp. 1-12). New York: Harper & Brothers, Pub.
- Hanzeli, V. E. (1966). The educational leadership of the academic dean: His position in the administrative triad. Journal of Higher Education, 37, 421-428.
- Hawkes, H. E. (1930). College administration. Journal of Higher Education, 1, pp. 245-253.
- Hawkes, H. E. & Hawkes, R. A. L. (1945). Through a dean's open door: A guide for students, parents and counselors. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Henderson, A. D. (1960). Policies and practices in higher education. New York: Harper & Row, Pub.
- Henderson, A. D. (1966). Higher education as a field of study in the university. In D. F. Dadson (Ed.), On higher education: Five lectures, pp. 125-142. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press.
- Henderson, A. D. & Henderson, J. G. (1974). Higher education in America. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub.
- Higgins, R. L. (1947). The functions of the academic dean. Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 33, pp. 393-399.
- Higher Education Publications, Inc. (1988). The HEP 1988 Higher Education Directory. Falls Church: Author.
- Hinckley, E. P. & Benner, K. N. (1955). The dean speaks again. Claremont: The Creative Press.
- Hodges, R. & Hodges, L. (1975). The role of the graduate dean. Educational Record, 54, 39-41.

- Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing: Author.
- Horn, F. H. (1962). The organization of colleges and universities. In G. P. Burns (Ed.), Administrators in higher education: Their functions and coordination (pp. 45-78). New York: Harper & Brothers, Pub.
- Horn, F. H. (1964). The dean and the president. Liberal Education, 50, 463-475.
- Jencks, C. & Riesman, D. (1968). The American Revolution. Garden City: Doubleday and Co.
- Johnson, E. L. (1949). Dear Dean Misanthrope: Imaginary correspondence on educational administration. Journal of Higher Education, 20, pp. 258-263.
- Joughin, L. (1963). The faculty and the dean. Liberal Education, 49, 502-512.
- Judge, H. (1982). American graduate schools of education. [A Report to the Ford Foundation].
- Kapel, D. E. & Dejnozka, E. L. (1979). The education deanship: A further analysis. Research in Higher Education, 10, pp. 99-112.
- Keenan, A. E. (1957). The dean and the president. In R. J. Deferrari (Ed.), Functions of the dean of studies in higher education (pp. 102-117). Washington D. C.: The Catholic Univ. of America Press.
- Kelley, W. F. (1957). The dean and the faculty. In R. J. Deferrari (Ed.), Functions of the dean of studies in higher education (pp. 88-101). Washington D. C.: The Catholic Univ. of America Press.
- Koch, H. C. (1968). And so you are a dean! In A. J. Diben (Ed.), The academic deanship in American colleges and universities (pp. 253-261). Carbondale: Southern Ill. Univ. Press. (Reprinted from The North Central Association Quarterly, 81, 1962, 248-252).
- Lasley, T. J. & Haberman, M. (1987). How do university administrators evaluate education deans? Journal of Teacher Education, 38(5), pp. 13-16.

- Ledbetter, P. J. (1981). According to Peggy J. Ledbetter. . . . The dean as scholar: Clinical competence, teaching, research and publication (Executive Development Series I., pp. 31-56). Continuing Education for Nurse Academic Administrators Project, American Association of Colleges of Nursing. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 210955).
- Lee, W. S. (1959). God bless our queer old dean. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Lindeman, C. A. (1981). According to Carol A. Lindeman. . . . The dean as scholar: Clinical competence, teaching, research and publication (Executive Development Series I., pp. 57-61). Continuing Education for Nurse Academic Administrators Project, American Association of Colleges of Nursing. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 210955).
- Lopez, T. R. & Balzer, D. M. (1984). Possibilities for the scholarly life in colleges of education. In D. Tavel (Ed.), Modern educational controversies (pp. 313-326). Lanham: Univ. Press of Amer.
- Lunsford, T. F. (1968). Authority and ideology in the administered university. The American Behavioral Scientist, 11(5), pp. 5-14.
- MacIntosh, A. (1948). Behind the academic curtain: A guide to getting the most out of college. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- MacPhail, J. (1981). According to Jannetta MacPhail. . . . The dean as scholar: Clinical competence, teaching, research and publication (Executive Development Series I., pp. 62-71). Continuing Education for Nurse Academic Administrators Project, American Association of Colleges of Nursing. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 210955).
- Marshall, M. S. (1956). How to be a dean. AAUP Bulletin, 42, pp. 636-643.
- Mayhew, L. B. (1968). Shared responsibility of the president and the dean. In A. J. Dibden (Ed.), The academic deanship in American colleges and universities (pp. 91-103). Carbondale: Southern Ill. Univ. Press. (Reprinted from The North Central Association Quarterly, 32, 1957, Oct., 186-192).

- McCarty, D. J. & Reyes, P. (1985). Models of institutional governance: Academic deans' decision-making patterns as evidenced by chairpersons. Chicago: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED259641).
- McCarty, D. J. & Reyes, P. (1987). Organizational models of governance: Academic deans' decision making styles. Journal of Teacher Education, 38, 2-8.
- McConnell, T. R. (1971). Faculty Government. In H. L. Hodgkinson & L. R. Meeth (Eds.), Power and authority (pp. 98-125). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub.
- McDaniel, T. R. (1978). On the dean and his office: Reflections of a department chairman. Peabody Journal of Education, 55, pp. 358-363.
- McGannon, J. B. (1973). The academic dean: Dimensions of leadership. Liberal Education, 59, 277-291.
- McGinnis, F. A. (1933). The dean and his duties. Journal of Higher Education, 4, pp. 191-196.
- McGrath, E. J. (1947). The office of the academic dean. In N. Burns (Ed.), The administration of higher institutions under changing conditions (pp. 40-49). Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- McGrath, E. J. (1959). The graduate school and the decline of liberal education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia Univ.
- McGrath, E. J. (1964). [Foreward]. In J. W. Gould, The academic deanship. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia Univ.
- McVey, F. L. & Hughes, R. M. (1952). Problems of college and university administration. Ames: The Iowa State College Press.
- Meeth, L. R. (1971). Administration and leadership. In H. L. Hodgkinson & L. R. Meeth (Eds.), Power and authority (pp. 39-53). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub.
- Mertz, N. (1989). Personal Conversation.
- Miller, R. I. (1974). The academic dean. Intellect, 102, 213-234.

- Millett, J. D. (1962). The academic community: An essay on organization. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Milner, C. A. (1936). The dean of the small college. Boston: The Christopher Pub. House.
- Mobberley, D. G. & Wicke, M. F. (1962). The deanship of the liberal arts college. Nashville: Board of Education, The Methodist Church.
- Mollenberg, W. P. (1976). The hazards of academic administration. Intellect, 104, pp. 375-378.
- Mooney, C. J. (April 5, 1989). Many scholars face identity crisis when they become top administrators--and some weather the change. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 13-14.
- Morris, V. C. (1981). Deaning: Middle management in academe. Urbana: Univ. of Ill. Press.
- Morsink, C. (1987). Critical functions of the educational administrator: perceptions of chairpersons and deans. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(5), pp. 23-27.
- Ness, F. W. (1971). An uncertain glory. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub.
- Nichols, R. F. (1959). The ambiguous position of the graduate school dean. Journal of Higher Education, 30, pp. 123-127.
- Nie, N. H. (Ed.). (1975). SPSS. Statistical package for the social sciences, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Parsons, T. & Platt, G. M. (1973). The American university. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Pellino, G. R., Blackburn, R. T. & Boberg, A. L. (1984). The dimensions of academic scholarship: Faculty and administrator views. Research in Higher Education, 20, 103-115.
- Perkins, J. A. (1973). Missions and organization: A redefinition. In J. A. Perkins (Ed.), The university as an organization (pp. 247-260). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Perkins, J. A. (1973). Organization and functions of the university. In J. A. Perkins (Ed.), The university as an organization (pp. 3-14). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Peterson's guide to graduate and professional programs: An overview 1989. (1989). Princeton: Peterson's Guide.

Peterson's guide to graduate programs in business, education, health, & law 1989. (1989). Princeton: Peterson's Guides.

Randall, O. E. (1934). The dean's window: A portrayal of college life and activity as seen from the dean's office. Boston: The Stratford Co., Pub.

The Random House dictionary of the English language (1967). New York: Random House.

Rasmussen, G. R. (1978). Evaluating the academic dean. In C. F. Fisher (Ed.), Developing and evaluating administrative leadership (pp. 23-40). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reeves, R. W. & Russell, J. D. (1929). College organization and administration: A report based upon a series of surveys of church colleges. Indianapolis: board of Education, Disciples of Christ.

Reeves, R. W., Russell, J. D., Gregg, H. C., Brumbaugh, A. J. & Blauch, L. E. (1932). The liberal arts college. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press.

Riesman, D. (1958). Constraint and variety in American education. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Robb, F. C. (1962). [Forward]. In D. G. Mobberley & M. F. Wicke, The deanship of the liberal arts college. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rosenheim, E. (1963). Letter to a new dean. AAUP Bulletin, 49, pp. 226-231.

Rourke, F. E. & Brooks, G. E. (1964). The managerial revolution in higher education. Administrative Science Quarterly, 9, pp. 154-181.

Rudolph, F. (1968). The American college and university: A history. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Rusche, P. J. (1984). Colleges of education: A question of viability. In D. Tavel (Ed.), Modern educational controversies (pp. 327-336). Lanham: Univ. Press of America.

- Ryan, D. W. (1980). Deans as individuals-in-organizations. In D. E. Griffiths and D. J. McCarty (Eds.), The dilemma of the deanship, pp. 133-176. Danville: Interstate.
- Salmen, S. (1971). Duties of administrators in higher education. New York: MacMillan Co.
- Schuster, Jack H. (1986). The faculty dilemma: A short course. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 275-282.
- Schwebel, M. (1985). The clash of cultures in academe: The university and the education faculty. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(4), pp. 2-7.
- Schwebel, M. (1989). The new priorities and the education faculty. In R. Wisniewski & E. R. Ducharme (Eds.), The professors of teaching. New York: State Univ. of New York Press.
- Selznick, P. (1957). Leadership in administration: A sociological interpretation. New York: Harper & Row.
- Silber, J. (1988). Should college presidents be educators? In J. L. Fisher & M. W. Tack (Eds.), Leaders on leadership: The college presidency (pp. 13-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub.
- Silver, P. F. (1980). Strategies for implementing inter-institutional research programs. In D. E. Griffiths & D. J. McCarty (Eds.), The dilemma of the deanship (pp. 45-64). Danville: Interstate Printers & Pub.
- Singleton, G. G. (1955). The college or university dean (2nd ed.). Waco: Baylor University.
- Smart, J. C. & McLaughlin, G. W (1985). Administrative service and research performance: A study of chemistry department heads. Research in Higher Education, 22, 31-42.
- Stark, J. S., Lowther, M. A. & Hagerty, B. M. K. (1987). Faculty and administrator views of influences on professional programs. Research in Higher Education, 27, 63-83.
- Stinnett, Roy (1989). Personal conversation.
- Stroup, H. (1966). Bureaucracy in higher education. New York: Free Press.

- ten Hoor, M. (1959). Personnel problems in academic administration. Liberal Education, 45, pp. 405-423.
- Thwing, C. F. (1926). The college presidency. New York: Macmillan Co.
- Veysey, L. R. (1965). The emergence of the American university. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Ward, M. S. (1934). Philosophies of administration current in the deanship of the liberal arts college. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Weld, W. E. & Sewny, K. W. (1958). Herbert E. Hawkes. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- Whaley, W. G. (1968). The graduate dean (editorial). In A. J. Dibden (Ed.), The academic deanship in American colleges and universities (pp. 79-87). Carbondale: Southern Ill. Univ. Press. (Reprinted from Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities, 1965, 4-10).
- White, G. C. (1957). The education of the administrator. Nashville: Board of Education, The Methodist Church.
- Wisniewski, R. (1986). The ideal professor of education. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 288-292.
- Wisniewski, R. (1989). The ideal professor of education. In R. Wisniewski & E. R. Ducharme (Eds.), The Professors of Teaching (pp. 134-146). New York: State Univ. of New York.
- Wisniewski, R. (1984). The scholarly ethos in schools of education. Journal of Teacher Education, 35, 2-8.
- Wisniewski, R. & Ducharme, E. R. (1989). Where we stand. In R. Wisniewski & E. R. Ducharme (Eds.), The Professors of Teaching (pp. 147-162). New York: State Univ. of New York Press.
- Wisniewski, R. & Ducharme, E. R. (1989). Why study the education professoriate? An introduction. In R. Wisniewski & E. R. Ducharme (Eds.), The Professors of Teaching (pp. 1-10). New York: State Univ. of New York Press.

Witmer, D. R. (1969). The rise of administration in higher education. Madison: Board of Regents of State Universities.

Wolotkiewicz, R. J. (1980). College administrator's handbook. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Woodburne, L. S. (1950). Faculty personnel policies in higher education. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Woodburne, L. S. (1958). Principles of college and university administration. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.

Wriston, H. M. (1955). The college presidency in retrospect: Reflections of a college president. Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 41, pp. 504-518.

Wriston, H. M. (1959). Academic procession: Reflections of a college president. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PRELIMINARY DRAFTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES

QUESTIONNAIRE I

The following activities may be considered as evidence of scholarship. Please indicate with an "X," those you would accept as evidence of scholarship from your Assistant or Associate Deans (Asst), yourself (Self), and those you perceive that the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) expects from you. Please place an "X" under each person to whom the activity is applicable.

Expectations of:

<u>Asst</u>	<u>Self</u>	<u>CAO</u>	<u>Activity</u>
_____	_____	_____	Publish in refereed journal (1)
_____	_____	_____	Publish in non-refereed journal (2)
_____	_____	_____	Serve on editorial board of journal (3)
_____	_____	_____	Review proposals for funding agency (4)
_____	_____	_____	Review articles for professional journal (5)
_____	_____	_____	Present faculty/student colloquium (7)
_____	_____	_____	Publish or edit book or monograph (8)
_____	_____	_____	Publish book review (9)
_____	_____	_____	Present paper at professional meeting (10)
_____	_____	_____	Design research to gain new knowledge (11)
_____	_____	_____	Consult, using results of scholarship (12)
_____	_____	_____	Develop new process for use in School (13)
_____	_____	_____	Speak to local organizations, using results of scholarship (14)
_____	_____	_____	Library research (15)
_____	_____	_____	Develop new pedagogical techniques (16)
_____	_____	_____	Academic leadership that results in faculty scholarly productivity (17)
_____	_____	_____	Other (please specify) (18)

In terms of your expectations regarding evidence of scholarship from administrators, please indicate which 5 of the above activities are most significant (use numbers that follow the activity). _____

In terms of the expectations of your institution regarding evidence of scholarship from administrators, please indicate which 5 of the above activities are most significant. _____

Please indicate whether you tend to agree (Ag) or tend to disagree (Dis) with the following statements.

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1) The pursuit of scholarship enhances the performance of my administrative duties. | Ag Dis |
| 2) The pursuit of scholarship detracts from the performance of my administrative duties. | Ag Dis |
| 3) The best Deans exhibited strong scholarship, prior to the Deanship. | Ag Dis |
| 4) The best Deans exhibit continued scholarship, after becoming Dean. | Ag Dis |
| 5) I have adequate time for scholarship. | Ag Dis |
| 6) If there were one extra day each week, I would use most of the time for scholarship. | Ag Dis |
| 7) If I were given a Sabbatical, I would use most of the time for scholarship. | Ag Dis |
| 8) I am looking for ways to diminish the time required for administrative duties, in order to have more time for scholarship. | Ag Dis |
| 9) There is a strong relationship between my career growth and my continued scholarship. | Ag Dis |
| 10) There is a strong relationship between my future salary increases and my continued scholarship. | Ag Dis |
| 11) There is a direct relationship between my evaluation and my continued scholarship. | Ag Dis |
| 12) There should be a direct relationship between my evaluation and my continued scholarship. | Ag Dis |
| 13) My institution should give high consideration to a candidate's scholarship, when selecting a Dean of Education. | Ag Dis |
| 15) My institution gives high consideration to a candidate's scholarship, when selecting a Dean of Education. | Ag Dis |
| 16) I plan to remain in an administrative position for the remainder of my academic career. | Ag Dis |

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 17) There is a direct relationship between a Dean's continued scholarship and the Dean's leadership effectiveness. | Ag Dis |
| 18) Most Deanships are filled by those who have exhibited past scholarship. | Ag Dis |
| 19) There are ways that I can diminish the time required for administrative duties. | Ag Dis |
| 20) A Dean can be an effective leader without exhibiting any continued scholarship. | Ag Dis |
| 21) It is possible to engage in substantial scholarship while serving as Dean. | Ag Dis |
| 22) My definition of scholarship has been affected by my service as Dean. | Ag Dis |
| 23) There is no possibility that I can diminish the time required to perform my administrative duties. | Ag Dis |
| 24) Deans with strong management skills are better leaders than those with strong scholarly backgrounds. | Ag Dis |
| 25) My own scholarly background contributes greatly to my leadership effectiveness as a Dean. | Ag Dis |
| 26) Deans who successfully motivate their faculty to pursue scholarly activities, are practicing scholars. | Ag Dis |

Which of the following strategies do you utilize in order to operationalize your scholarship goals?

- _____ Set a definite scholarship agenda
- _____ Keep a particular time of the day, or day of the week, free from interaction with others
- _____ Delegate routine administrative duties to others
- _____ Set time limit for meetings
- _____ Restrict number of meetings per week or month, etc.
- _____ Restrict official evening responsibilities
- _____ Decentralize decision-making
- _____ Pursue scholarship on my own time
- _____ Keep a superb administrative assistant
- _____ Other (please specify)
- _____

Please list 3 current Deans of Education in doctoral-granting institutions, whom you believe are keenly interested in the relationship between scholarship and administration in Schools and Colleges of Education. You may include your name as one of the 3.

Name

Institution

Number of Assistant or Associate Deans in your School of Education _____. Number of Chairpersons _____.

Does your School or College offer a specialization in the administration of higher education? _____

Indicate in which type of unit, courses in higher education administration are offered:

- _____ Center of higher education
- _____ Department of higher education
- _____ Department of educational administration
- _____ Other (please specify)

Please circle the appropriate category. I am:

- 1) Female Male
- 2) Cauc. Amer. Indian Black Hispanic Asian Other
- 3) Tenured Untenured
- 4) Appointed Dean Acting Dean

What is your major area(s) of academic specialization? _____

How much time should your Assistant or Associate Deans devote to scholarship?

- _____ Less than 10 hrs/month
- _____ 10-25 hrs/month
- _____ 25-40 hrs/month
- _____ More than 40 hrs/month

How much time does the Chief Academic Officer expect you to devote to scholarship?

- _____ Less than 10 hrs/month
- _____ 10-25 hrs/month
- _____ 25-40 hrs/month
- _____ More than 40 hrs/month

Please indicate the average hours/month that you engaged in scholarly activities:

- 1) Before you became an academic administrator_____
- 2) After you became an administrator, but before you became a Dean_____
- 3) After you became Dean_____

Do you expect your Assistant or Associate Deans to devote time away from the university to scholarship?_____

Do you devote time away from the university to scholarship?_____

Does the Chief Academic Officer expect you to devote time away from the university to scholarship?_____

QUESTIONNAIRE II

Because the focus of this study is upon your perceptions and beliefs, it is necessary to seek some information through open-ended questions. I do appreciate the time required to respond. If you prefer, feel free to use other paper for these responses.

1) When you think of scholarship, how do you define the term? Is there a difference between what you expect from faculty and administrators in terms of scholarship? If so, what is the difference?

2) What activities are on your scholarly agenda? How many days/month will each activity require? What steps do you take to operationalize these scholarship goals?

3) In what ways are these scholarly activities different from those you pursued before you became a Dean?

4) In what ways does the pursuit of scholarly activities enhance your administrative responsibilities?

5) In what ways does the pursuit of scholarly activities detract from your administrative responsibilities?

6) To what extent should scholarship be considered when the Dean is evaluated?

7) Is it possible to be an academic leader without continuing the practice of scholarship? Why or why not?

8) Please indicate any topic not raised in the questionnaire that you believe should be considered when examining the relationship between scholarship and the Deanship?

APPENDIX B

FINAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

QUESTIONNAIRE -- FORM I

All respondents are requested to complete this part of the survey.

I. The following activities are suggested as **possible** evidence of scholarship. Please indicate with an "X," those you would accept as evidence of scholarship from your Assistant or Associate Deans (Asst), those you accept from yourself (Self), and those you perceive that the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) (or other immediate administrative superior) expects from you. Please place an "X" under each person to whom the activity is applicable.

Expectations of:

<u>Asst</u>	<u>Self</u>	<u>CAO</u>	<u>Activity</u>
___	___	___	Publish in refereed journal (1)
___	___	___	Publish in non-refereed journal (2)
___	___	___	Serve on editorial board of journal (3)
___	___	___	Review proposals for funding agency (4)
___	___	___	Review articles for professional journal (5)
___	___	___	Academic leadership that creates an environment conducive to faculty scholarship (6)
___	___	___	Participate in faculty/student colloquium (7)
___	___	___	Publish or edit book or monograph (8)
___	___	___	Publish book review (9)
___	___	___	Present paper at professional meeting (10)
___	___	___	Serve on an accreditation team (11)
___	___	___	Design research to gain new knowledge (12)
___	___	___	Consult, using results of scholarship (13)
___	___	___	Read to stay current (14)
___	___	___	Develop new process for use in School (15)
___	___	___	Speak to local organizations, using results of scholarship (16)
___	___	___	Library research (17)
___	___	___	Develop new pedagogical techniques (18)
___	___	___	Other (please specify) _____ (19)
___	___	___	_____ (20)

In terms of your expectations regarding evidence of scholarship from administrators, please indicate which 5 of the above activities are most acceptable (use numbers that follow the activity). _____

II. Please indicate whether you : Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), or Strongly Disagree (SD) with the following statements. All statements are in particular reference to Deans of Education in doctoral-granting institutions.

- | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|----|
| 1) The pursuit of scholarship enhances the performance of my administrative duties. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 2) The pursuit of scholarship detracts from the performance of my administrative duties. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 3) The most effective Deans exhibited strong scholarship, prior to becoming Dean. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 4) The most effective Deans exhibit continued scholarship, after becoming Dean. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 5) I have adequate time for scholarship. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 6) If I were given a Sabbatical, I would use most of the time for scholarship. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 7) There are ways that I can diminish the time required for administrative duties. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 8) There is a strong relationship between my career growth and my continued scholarship. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 9) There is a strong relationship between my future salary increases and my ongoing scholarship. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 10) There is a direct relationship between my performance evaluation and my scholarship. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 11) There should be a direct relationship between my performance evaluation and my scholarship. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 12) My institution gives high consideration to a candidate's scholarship, when selecting a Dean of Education. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 13) My institution should give high consideration to a candidate's scholarship, when selecting a Dean of Education. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 14) There is a direct relationship between the Dean's continued scholarship and the Dean's effectiveness as an academic leader. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 15) Most Deanships are filled by those who have exhibited past scholarship. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 16) I have narrowed the focus of my scholarship since becoming Dean. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 17) A Dean can be an effective leader without exhibiting any continued scholarship. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 18) It is possible to engage in substantial scholarship while serving as Dean. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 19) My definition of scholarship has been affected by my service as Dean. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 20) It is more important for the Dean to have excellent administrative skills than to continue active scholarship. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 21) My own scholarly background contributes greatly to my effectiveness as Dean. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 22) Deans who successfully motivate their faculty to pursue scholarly activities, are scholars. | SA | A | D | SD |

III. Which of the following strategies do you utilize in order to implement your scholarship goals?

- ☐ Set a definite scholarship agenda
- ☐ Keep a particular time of the day, or day of the week, free from interaction with others
- ☐ Delegate routine administrative duties to others
- ☐ Set time limit for meetings
- ☐ Restrict number of meetings per day or week.
- ☐ Restrict official evening responsibilities
- ☐ Decentralize decision-making
- ☐ Pursue scholarship on my own time
- ☐ Keep a superb administrative assistant
- ☐ Shift focus of scholarship to issues in administration or higher education
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Number of Assistant or Associate Deans in your School or College of Education _____

How much time do you expect your Assistant or Associate Deans to devote to scholarship?

- ☐ Less than 10 hours/month
- ☐ 10 - 25 hours/month
- ☐ 25 - 40 hours/month
- ☐ More than 40 hours/month

In order to meet the expectations of the Chief Academic Officer (or other immediate administrative superior), what do you estimate to be the amount of time you should devote to scholarship?

- ☐ Less than 10 hours/month
- ☐ 10 - 25 hours/month
- ☐ 25 - 40 hours/month
- ☐ More than 40 hours/month

Please estimate the average hours/month that you engaged in scholarly activities:

- 1) Before you became an academic administrator _____
- 2) After you became an administrator, but before you became Dean _____
- 3) After you became Dean _____

Do you expect your Assistant or Associate Deans to devote free time to scholarship? _____

Do you devote free time to scholarship? _____

Does the Chief Academic Officer expect you to devote free time to scholarship? _____

Please indicate any topic(s) not raised in the questionnaire that you believe should be considered when examining the relationship between scholarship and the Deanship.

Please circle the appropriate category. I am:

- 1) Female Male
- 2) Caucasian Native Amer. African Amer. Hispanic Asian Other
- 3) Dean Acting or Interim Dean

What is your major areas(s) of academic specialization? _____

What is your age? _____

How many years have you served in administration, including years as Dean? _____

How many total years have you served as Dean at this and other institutions? _____

Please list 3 current Deans of Education in doctoral-granting institutions, whom you believe have substantial interest in the relationship between scholarship and administration in Schools and Colleges of Education. You may include your name as one of the 3. (This information will be used to construct a list of names for possible interviews).

- | Name | Institution |
|------|-------------|
| 1) | |
| 2) | |
| 3) | |

Please read and sign this statement: I hereby acknowledge that my completion of this survey signifies my informed consent to participate in this research project. I am assured anonymity. Data reported as a result of this survey will be presented only in aggregate form, and no attempt will be made to associate data provided with the institutions providing said data.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Institution: _____

Thank you for your cooperation in this research activity.

Please return this questionnaire to:

Janet S. Chopra
UTK/UTC Graduate Center
105 Hunter Hall
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37403

QUESTIONNAIRE -- FORM II

These questions, which allow for open-ended answers, are an optional part of the survey. Because the focus of this study is upon your perceptions and beliefs, it is useful to obtain a deeper understanding of your unique point of view on the research questions addressed in Form I of the questionnaire. If you have nothing further to add to the answers provided in Form I, thank you for your participation in this study.

If you can allow the time, your efforts to answer any or all of the following questions in a short essay format, will be appreciated. You may use this form, or other paper.

1) When you think of scholarship, is there a difference between what you expect from a faculty member and what you expect from an administrator? If so, what is the difference?

2) What activities are on your scholarly agenda? How many days/month do you estimate that each activity will require? What steps do you take to implement these scholarship goals?

3) In what ways are these scholarly activities different from those you pursued before you became a Dean?

4) In what ways does the pursuit of scholarly activities enhance your administrative responsibilities?

5) In what ways does the pursuit of scholarly activities detract from your administrative responsibilities?

6) To what extent should scholarship be considered when the Dean is evaluated?

7) Is it possible to be an academic leader without continuing the practice of scholarship? Why or why not?

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS PROTOCOL

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS PROTOCOL

I. Definition of scholarship

- A. What activities do you define as scholarly?
- B. Would your definition of scholarship find wide acceptance among other administrators in Education? In other fields?
- C. Was your definition of scholarship modified as you moved up into administration?
- D. How has the primary focus of your scholarship interests been affected by your assumption of the Deanship?
- E. Does academic leadership that nurtures faculty scholarship, qualify as evidence of scholarship?

II. Relationship of the Deanship and scholarship.

- A. Do most individuals who become candidates for Deans of Schools and Colleges of Education have strong scholarly backgrounds?
- B. Do most who are selected for Deanships have strong scholarly backgrounds?
- C. Is there a relationship between the academic orientation of Deans, and their administrative expectations of scholarship?
- D. What types of research or scholarly activities are pursued by Deans in Schools or Colleges of Education?
- E. How do you implement your scholarship goals?
- F. Does continuing scholarship inhibit or enhance the performance of administrative duties by Deans?
- G. Does administrative experience as a Dean enhance an individual's scholarly capabilities?
- H. Is it necessary to curtail scholarly engagement in order to achieve the management responsibilities of the Deanship?

III. Evaluation and scholarship

- A. Does the current administrative evaluation process at your School include consideration of scholarship?
- B. Should evidence of scholarship be part of the Dean's evaluation?

APPENDIX D

INITIAL MAILING COVER LETTER

May 10, 1989

Governance of the modern university increasingly demands skillful administration. At the same time, the most acceptable administrators continue to derive from the ranks of scholars and teachers. The identity crisis that often results when individuals shift from faculty to administrator status was the focus of a recent article in The Chronicle of Higher Education (April 5, 1989, p. 13). A frequent regret was the supposed inability to continue active scholarship. Scholarship is a fundamental philosophical underpinning of higher education, and its relationship to the professoriate has been argued vigorously in the literature. There has not been a similar examination of the relationship of scholarship to administration.

The specific purpose of our study is to investigate the perceptions of Deans of Education in doctoral-granting institutions in the United States, about the role and importance of scholarship in their administrative careers. All respondents are requested to complete Form I of the questionnaire which should require only about 15-20 minutes to complete. Form II of the questionnaire is optional. It requests short essay responses to the underlying research questions. If you can take the time to complete any or all of Form II, it will provide an opportunity to gain a deeper understanding and explanation of your perceptions.

All information provided will be held in strictest confidence, and findings will be reported only in aggregate form. The questionnaire is coded with the institution's FICE number for follow-up purposes and will not be recorded after receipt of your questionnaire.

We believe your involvement in this research is important and thank you for considering our request to participate. We hope to receive your completed questionnaire no later than June 1, 1989. Since the findings of this research should be of interest to Deans of Education, we will forward a summary of the findings to you upon completion.

Sincerely,

Dan R. Quarles
Associate Prof. & Director

Janet S. Chopra
Researcher

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW UP POSTCARD

REMINDER! About three weeks ago you received a questionnaire requesting your opinions about the role and importance of scholarship in the office of the Dean of Education.

Your response has not been received. We hope you will choose to participate in this research so that the findings will be as meaningful as possible. If you require another copy of the questionnaire, it will be forwarded upon request. Thank you for your assistance.

Dr. Dan Quarles
Director, UTK/UTC Graduate Center
105 Hunter Hall
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37403
(615) 755-4113

Janet S. Chopra
Researcher

APPENDIX F

SECOND MAILING COVER LETTER

June 29, 1989

Dr. Dan Quarles and I are engaged in an examination of the relationship between continued scholarship and administration in higher education. An article in the April 5, 1989 The Chronicle of Higher Education highlighted the significance of this topic--especially for individuals who have shifted from faculty to administrative roles in colleges and universities.

About five weeks ago we mailed a questionnaire requesting your opinions about the role and importance of scholarship in the office of the Dean of Education. Your response has not been received. We hope you will agree to participate in this research so that the findings will be as meaningful as possible. Since the results of this research should be of interest to all Deans (or Chairpersons) of Schools and Colleges of Education, we will forward a summary to you upon completion.

Thank you for your assistance in this research. Please note that all respondents are requested to complete Form I of the questionnaire. Form II is optional. All information provided will be held in strictest confidence and findings will be reported only in aggregate form. We hope to receive your completed questionnaire by July 14, 1989.

Sincerely,

Janet S. Chopra
UTK/UTC Graduate Center
105 Hunter Hall
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37403
(615) 755-4113

APPENDIX G

DISTRIBUTION OF MAJOR AREA(S) OF SPECIALIZATION
OF RESPONDENTS

MAJOR AREA(S) OF SPECIALIZATIONS OF RESPONDENTS

<u>Specialization</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Educational Administration	30
Curriculum and Instruction	18
Educational Psychology	13
Teacher Education	12
Elementary Education	6
Special Education	6
Higher Education	5
Measurement	5
Counseling	4
Social Studies Education	4
Educational Policy	3
Evaluation of Education	3
History	3
Psychometrics-Cognitive Science	3
Statistics	3
Clinical Psychology	2
Educational Reform	2
Educational Sociology	2
Industrial Education	2
Instructional Techniques and Design	2
Math Education	2
Philosophy	2
Black Women's Education	1
Communication Arts	1
Comparative Education	1
Early Childhood Education	1
Economics Education	1
Educational History	1
Effective Teaching	1
English Education	1
Health Education	1
Kinesiology	1
Language Arts Education	1
Law	1
Linguistics	1
Literacy	1
Methodology	1
Music Education	1
Physical Education	1
Reading	1
Secondary Education	1
Sports Psychology	1
Test Validity	1
Women's Careers	1

Some deans indicated more than one area of specialization. Therefore, the total is more than 118.

VITA

Janet Sue Chopra, daughter of Merle S. and Darline C. Neagle was born November 1, 1945 in Wichita, Kansas. She graduated from Wichita High School South in June, 1963.

In September, 1963, she entered Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas. In June, 1967, she received a Bachelor of Arts degree with majors in English and Speech and Drama. She entered the University of Washington, Seattle, Washington in September, 1967 and received the Master of Arts degree in English in January, 1969.

She taught Speech and Drama at Newman College in Wichita, Kansas and then English at Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas from 1969 - 1970. She was involved in the real estate business from 1972 - 1986 in Downers Grove, Illinois. She has taught English and Speech at the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga, Tennessee on a part-time basis.

She entered the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee in September, 1986. In May, 1990, she received the Doctor of Education degree; her major was Educational Administration and Supervision.