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This is a descriptive study of factors that influenced search committees to recommend a candidate as president of a higher education institution. Forty-eight chairpersons of search committees recommending a president between June 1, 1990, and May 31, 1991, comprised the population for the research.

Chairpersons were asked, by means of a written survey, to indicate why their committee selected the individual to nominate as president as opposed to other finalists. Each chairperson classified one's response as being in one of the following categories: personal, performance, participation, or friendship.

The repeated measurement test was utilized to determine if a significant factor existed that influenced the selection of a president. All four categories influenced the selection of a nominee.

A Fisher least significant difference was computed to determine the degree to which each category influenced the selection of the candidate. Performance qualities were the greatest influence on the selection of a president.
Personal, participation, and friendship were the second, third, and fourth factors respectively.

One-way analysis of variance was used to determine if a difference existed related to factor scores by state, private, or church related institutions of higher education. No significant difference existed for the personal, performance, and participation factors.

However, a difference existed within the friendship factor. Church related institutions were influenced significantly by friendship. There was no significant difference for state or private schools related to the friendship factor.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introductory Statement

Presidents of higher education institutions, long viewed as molders of the school, today find themselves in a demanding, changing, often stressful environment. Scores of higher education institutions will annually search for the perfect president that will move their particular school forward. When a vacancy occurs an urgent priority must be given to selecting the best president to give leadership to the school.

Even until after the American Revolution it was the standard, but unwritten policy of many colleges and universities to entrust all leadership responsibilities to the consensus of the president and a few key instructors. Members of governing boards, during this era, had other things to do which led to the delegating of large powers to the president, whom they had appointed (Trow, p. 20, 1984).

The position of president can be found vacant in at least ten percent or more of the universities and colleges in North America annually. In the past, presidents in higher education tended to be quite immobile, staying in their jobs for years, as opposed to faculty members who would change frequently. It can now be demonstrated that
the reverse is true. Among the reasons which account for this dramatic change are the following: end of the big boom of higher education, limited resources for growth, less research money, greater competition for students, major conflicts and confusion over goals, and a shortage of well trained administrators (Richman, p. 234, 1974).

Background

In 1935, Greenleaf conducted a study that revealed a turnover rate of approximately eight percent among presidents of higher education institutions (Greenleaf, pp. 61-62, 1936). In 1940, R. M. Hughes conducted a study of three hundred college and university presidents, and reported the average length of office was nine years and the annual turnover was approximately ten percent of those studied (Hughes, p. 2, 1940). William Selden in 1960 found the average presidential tenure for the past 60 years, excluding presidents who are currently serving, to be 10.3 years. The average tenure for those currently in office was 8.1 years (Selden, p. 1, 1960). Kauffman observed from his study of the presidential turnover rate in 1977 that vacancies were occurring at the rate of thirteen percent per year (Kauffman, p. 16, 1980).

Approximately 5,000 persons will have served as university and college presidents in the 1980's and a similar number in the 1990's. These 10,000 presidents will have been chosen from an estimated 50,000 persons who were
considered for the position in each of those two decades. These people either nominated themselves or were nominated by others. Their selection took place or will take place in the midst of intense interest trustees, faculty members, alumni, students, and by the news media. No other personnel selection will draw such attention. Most of the presidents at the start of the decade will have departed by the end of that decade due to age, their own choice, or the choice of others. Three generations of presidents will have passed between 1980 and the year 2000 (Kerr, p. 3, 1986).

The 10,000 people who will serve as presidents from 1980 to 2000 will be enormously diverse in their abilities, their characters, their motivations, and their personalities. Some will appear to be as Moses leading the people out of the wilderness; some Mr. Chips, loved by all; some Mark Hopkins the great friend and teacher sitting on one end of the log with the student on the other; some masters of maneuvering; and some like Dr. Strangelove, using fresh knowledge to create a new world or no world at all. Nearly all of these will reflect some aspects of two or more of the afore mentioned models. These presidents will have been chosen to serve many purposes. The universal characteristic is their diversity. In their diversity they will contribute to keeping the world of American higher education safe and challenging (Kerr, p. 4, 1986).
Bensimon suggests that more than 300 new college and university presidents will take office annually. The exit of the incumbent president and the entrance of the new one is a major organizational event for the institution of higher learning (Bensimon, p. 1, 1987).

The vacancies that occur in presidential positions happen for various reasons. Among the reasons given for termination are retirement, illness, resignation, and dismissal. The latter two reasons appear to be the main cause for an increasing yearly toll on college presidents (Stoke, p. 2, 1959).

In 1990, one resignation was the result of a 15 month battle with two faculty critics who charged that the president had deliberately misrepresented his academic credentials (Monaghan, pp. A16-A17, 1990). Another resignation in 1990 occurred when a settlement was reached with the president and the board of trustees. In exchange for the president's resignation, the board dropped charges of misconduct against him and offered him a $150,000 settlement. The charges included using college expense accounts to make political contributions, and verbally abusing trustees and employees (Blum, p. A20, 1990).

Because of the vast number of unfilled university and college presidencies some institutions have appointed individuals with unproven records in higher education administration. Conversely, top scholars with at least some
administrative experience may prove to be a better choice. A proven leader from the government or a profession like law or medicine could also serve as a wise choice providing the individual's attitudes, values, interests, and expertise fit those of the university (Richman, p. 237, 1974).

Expectations and requirements will vary by institution. One school may want the president to be the key educational leader, as well as a fund raiser, a scholar, and a community relations expert (Fischer, p. 1, 1988). Another university expects the president to be a manager (Muller, p. 27, 1988). For another, a college president is supposed to be an academian who is required to be a developer and one who is at ease with business and political leaders. He must be a good manager, capable of balancing the budget, and able to raise money (Kuninggim, p. 3, 1985).

The president is the leader of an academic enterprise but also is the chief executive of a multi-million dollar complex organization. As the principal manager, the president is responsible for issues related to finance, physical plant, energy conservation, complex legal questions, labor relations, purchasing, philanthropy, and regulating the academic environment (Pruitt, p. 33, 1988). Colleges and universities demand many qualities in presidents that are essential in the effective management of the enterprise. Expectations will range from the ability to lead people, balance the budget and the capacity to make
five speeches in two days and remain unruffled (Daughdrill, p. 81, 1988).

There is good reason to believe that presidential leadership is a function of personal qualities and role behavior in their respective interactions with situational demands or characteristics. Different personal qualities may come into play as academic leaders are identified, chosen, observed, and evaluated in terms of their effectiveness (Fincher, p. 1, 1987).

American higher education faces an increasingly demanding future as one sees the urgency for better leadership becoming more evident. The goals for universities may be reached if true leaders can be identified, inducted, and induced to remain on the job long enough to achieve them (Fretwell, p. 60, 1988).

Studies have been conducted to investigate qualities and characteristics of existing presidents. Findings vary related to the description of presidents. Whether the president is being successful or ineffective, there exists a common factor; they were selected for their respected position.

With the increasing number of vacancies occurring each year, it is important that the selection committee make the correct choice when recommending the new president. In attempting to reach a decision regarding a presidential
candidate, selection committees can learn from recent search committees the qualities desired in a president.

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed in this study involved factors associated with a selection committee decision to recommend a person(s) for college president.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study were:

1. To assess the factors associated with search committees' decisions to employ a new president.

2. To determine if a difference existed in the factors associated with search committees' decisions to employ a new president between a state, private, or church supported college.

Hypotheses

1. It was an hypothesis of this study that there would be a significant factor that influenced the selection of an individual who was recommended as president.

2. It was an hypothesis of this study that there would be a significant difference in factors that influenced the selection of presidents in a state, private, or a church supported institution of higher education.
Significance of Study

Books and articles have been written and research conducted attempting to describe individuals who are serving as presidents of higher education institutions. Such efforts involve personal qualifications, educational background, and previous experience. Leadership styles and characteristics have been considered in several exhaustive studies.

Adequate resource material is available relating to the president's role in governance. Researchers identified the need for the president to effectively relate to the trustees, faculty, student body, and alumni (Millet, p. 183, 1962).

Attempts have been made to describe the presidents that are selected. However, research is silent on why a particular president was selected.

A study of the factors that influenced the final selection of the person to be president should be helpful to potential candidates and search committee members. For individuals seeking a presidential position the study reveals tangible and intangible qualities that search committees desire in a nominee. New search committees can learn from institutions, that have recently been involved in the process, the trends concerning types of individuals that should be considered for president.
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CHAPTER II

SYNTHESIS OF RELATED LITERATURE

Indexes and card catalogues were utilized in searching for related material for this study. Among the indexes consulted were Comprehensive Dissertation Index, Current Index to Journals in Education, and Resources in Education.

The related literature can be classified into three major categories. The categories include the selection process, selection criteria, and presidential roles.

The Selection Process

Richman suggests a special search committee be used for selecting a new president. The exact makeup of the committee varies by institution. Even though the board has the final decision, the selection committee's views and recommendations are given serious consideration by the board (Richman, p. 238, 1974).

Kauffman prefers a search committee that would screen potential presidents and propose a list of finalists to the appointing authority. In this case the appointing authority is the board. The board then works from a short list that has already been screened to make their final decision (Kauffman, p. 19, 1980).
The Tennessee Board of Regents follows a process in which the Chancellor makes the recommendation for the new president. It is the responsibility of the Chancellor to make a recommendation for filling the presidency to the full board as required by TCA 49-8-203 (R. G. Rhoda, personal letter, November 27, 1991). This particular model has one individual responsible for making the recommendation to the board.

Presidential succession begins with the creation of the vacancy and concludes with the assuming of office by a new president (American Council on Education, p. 1, 1986). The search process that is conducted by the board establishes the climate in which the president begins to exercise leadership (Appleberry, p. 3, 1987).

Powers observes four general steps in the selection process of a president: 1) Nominations, steps taken to find qualified candidates; 2) Consideration, the procedure that is followed in studying the nominees; 3) Individual evaluation, what items are examined and how they are evaluated; 4) Final selection, which is making the decision of whom to employ (Powers, p. 261, 1950).

A recommendation concerning steps to be followed in conducting the selection process can be found by reviewing documents of institutionally based organizations as well as executive search firms. Appleberry indicates that most
experts agree the search process should include at least the following elements:

Prior to the initiation of the search process, there should be a careful assessment of the needs of the institution and the type or style of leadership needed. Governing boards should make a determination about the representative nature of the search committee to be appointed.

The search committee should be appointed, the responsibilities of the committee stated, and adequate resources allocated.

The steps to be followed in the search process and the timetable for completion should be stated.

Criteria to be used in the selection of candidates should be stated, and the range of the conditions of employment identified.

Communication plan to be followed with the candidates, the media and others should be determined in advance to provide needed information in a timely and courteous manner, and to respect the confidentiality of the candidates as appropriate.

A pool of qualified candidates including men and women, majority or minority, should be identified. The search committee should not hesitate to be aggressive in identifying potential candidates, even though they may not have applied or been nominated.
The results of the study of institutional needs and the type of leadership needed should be given to each candidate. The candidate pool should be screened to select the most able to meet the needs of the institution, and additional information should be collected on the select few to further narrow the list. Finalists should be chosen and additional information collected as needed. Finalists should be interviewed and additional background interviews conducted as needed. Candidates should be evaluated according to established criteria. Position should be offered to the top candidate in terms of employment negotiation. Unsuccessful candidates should be notified prior to the public announcement and then the successful candidate should be announced (Appleberry, pp. 3-4, 1987).

**Selection Criteria**

Among the first duties of the selection committee is once a vacancy occurs in the presidency, is the development or establishment of qualifications for a new president. Too often these statements evolve from other institutions regardless of similarity, and they become idealistic descriptions of unattainable characteristics. Most often such a list of qualifications is irrelevant to the needs of the institution (Kauffman, pp. 19-20, 1980).
Research conducted by Nason reveals that the formulation of criteria of the new president is part of the mandate given to the selection committee. There are qualities which any president should possess such as; an understanding of the dynamics of the educational process, a reasonable degree of administrative ability, physical and emotional stamina to work long hours under stress, and above all, honesty, courage, and personal integrity. Beyond these, selection committees often consider various personal qualifications. However, the real test of intelligent criteria is the relevance to the current and future condition of the institution. What is the mission for the next ten years? What are the major problems? Does the institution need an educator, a fundraiser, or a caretaker? How should the new president be alike or unlike the previous president (Nason, p. 28, 1980)?

Marchese suggests the need to analyze the task of the president before beginning the search. Included in such an analysis is knowledge, experience, abilities, and personal traits that are necessary for an individual to be successful as president of a particular institution (Marchese, p. 18, 1987).

It is within the selection process that the search committee identifies the needs of the respective institution. Deua conducted research that resulted in the identification of the most challenging issues confronting
institutions in 1980. Most of the issues were assigned to three categories: 1) Funding, 2) Planning and program considerations, 3) Concern related to faculty development and renewal (Deau, p. 43, 1980).

What a search committee identifies and normally bases their decision upon are credentials: degrees, publications, positions held, plus a surface performance in an artificial situation known as the interview. Appointees usually come from the outside, and the references normally try to make their recommendations as attractive as possible (Kerr, p. 5, 1986).

No candidate is equally strong in all areas and the search committee must decide what qualities and abilities the institution needs most in a president. Scholarly credentials and administrative experience would be important, but specifying particular credentials and minimum years of experience is not always helpful. Most committees should seek academic credentials appropriate to the nature of the institution's needs. Relevant and administrative experience should reflect excellence in performance and indicate a potential for greater responsibility (American Council on Education, p. 5, 1986).

Kolman suggests that as a search committee is developing criteria for a potential presidential position they are greatly influenced by the incumbent. Research conducted by Kolman revealed there is no effort on the part
of the incumbent or former president to choose the new president but rather it is the attitude of the college community toward the incumbent that affected the search process. Normally, incumbent strengths are taken for granted; it is the weaknesses of the president being replaced that becomes an issue in the search. In one institution surveyed, a terminal degree became an absolutely necessary credential because the previous president felt handicapped without one. Another institution forgot the decisive presidential leadership that eliminated an operating deficit and reversed enrollment declines, and chose to seek a unifier. In still another institution, administrative and management skills of the previous president were hardly mentioned as the committee sought a fundraiser (Kolman, p. 7, 1987).

During the fall of 1991, Auburn University searched for a president that could give some leadership to the sports program. Prior to their vote to employ William Muse as the president, the board reversed a 1989 policy that gave the board the final say over the hiring of the university's athletic directors and coaches. The school in the midst of a controversy in the athletic program felt pressured to add this criteria to the qualifications for president (Lederman, p. A43, 1992).

Research conducted by David Powers considered current practices involved in selecting university presidents.
Included in the study was the basis for evaluating potential candidates. Factors in order of importance, from the most important to the least important included: personal integrity, administrative ability, health, skill in public relations, family life, academic training, university experience, social skill, speaking ability, distinguished scholarship, business and financial experience, recognition in chosen field, age, fundraising ability, religious affiliation, publications, research activities, political experience, and alumnus status (Powers, p. 261, 1950).

When conducting a search for a new president, Koltai suggests the search committee consider certain criteria:

1. Do they have the level of physical endurance needed?
2. Do they have the degree of psychological resilience needed?
3. Do they have a family situation compatible with the job?
4. Are they willing to live in the midst of ambiguity and conflict (Koltai, p. 5, 1984)?

Pritchard's research of existing literature revealed an absence of relevant data on reasons why a particular person was chosen as president for a specific institution. Pritchard conducted a study seeking to fill the gap insofar as presidents of selected four year institutions were concerned. The objectives of the study sought to determine
answers to the following questions: 1) What were the particular needs of the selected college, 2) What personal characteristics and professional qualifications distinguish the successful candidate from others receiving consideration, 3) What career experiences, as perceived by the new president, were instrumental in their selection, 4) What other factors, as perceived by the search committee and the new president, influenced the committee's final choice (Pritchard, pp. 13-14, 1971).

The needs and concerns in Pritchard's study were classified according to the following institutional areas: presidential administration, governing board, students, finances, physical plant, and external relations. Administrative experience in higher education was the professional qualification most frequently mentioned by the search committees in the selection of the new president over other candidates. Likewise, administrative experience was the factor most cited by the newly elected presidents as being instrumental in preparing them for their new position (Pritchard, pp. 29, 159, 1971).

During 1986, the University of Georgia surveyed the faculty and staff before conducting a search for a president of the state system. Opinions of faculty members and staff concerning the responsibilities and qualifications of the next president assumed the form of panel papers. Panels represented various disciplines as well as the university's
public service, research and student affairs offices. Each panelist was asked to prepare a ten to twelve minute statement on the expectations and preferences of his or her colleagues and to discuss the implications of such expectations or preferences with other participants in the campus wide seminar.

The panelists were asked to respond to two questions: 1) What are the expectations of your colleagues concerning the University of Georgia presidency, the authority and responsibility the new president should have, the challenges and commitments that the president should bring to the campus? 2) What are the preferences of your college concerning academic background, professional experience, and reputation that the next president should have (University of Georgia, pp. III-IV, 1986)?

Expectations from the panelists included the following comments:

We must have a new president who understands that we do not work and teach in an isolated ivory tower insulated from the public.

We want a president from the academic community who can work with the faculty and all the university constituencies in defining and furthering excellence at the University of Georgia.
Should be a distinguished scholar in one of the traditional arts or sciences with a documented history of success as a college or university administrator. Primary interest is in the quality of our students and faculty scholarly experiences, whether in the history, lecture hall, or the physics laboratory...a clear understanding that humanities are not the frills or window dressing of a great university, but its very essence.

Believes that education is a major part of the long term solution to current problems whether the problems exist at the state, national, or international level. Has a desire to develop the whole institution in an understanding and abiding appreciation of the land grant system.

A positive and enthusiastic attitude toward change in the future, particularly with regard to new technologies...

He needs to recognize that the tripartite mission of the university is education, research, and public service...

Students want someone who is a respected professional, one possessing charisma who will surround her or himself with quality people and who can rise above the bureaucracy.
Someone who is more interested in making the most of what we can be and should be at the University of Georgia and in comparing ourselves with other institutions of stature...

Someone who sees the university's mission as serving all people in this state, has a history of participatory administration, and a leadership style which is consistent with the academic collegial environment (University of Georgia, pp. VI-VII, 1986).

Memphis State University's Senate ad-hoc committee, during 1990, suggested qualifications and characteristics of the next president for the institution. The traits, skills, and characteristics they felt the next president should possess included:

- Demonstrated leadership ability and effective communication skills with a wide variety of constituencies within and outside of the university
- Innovative and creative vision of the future of a major university with an appropriate balance among teaching, research, inservice
- Ability to expand and foster an environment in which students, scholars, staff, and administrators of distinction can be attracted to the university
- Awareness of and sensitivity toward the aspirations and interest of all members of a multi-cultural university community
Dedication to and preferably with a demonstrated record of achievement in an effective program of affirmative action

Demonstrated understanding of fundraising organization

Understanding and appreciation of the important role that intercollegiate athletics can play in advancing the educational mission of the university

Openness to the needs of the community and the opportunities for a metropolitan university

Understanding of and appreciation for the diversity of disciplines and individuals within a comprehensive university (Payne, 1990).

Presidential Roles

Bensimon conducted research that identified five theories of leadership for college presidents. The theories were bureaucratic, collegial, political, symbolic, and single-frame. It was observed that the older presidents surveyed tended to utilize one of the first four models. The newer presidents surveyed adopted a single-frame approach which resulted in a model that encouraged greater participation and shared decision making (Bensimon, pp. 25-28, 1987).

Regardless of the leadership model that is utilized by a president, they all will possess power and influence. Birndaum studied theories implicit in college presidents' definitions of leadership. The basis for presidential power
resides in the following ways: 1) Through their offices because of the authority provided by the social and legal system (legitimate power), 2) Through their ability to provide rewards (reward power), 3) To threaten punishments (coercive power), 4) Influence others with their own personalities through their perceived expertise (expert power), 5) To the extent that others personally identify with and like them they have influence (referent power) (Birndaum, p. 7, 1987).

Of the 32 presidents surveyed in the sample of Birndaum's study, the majority defined leadership as a one way process of getting others to comply or to conform with one's directives. The use of social power was commonly expressed through phrases such as "the power of persuasion," "getting people to buy into your goals," or "getting people to act positively" (Birndaum, p. 8, 1987).

Trow expands on the concept of power control of the president in his study related to presidential leadership. The president has substantial control over the budget and its allocations throughout the university. The president can decide what portion of the budget to recommend for salaries. Many of the top staff people owe their appointments to the president and hold those appointments at the president's discretion. The president appoints the chief academic officers at the institution or replaces them. The president has the power and the ability to take a
department or program into receivership (Trow, pp. 23-27, 1984).

Even though the president possesses power and influence within the institution, one will find the need to share the power and influence with the trustees. Chait expands on the theme developed by Clark Kerr that identified the 1960's as the decade of students, the 1970's as the decade of faculty, the 1980's as the decade of management and predicts the 1990's will be the decade of the trustees. A number of trends will heighten the prominence and influence of governing boards during the 1990's. Federal and state regulations and court decisions will underscore the authority and liability of the governing boards prompting trustees to become better informed, more involved, and increasingly diligent in carrying out their jobs. There will also be an intensified call for accountability promoting such manners as "business-like behaviors" including marketing, strategic planning, and performance appraisals (Chait, pp. 25-31, 1990).

Furthermore, mounting public resistance to the escalating price of higher education will put pressure on boards to hold the line on spiraling costs. The president will need to play a leading role in trustee education: first, by modeling behavior as the institution's number one learner; second, by encouraging board members to ask questions and to seek information; and third, by suggesting
topics that the board should be discussing (Chait, pp. 25, 27, 1990).

Exactly what role the president will serve in the 1990's is yet to be determined. There are some that view the role of the college president as a mayor, viewing the institution as a political model. Some view the university as a business enterprise with the president serving as the chief executive. There is the view of the university being a symphony orchestra with the president as the conductor. Others see the university as a dispensing machine with the president as the operator who has the responsibility to keep it well stocked with interesting and useful programs. There are those that see the university as a zoo with the president as the zookeeper. Still, others view the university as a mammoth cave with many rooms to be explored and the president serving as the chief guide (Kauffman, p. 12, 1980).

Kerr analyzed presidents from a view of overall strategies. The first category was path-breaking leaders. These presidents took charge in leading their institution into new territory. The second category was that of managerial leaders. These presidents were concerned more with the efficient pursuit of what is already being done. The third major category was classified as survivors or time servers. Presidents of this type are not intent on changing their institution, neither more effectively nor efficiently.
They seek instead to continue in the presidency for as long as they can survive. The fourth category was that of scapegoats. Probably no president enters a new position with the intent of being in this category, but often some will end up in this classification (Kerr, pp. 67-73, 1986).

Role expectations for the office of the president was the subject of a study conducted by Nelson in the late 1950's. In the study he sought to discern the expectations of incumbent presidents and members of boards of trustees related to the status of the college presidency. The assumption was made that conflicts exist between incumbent presidents and board members in regard to the expectations each holds for the role of the president (Nelson, pp. 2, 5, 1960).

Nelson gathered data from the following areas: 1) Personal data - age, sex, race, marital status, political/religious preference, education, experience, personal habits, competencies, personal attributes, education and administrative philosophy; 2) Performance data - administrative responsibilities, board relations, faculty relations, student relations, staff relations, public relations, professional responsibilities, personnel policies; 3) Participation data - faculty activities, student activities, professional associations, civic activities, political activities, religious activities, spouse involvement in activities, group organization
activities; 4) Friendship data - individual board members, college staff, students, organization leaders, education leaders, members of the press, individuals of economic importance and factional leaders (Nelson, p. 40, 1960).

A similar study to Nelson's was conducted by Hutchinson two years after the previous study. Hutchinson discovered that prospective presidents should be familiar with the expectations appointing boards hold for the role of college or university presidents (Hutchinson, p. 72, 1962).

In 1984, Lawrence Cote conducted research to discern the agreement of college presidents and chairmen of trustees concerning the relative importance of twenty selected presidential roles. It was discovered that the presidents and board chairpersons did not differ significantly in their perceptions of importance of the twenty presidential roles that were described in the survey instrument. The strongest areas of agreement were fundraiser, community leader, government/resource stimulator. The weakest levels of agreement were the responses related to physical plant/property overseer, and labor relations specialist (Cote, pp. 14, 16-17, 1984).

The presidential roles utilized in Cote's study were as follows: visionary, trustee rapport builder/adviser, public relations specialist/image builder, fundraiser, financial manager, administrator/executive, consensus builder and mediator, marketer/salesperson, faculty advocate,
educational advocate, symbol/ceremonial official, academic planner/innovator, community leader, government liaison/resource stimulator, inter-institutional diplomat, student liaison/mentor, alumni liaison/motivator, physical plant/property overseer, scholar/teacher, and labor relations specialist (Cote, p. 36, 1984).

In 1986, Fleming conducted a similar study to that of Cote's. Fleming added to his subjects the academic deans. He further delimited his study to Christian colleges. Fleming observed that fundraising abilities had become a top priority on most job specifications for new presidents. The conclusion was drawn that a number of institutions had made some compromises on traditional qualifications in order to recruit an individual who could address the immediate needs (Fleming, p. 17, 1986).

Bowman proposes that a president must be able to comprehend and interpret the aesthetic, moral, religious, economic, and political aspects of our society. Like executives in other organizations, the president needs to be able to take part in solving some of the problems of society (Bowman, p. 32, 1964).

Nason suggests a demanding set of expectations for a president that include being an educator, to have been at some time a scholar, to have judgment about finance, to know something of construction, maintenance of labor policy, and to be able to speak virtually continuously with words that
charm and never offend. The president is to take bold positions with which no one will disagree, to consult everyone, to do everything through committees, but to do so with great speed and without error (Nason, p. 13, 1980).

Kerr illustrates the role of college and university presidents by describing him or her as being a friend to the students, colleague of the faculty, a good fellow with the alumni, a sound administrator for the trustees, a good speaker, an astute bargainer with the state legislature, a friend of industry, labor, and agriculture, a persuasive diplomat with donors, and champion of educational goals. He or she is to be a supporter of the professions, spokesman to the press, a scholar in his own right, public servant at the state and national levels, a devotee to opera and football equally, a decent human being, a good husband and father, and an active member of the church (Kerr, pp. 29-30, 1963).

McIntosh observes that many presidents now are having to deal with retrenchment as a creative challenge. Presidents today must get their satisfaction out of coping with and balancing the budget as opposed to previous days when enjoyment came from expansion (McIntosh, pp. 87-91, 1976).

Mooney suggests:

More and more colleges and university presidents say those observers as well as a number of presidents themselves are being chosen not so much for their
academic leadership but as for their ability to build endowments, work with government officials in the business community, raise the profile of their institutions, and manage administrators that has become increasingly specialized and professional (Mooney, p. A15, 1976).

Research conducted by Fischer revealed the following opinions of individuals in higher education, business, and industry regarding what they characterized as an effective president. Higher education presidents have vision and a high energy level. They are visible and relate well to others. They draw respect and admiration and are bold decision makers who use power well. They have a positive self-image and are trusting and trustworthy. They have a highly developed sense of humor. They believe in shared governance, but they believe in the underlying goals of the organization (Fischer, pp. 22-42, 1988).

Fischer's study revealed differences in personal attributes and personal and professional experience among presidents. He discovered that effective college presidents usually did not earn their first degree in business. They were more likely to have received their doctorate from a private institution, and they tended to lead institutions with large student enrollments. Effective presidents tended to publish more books and articles and were members of national and professional organizations. They often possess
knowledge of administrative and faculty responsibilities as well as comparative data about the management of external organizations. They were more likely to identify themselves as politically independent (Fischer, pp. 62-63, 1988).

Horn indicates that character is the most crucial aspect of a potential president. His justification is based on the fact that many issues are still part of the unfolding future and cannot be accurately foreseen. It is the character of the president, that consistent appearance, to doing what is right in the best interest of the university, even at the price of unpopularity or one's job, that is essential (Horn, p. 47, 1988).

The president must relate to everybody but belong to no one. He or she is to be respected by the faculty but not necessarily loved. He or she should be admired, or at least tolerated by the trustees, and accepted as a champion of students, the alumni, and the community in which the campus is situated. In this context the president must avoid the pitfall of believing that he or she is irreplaceable (Fretwell, p. 61, 1988).

Hillway conducted a survey of trustees to discover factors used most frequently in evaluating effectiveness in college presidents. The factors that were most frequently mentioned and in order of their frequency were: leadership in maintaining high academic standards; good judgment in selecting faculty and staff; ability to maintain high morale
among faculty and staff; facilitator in making friends for
the institution; provide general intellectual leadership in
college and community; fairness and honesty in treatment of
faculty and staff; good judgment in promoting faculty and
staff; ability to maintain a balanced budget; respected by
educators; and influential on the moral character of
students and faculty (Hillway, pp. 51-53, 1961).

Research conducted by Demerath revealed the view of a
Yale trustee following the selection of a new president.
From the perspective of the trustee the new president had to
be a leader, a magnificent speaker, a great writer, a good
public relations man, a fundraiser, a man of iron health, a
man of the world, a great spiritual quality, an experienced
administrator who is able to delegate authority, a Yale man,
a great scholar, a social philosopher, and married to a
combination of Queen Victoria, Florence Nightingale and best
dressed woman of the year (Demerath, p. 56, 1967).

Richman suggests that the successful university and
college presidents usually possess a minimum of basic
qualifications. He includes in these qualifications: being
cool-headed and a good negotiator; able to communicate
effectively both orally and in writing; and consults quite
widely with different constituencies and uses two-way
communication. The president has critical information on
hand when needed; is an effective organizer and chooses
competent deputies; has a democratic rather than
authoritarian leadership style, but can be tough in making decisions. He or she backs up decisions with well thought out explanations and meaningful documentation; is a good planner, follows through with effective control; and has tremendous energy (Richman, p. 237, 1974).

In contrast with Richman, Wright conducted a study that led her to the conclusions that the most effective college presidents are those whose leadership styles tend to be dominant. She discovered that successful presidents are more decisive, less democratic and, when appropriate, even autocratic (Wright, pp. 87-89, 1988).

Kerr identifies a number of common characteristics which mark the better presidents. The characteristics are: optimistic attitude, willingness to listen, academic credentials, intellectual approach, dedication to liberal education, appreciation of scholarship, dedication to the institution, relevant experience, accessibility, enthusiasm, energy, creativity, decision-making ability, willingness to take risks, boldness, demand for excellence, ability to delegate, a natural confidence in others, firmness and flexibility, straightforwardness and openness, non-dogmatic frame of mind, family stability, wisdom, tolerance, patience, compassion, friendliness, self-assurance, concern for employees, concern for students, concern for faculty, concern for community, attention to public relations, a
sense of business and a sense of humor (Kerr, pp. 230-232, 1986).
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Population

The population for this study consisted of individuals who served as chairpersons of the selection committee for a state, private, community or church college or university that elected a president between June 1, 1990, and May 31, 1991. One hundred and forty-nine higher education institutions selected a president during the specified time period. A list of institutions of higher education, that qualify for the study, appears in Appendix A.

Sampling

On July 2, 1990, the researcher sent a letter to Richard Chait, Executive Director of the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance at the University of Maryland, requesting recommendations concerning a list of new presidents (Appendix B). One suggestion, from Chait, was to write the American Council of Education (Appendix C). A letter was sent on July 20, 1990, to Madeleine Green, Vice President and Director of the Center for Leadership Development of the American Council on Education, requesting a list of new presidents (Appendix D). Green's reply agreed
with a suggestion from Chait to consult *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (Appendix E).

The appointment section of the issues dated June 1, 1990, to May 31, 1991, of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* was researched to identify newly elected presidents. Each president was asked to identify the chairperson who recommended them for their respected position. Fifty-nine chairpersons were identified as subjects for this study. A list of institutions that were represented by the chairpersons appears in Appendix F.

**Instrument**

In January of 1990, Sheila Murray Bethel, president of Getting Control, Inc., was contacted concerning an instrument relating to leader characteristics. Her company did not use a standardized instrument for gathering data.

Upon the recommendation of Bethel, the Institute for Exceptional Performance was contacted as a possible source for an instrument to be utilized in this study. A copy of "Consistently Exceptional Leadership" was received. Upon review of the instrument the researcher determined the instrument would not yield the desired data.

Green, with the American Council on Education, was unaware of any instrument designed to identify characteristics of new presidents. The survey used by the American Council on Education is limited to background information. This information included "previous position", 
"total years of full-time employment prior to assuming the current presidency", "years in academic employment", "years in non-academic employment", "highest degree earned", "supervisor", "member of boards", "sex", "age", "race", "marital status", "religious preference", "previous president" and "position accepted".

Due to the non-availability of a standardized instrument the researcher designed the instrument. Two survey instruments were utilized in this study. The first was sent to the newly elected presidents to obtain information related to the university and the president. The instrument for the presidents was designed to gather basic background information.

The second was developed for the chairperson of the search committee. A copy of the chairperson's survey instrument (Appendix G) was sent, on July 26, 1991, to five of the newly elected presidents asking for agreement or disagreement on the questions. Content validity was established by having expert judges examine the test items and indicate whether the items measure the pre-determined content (Borg, p. 124, 1983). Five experts in the content area comprised the validation panel (Yount, p. 11-6, 1986).

Mailed questionnaires are a common instrument for data collection and survey research (Borg, p. 406, 1983). A questionnaire is much more efficient than an interview in that it requires less time, less expense, and permits
collection of data from a large sample (Grugay, p. 195, 1987). The instrument developed for this study was a questionnaire to be mailed.

Structured questionnaires restrict the respondent to specific answers. Open ended questions can illicit creative or original responses (Sproull, p. 197, 1988). Open ended questions are often defended on the grounds that they permit greater depth of response (Grugay, p. 197, 1987). An open ended question was included in the survey to encourage freedom of response.

A disadvantage of the open ended question is unpredictable information that can be generated (Sproull, p. 200, 1988). Open ended questions are difficult to score and analyze (Grugay, p. 197, 1987). To assist in scoring, factor areas that were utilized in the study conducted by Nelson were included on the questionnaire. The four factor areas were "personal data", "performance data", "participation data", and "friendship data". Subjects were requested to clarify their open ended response by classifying their answer in the factor areas.

Chairpersons were asked to indicate the degree to which each of the four factors influenced their decision. This data was collected by means of a five point Likert Scale to quantify an individual's response.
Assumptions

It was assumed that with the passing of time, individuals forget the reasons for one's actions. Due to this lack of retention, search committees that made their selection prior to June 1, 1990, were not included in this study. It is further assumed that chairpersons of selection committees that made their recommendation after May 31, 1990, should be able to accurately remember what factors influenced the search committee's decision to recommend their selection as president.

Definitions

1) Institution - Any two or four year college or university of higher education.

2) President - The individual elected by the board of trustees or regents to serve as chief administrator of the institution.

3) Search Committee - The group of individuals that had the responsibility for screening the nominees for the presidential position. This could be a special appointed committee, elected committee, or the existing board.

Procedure for Collecting Data

Following the content validation of the survey instrument, letters were sent on October 25, 1991, to the newly elected presidents (Appendix H). These presidents were asked to return a permission form (Appendix I) that
would include the name and address of the chairperson of the search committee that recommended them for the presidency. Each president was asked to complete a survey that included basic background information (Appendix J).

From the initial mailing of 149 institutions, 57 responses were received. Thirty-eight returned the completed "President Survey" and permission card. Three returned the completed "President Survey" but indicated a search committee was not used in the selection process. One returned the completed "President Survey" but indicated selection came after the dates for this study. Eight returned letters indicating they were too busy to complete a survey. One did not return a completed "President Survey" but sent a letter stating the election was after the stated dates for the study. One indicated selection prior to the specified dates for the study. One declined to participate due to budget problems facing the institution. Four surveys were returned to sender indicating improper address.

A school code number (Appendix K) was assigned to institutions returning the "President Survey" or notification of declining to participate. The school code number was placed on the permission card and "Search Committee Chairperson Survey" for identification purposes.

On November 15, 1991, 92 follow-up letters (Appendix L) were sent to non-responding presidents. A copy of the permission form and "President Survey" was included with
this mailing. Two weeks were allowed for responses to be returned.

The second mailing elicited thirty-one additional responses. Nineteen "President Survey" and permission cards were received. Five completed "President Survey" were received without the permission card. One completed "President Survey" was received indicating the chairman of the search committee was deceased. Five presidents responded they were too busy to participate. One letter was marked return to sender.

Fifty-seven chairpersons whose institution's president granted permission for participation in this study comprised the population of the study. Each chairperson of a search committee was sent a letter (Appendix M) requesting their involvement, a survey (Appendix G), and a stamped addressed envelope. Each survey was identified with the school code number.

Grugay suggests that if the percent of return is not at least seventy percent the validity of one's conclusions will be weak (Grugay, p. 201, 1987). Forty completed "Search Committee Chairperson Survey" were returned representing a return of seventy percent.

Three weeks following the initial mailing, a follow-up letter (Appendix N), along with another copy of the survey and a stamped addressed envelope was sent to the seventeen non-responding chairpersons. Eleven additional completed
surveys were returned yielding a response rate of 89 percent. One letter was returned stating no search committee was used, rather the chancellor recommended the president. Two surveys were completed on page one only.

Forty-eight useable surveys were received. The completed surveys represented a return of 84 percent.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Background Information

Background data was compiled, from the two survey instruments, on the institutions, presidents, and chairpersons of the search committee. The background information is reported by percentages in "Tables" contained in this section.

Within Table 1 data is reported related to the type of institution and the type of support the institution receives. The participating institutions are representative and not skewed toward one type. The exception to the representative grouping is the graduate school. Only one such type of school responded. Since many graduate schools are affiliated with a university, the responding graduate institution data will be reported with the university type institutions.

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF INSTITUTION</th>
<th># RESPONDING</th>
<th>% REPRESENTATION</th>
<th>% STATE</th>
<th>% PRIVATE</th>
<th>% CHURCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comm. College</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49
State supported information is strongly influenced by the Community College. Private and state supported institutions will impact background information greater than the church supported institutions.

Institutions represented in this study would be in the older category. Seventy-one percent have been in existence for more than fifty-one years. No new institution, age ten years or less, is represented.

**TABLE 2**

**AGE OF INSTITUTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th># OF INSTITUTIONS</th>
<th>% OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New institutions in this study are community colleges. Nine of the youngest 11 are community colleges. Only three community colleges were in the 51-100 category.

Table 3 reflects the size of the representative institutions. Colleges dominate the smaller sizes. Universities and community colleges are the larger institutions in the research.

TABLE 3
SIZE OF INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENROLLMENT</th>
<th># COMM. COLLEGE</th>
<th># COLLEGE</th>
<th># UNIV.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500 or less</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-1500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501-2000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-3000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001-5000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-7000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7001-10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-15,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001-20,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 +</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Enrollment Reported</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forty-eight percent of the institutions had undertaken the search for a president at least eight different times. The age of the institutions represented in this upper category were at least 50 years old.

Institutions that had experienced fewer searches tended to be the newer institutions. However, one institution in the 51-100 years old category had only two previous presidents. Two of the institutions over 100 years old had five previous presidents. Table 4 contains the data related to the number of past presidents. One institution in the 21-30 year age category had six previous presidents.

**TABLE 4**

**NUMBER OF PREVIOUS PRESIDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># OF PREVIOUS PRESIDENTS</th>
<th># OF INSTITUTIONS</th>
<th>% OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>AGE OF INSTITUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11-20, 21-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21-30, 51-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11-20, 21-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-30, 31-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21-30, 21-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-50, 31-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21-30, 21-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51-100, 100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21-30, 31-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51-100, 51-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51-100, 51-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 continued

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51-100,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+, 100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51-100,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51-100,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51-100,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100+, 100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+, 100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+, 100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-up</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51-100,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average tenure of presidents ranged from six years to 35 years. Six respondents stated the tenure varied for previous presidents. Two did not indicate an average.

Table 5 relates to the previous presidents resignations. Community colleges, colleges, and universities were represented in all but three categories. Death was the cause of vacancy in two colleges. Community colleges and universities vacancies were not represented in this category.

Previous community college presidents did not leave to accept a position outside the academic community. Colleges and universities both had presidents leaving the academic community.

One college changed the organizational structure. This change resulted in the president moving to chancellor.
TABLE 5
REASONS FOR PREVIOUS PRESIDENTS RESIGNATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASON FOR RESIGNATION</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted another presidency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted another position in higher education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left the academic community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced to resign</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in organization structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The eight forced resignations included one for health reasons, three were confidential and gave no reasons for the action leading to the resignations. Four forced resignations were due to inability to work with the board of trustees.

Eleven (3 left academic community, 8 forced), or 23% of the previous presidents apparently had difficulty in the presidential position. The majority of the previous presidents were performing well enough to stay until retirement or received another offer to be president.

President Information
A male, between the ages of 41-55, possessing a doctorate, who had previous experience in education appeared
to be the person whom search committees were seeking. Tables 6–10 contain the data for the description of the new presidents who were selected by the search committees.

**TABLE 6**

**AGE OF PRESIDENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th># IN AGE RANGE</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 7**

**SEX OF PRESIDENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 8**

**EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th># WITH DEGREE</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A majority of the selected presidents perceived their choice as a result of their prior experience. Twenty-eight
or 58 percent of the presidents indicated their previous work experience led to their choice as the president of the institution.

**TABLE 11**

**PRESIDENTS PERCEPTION OF REASON FOR SELECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASON</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Knowledge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Institution</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relation Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most frequent response for accepting the position was the challenge to be met at the institution. Twenty-seven percent cited the challenge at the institution as being the influencing factor for their decision.

**TABLE 12**

**PRESIDENT REASONS FOR ACCEPTING POSITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASON</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution they could make</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth potential at institution</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the institution</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal they had</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord's leading</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chairperson Information

Chances of one being the chairperson of the search committee were greater if one was a member of the Board of Trustees. A majority of the chairpersons were appointed to the position as opposed to being elected to serve. Table 13 contains the percentage of board members appointed or elected.

**TABLE 13**

**SELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECTION</th>
<th>#</th>
<th># BOARD MEMBERS</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL FROM BOARD</th>
<th># NOT BOARD MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-five of the chairpersons were members of the Board of Trustees. Eight served as chairman of the Trustee Board. Five were vice chairmen of the Board. One was a
trustee as a result of being the alumni representative to the Board.

The selected non-board members that were appointed included two presidents. Each president was in a system that had several institutions. One search committee chairperson was the vice chancellor, one a professor, one a dean, one an administrator and one the past president of the Trustee Board. Elected, non-board member chairpersons included one dean and one professor elected by the faculty.

Experience on the board of trustees ranged from three to 27 years. Seventeen of the chairpersons, with board experience, indicated they had previous experience in higher education prior to one's appointment as a trustee.

Varied occupations were represented by the search committee chairpersons. Thirteen were involved in higher education positions. Eight chairmen of the search committees were lawyers and one was a judge. Four chairpersons were housewives. Other vocations represented included business and medical professions.

Sixteen of the chairpersons were alumni of the institution they represented. Thirty-two, representing 66 percent of the chairpersons, were not alumni of the institution they were serving.

Finalists considered for the office of president ranged from one to 121. Twenty-four, 50 percent, of the search committees recommended only one candidate.
The number of candidates, recommended by search committees nominating more than one individual, ranged from two to six. Fifteen of the committees recommended a lesser number than their finalist list. Thirteen sent all finalists to the Board for the final selection.

All presidents were selected from the names submitted by the search committees. One Board delayed the selection between the two finalists that were presented asking for additional information on both nominees. While the search committee was gathering additional information, one candidate withdrew from consideration. The Board then elected the remaining candidate as president.

Experience was given most often as the reason for the selection of the search committee's nominee to be president. Table 14 classifies the search committee chairpersons' perception of the reason the candidate was selected instead of another individual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASON</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Ability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Needs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Credentials</th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Qualified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Answers to Questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Ability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Command Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Interview</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Balanced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Recommend One Candidate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HYPOTHESES**

The first hypothesis of this study was that a significant factor influenced the selection of an individual who was being recommended as president. A repeated measurement analysis was computed to test the hypothesis. Table 15 contains the results of the computations.

Some experiments are single-factor experiments in which subjects are tested under a number of experimental conditions. These types of experiments are called one-factor experiments with repeated measurements. The repeated measurements test is one in which the same subjects are tested under different treatments (Ferguson, p. 317, 1981).

Related to the research, the information contained in Appendix 0, entitled "Factor Scores", was utilized as four separate test scores per institution. This treatment of the
factor scores allowed the comparison of the totals for an individual factor with the other factors.

Measurements obtained under different treatment conditions utilizing the same subjects was found to be highly correlated. The presence of these correlations will reduce the error term (Ferguson, p. 318, 1981).

TABLE 15
ALL FACTORS
REPEATED MEASURES ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>DEGREES OF FREEDOM</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis (Factors)</td>
<td>178.182</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59.394</td>
<td>58.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>142.568</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F-ratio is significant at .05 with a 2.68. Since the F-ratio is greater than the 2.68, the first hypothesis was retained. There was a significant difference in the factors which influence the selection of a president.

Where was the difference among the factors? To discover the answer to the question raised, a Fisher Least Significant Difference (FLSD) test was utilized to determine where the difference existed. Mean scores for each factor were as follows: personal, 4.167; performance, 4.646; participation, 3.625; and friendship, 2.083.

When researchers want to know which means in an experiment differ sufficiently to result in a significant F-
ratio they study differences between pairs of means utilizing techniques called multiple comparison procedures (Keselman, p. 511, 1974). Concerning the FLSD, Yount indicates, "It has greater power (will declare more differences between paired mean significant) because it has a lower critical difference" (Yount, p. 22-5, 1986).

TABLE 16
FACTOR RANKINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(PART) 3.625</th>
<th>(PERS) 4.167</th>
<th>(PERF) 4.646</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(FRIEND) 2.083</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>2.084</td>
<td>2.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PART) 3.625</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>1.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PERS) 4.167</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 17
FLSD ALL FACTORS

\[ FLSD = q(.05, 2, 141) \]

\[ 2.80 \sqrt{\frac{1.01}{48}} \]

\[ 2.80 \sqrt{.021} \]

\[ 2.80(.145) = .406 \]
All factor rankings were greater than .406. Therefore, all factors were significantly different. The performance factor had the highest mean score, second was personal, third participation, and fourth friendship. Differences between friendship and the other factors indicated that friendship was not an important factor in the choice of a president. Likewise, the participation factor had less influence than the personal and performance factors on the selection of a president.

The second hypothesis of this study stated there would be a significant difference in factors influencing the selection of presidents for state, private, and church institutions of higher education. A one-way analysis of variance was used for each factor, to determine the level of significance of the means, for the three types of higher education institutions.

For each factor, the F-ratio was significant at the .05 level at 3.21. Table 18 reflects the computation of the F-ratio for the "personal" factor.

**TABLE 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>DEGREES OF FREEDOM</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4.237</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.119</td>
<td>1.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>54.429</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With an F-ratio of 1.752 there was no significant
difference among state, private, and church institutions of
higher education on the "personal" factor. The second
hypothesis was rejected in relation to the "personal"
factor.

TABLE 19
PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>DEGREES OF FREEDOM</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARES</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>10.926</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A "performance" factor F-ratio of .111 indicated no
significant difference among state, private, and church
institutions of higher education. The second hypothesis was
rejected for the "performance" factor.

TABLE 20
PARTICIPATION ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>DEGREES OF FREEDOM</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARES</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2.511</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>56.739</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An F-ratio of .996, for the "participation" factor
revealed no significant difference in the scores for state,
private, and church higher education institutions.
Hypothesis two is rejected for the "participation" factor.
TABLE 21
FRIENDSHIP ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>DEGREES OF FREEDOM</th>
<th>MEAN SOURCES</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>10.473</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.237</td>
<td>3.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>69.193</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With an F-ratio of 3.406 for the "friendship" factor there was a significant difference between the responses of state, private, and church institutions of higher education. The second hypothesis was retained for the "friendship" factor.

The FLSD test was utilized to determine where the difference existed within the "friendship" factor among the state, private, and church higher education institutions. Mean scores for each type of institution were as follows: church, 3.125; state, 1.909; and private, 1.833.

Since the size of the three groups was unequal, a different approach needed to be taken from the FLSD utilized in Table 17. When the groups are unequal in number the best way to handle the situation is by computing the harmonic mean of the two groups being tested. The harmonic mean substitutes for the number of subjects found in Tables 15 and 17 (Yount, p. 22-9, 1986). The result is a unique denominator for each comparison.
TABLE 22

TYPE RANKINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(S)</th>
<th>(C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>1.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>1.909</td>
<td>1.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 23

FLSD FOR PRIVATE/CHURCH

\[ FLSD = q(.05, 2, 45) \sqrt{\frac{1.538}{11.050}} \]

2.86\sqrt{.139}

2.86(.373) = 1.067

1.292 - Significant

There was a significant difference in the ratings of the friendship factor between the private and church higher education institutions. The friendship factor was a significant greater influence on church institutions of higher education than private institutions.
TABLE 24

FLSD FOR CHURCH/STATE

$$FLSD=q(0.05, 2, 45)\sqrt{\frac{1.538}{11.765}}$$

$$2.86\sqrt{1.131}$$

$$2.86(.362)=1.035$$

$$1.216 - Significant$$

There was a significant difference in the ratings for the friendship factor between the church and state institutions of higher education. Church institutions' search committees were influenced significantly more than state search committees by the friendship factor.

TABLE 25

FLSD FOR STATE/PRIVATE

$$FLSD=q(0.05, 2, 45)\sqrt{\frac{1.538}{19.802}}$$

$$2.86\sqrt{1.078}$$

$$2.86(.279)=.798$$

$$.076 = Not Significant$$
No significant difference was found between the state and private higher education institutions related to the friendship factor. Search committees for both types of institutions were influenced the same by friendship.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the existence of factors that influence the selection of an individual to be president of an institution of higher education. Chairpersons of presidential search committees, from June 1, 1990, to May 31, 1991, were surveyed to obtain data related to the reasons for the committee selecting a specific candidate.

A review of related literature was conducted to determine the findings of previous studies of presidents. Reviewed literature gave insight regarding the background of presidents. However, little was discovered relating to the reasons the search committee made their particular recommendation. Therefore, this research sought to determine if predominant factors tended to result in an individual being selected as president.

Institutions selecting a president during the stated period were identified by searching the related issues of The Chronicle of Higher Education. Newly elected presidents were mailed a questionnaire requesting information regarding the institution they served, personal background information, and the name and address of the chairperson of
the search committee that recommended persons for the presidency. Once the names of the chairpersons were received, a survey was mailed to determine the background of individuals serving in such a capacity. Questions on the survey instrument related to reasons for the search committee selecting the particular individual as opposed to other candidates who were considered.

Conclusions

Research findings revealed several trends apparent in the selection process. These trends describe the type of individual the majority of universities are attracted to when searching for a president.

Men, with experience in education, possession of a doctorate, and between the ages of 41 to 55 appear to be the most likely choice to be president. Each institution has unique needs and goals that dictate the type of individual a search committee is seeking. On the average, individuals desiring to be president of a higher education institution are more likely to be selected for the position if they fit the above description.

The data obtained from the research did indicate a wide range of background, qualities, and characteristics of presidents who were selected. Depending on the needs of the institution, a candidate not possessing the qualities that a majority of the presidents possessed, could receive preference over the other candidates.
One's chance of being selected as president was greatly enhanced with previous educational administration experience. A majority of the presidents selected were presidents at other institutions or in the administration of the institution they served. Considerable weight is given by search committees to the educational administration experience factor.

Presidents reinforced the experience factor influencing their selection. Fifty-eight percent indicated the belief that prior experience led to one's selection as president.

Chairpersons' responses underscored experience as the reason for the selection of a president. This finding agrees with the research conducted by Pritchard in 1971.

The four factors tested in the research revealed that each factor influenced the selection process by varying degrees. Performance record, or ability to administer, was the most significant of the factors tested.

Personal qualities and background were determined to influence the decision of selecting a president. This particular factor would include age, education, and experience.

Friendship had the least influence on the selection of a president. When considering all the factors, knowing the right people did not influence individuals charged with selecting the president to the degree of the other factors.
Comparing the scores on each factor by the type of school - state, private, or church - reveals similarities and differences. All three types were similar in their respective scores on the factors of participation, performance, and personal. State and private institutions were similar on scores related to the friendship factor.

There was a significant difference on the friendship factor scores when comparing church related institutions with the state and private institutions. It is clear the church related search committees were influenced to a greater extent by the "who the president knew" ingredient.

Recommendations

Findings from this research have future implications and give rise to additional questions. Some of the implications are the following:

1) The majority of the presidents have previous experience in the field of education. What kind of experience in the field of education best qualifies or prepares one to be considered for president of an institution? Further research needs to be conducted to determine if there are certain administration positions that better prepare one for the position of president.

Consideration should be given to discover if search committees give preference to one administrative position experience as opposed to other positions in administration.
2) How does one gain the experience to be considered a good presidential candidate? For the individual faculty member with desires to be president someday, a suggested experience profile might be helpful. Does the faculty member need to move into any administrative position? Will one's chance of being selected be greatly enhanced by being in administration as opposed to remaining a faculty member?

3) Is there a way to measure a potential candidate's ability related to the performance factor? A survey could be developed that would assist with assessing administrative skills; ability to work with the board, faculty, students, and staff; public relations skills; understanding of job requirements; and personnel administration.

4) Would search committees utilize or would it be helpful to have an organization that maintains profiles on potential presidential candidates? Such an organization would be contacted to nominate potential candidates to the search committee. An attempt would be made to match the nominees with the institutional needs. Search committees would still interview, check references, and make the final choice. It would appear a search committee's work would be enhanced and perhaps easier and more effective if such a service was available for them to utilize.

5) How did the search committee receive the nominations that were considered? Additional study could involve the number of nominees that respond to the
announcement in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Was there a leading candidate from the beginning of the search that was elected? Was the search process conducted to assure non-search committee members that consideration was given to a wide range of candidates?

6) Some institutions contract with consultants to assist in the search for qualified candidates. Additional research could be conducted to determine the percent of schools using a consultant service for the presidential search and the rationale for securing the service of a consultant.
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INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

THAT QUALIFY FOR THE STUDY
INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
THAT QUALIFY FOR THE STUDY

Abilene Christian University
Alvernia College
American University
Andover Newton Theological School
Anoka-Ramsey Community College
Aquinas College
Asbury College

Bacone College
Barber-Scotia College
Belmont Technical College
Beloit College
Bentley College
Bethany College
Brandeis University
Brookdale Community College
Brunswick College

Cabrillo College
California State Polytechnic University at Pomona
California State University at Fresno
Cape Fear Community College
Cardinal Stritch College
Casper College
Catonsville Community College
Chabot College
Chattanooga State Technical Community College
City College of San Francisco
City University of New York Graduate School
Cleveland Community College
Cleveland Institute of Art
Community College of Philadelphia
Corpus Christi State University
Crozer Theological Seminary

DeVry Institute of Technology at Decatur

Eastern Washington University
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University
Emerson College
Essex Community College

Florida Memorial College
Fort Valley State College
Friends University

Galveston College
Grossmont College
Grove City College
Guilford Technical Community College

Hampden-Sydney College
Hardin Simmons University
Hartford Seminary
Harvard University
Henry Ford Community College
Herbert H. Lehman College of City University of New York
Hollins College
Hudson County Community College
Huntington College

Immaculate Heart College Center
Iowa State University

Jarvis Christian College
John F. Kennedy University
John Tyler Community College

Kansas Newman College
Kentucky State University

Lindenwood College
Lurleen B. Wallace Junior College

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Memphis State University
Mennonite College of Nursing
Mercy College
Middlesex Community College
Middle Tennessee State University
Millikin University
Mills College
Minneapolis Community College
Missouri Baptist College
Montana State University
Moore College of Art and Design

Nazareth College
Normandale Community College
North Central College
Northeastern Ohio Universities College of Medicine
Northern Montana College
North Hennepin Community College
Northwest Iowa Technical College

Ohio State University
Oklahoma Panhandle State University

Palm Beach Atlantic College
Penn Valley Community College
Peru State College
Pomona College

Rio Salado College
Rosemont College
Rutgers University

Saint Bonaventure University
Saint Catherine College
Saint John's College
Saint John's University
Salem Academy and College
Salt Lake Community College
San Bernardino Valley College
School of International Training
Seton Hall University
Shelby State Community College
Springfield College
Spokane Community College
Stanly Community College
State University of New York at Binghamton
Suffolk Community College
Sul Ross State University
Suomi College
Swarthmore College
Syracuse University
System of State Colleges in Colorado

Talladega College
Tennessee State University
Texas Wesleyan University
Thiel College
Thomas Aquinas College
Trinidad State Junior College
Triton College

Union College
Union County College
Union Theological Seminary
University of Alabama at Huntsville
University of Alaska
University of Arkansas
University of Connecticut
University of Dubuque
University of Kentucky
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor
University of Montana
University of Nebraska
University of New Hampshire
University of North Alabama
University of Pittsburgh
University of Rhode Island
University of San Francisco
University of South Carolina
University of Southern California
University of Southern Maine

Viterbo College

Warren College
Wayne Community College
Weber State College
Western Oklahoma State College
West Texas State University
William Tyndale College
Wilson College
World College West

Xavier University

York College (Pennsylvania)
York College (Nebraska)
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LETTER TO DR. RICHARD CHAIT

July 2, 1990

Dr. Richard Chait
4114 CSS Building
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742-2435

Dear Dr. Chait:

I am currently beginning work on a prospectus for the completion of my Ph.D. degree in Higher Educational Administration at the University of North Texas. Dr. William Miller, chairman of my committee, suggested I contact you to see if you could be of any assistance.

I talked with Dr. Miller about doing my dissertation on influencing factors in the selection process of new presidents over other candidates. I plan to survey new presidents in universities as well as chairmen of the search committees.

I have several questions related to my study. Are you aware of an organization that would have a list of new presidents? Has research been done in this area? Do you have any suggestions concerning format or content of the survey?

Any suggestions you might have to help make this a beneficial study would be greatly appreciated. Thank you so much for your time.

Sincerely,

Gary Waller

GWW:jh
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RESPONSE FROM DR. RICHARD CHAIT

July 9, 1990

Mr. Gary Waller
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
P. O. Box 22000
Fort Worth, TX 76122

Dear Mr. Waller:

In response to your letter of July 2, I would suggest that you contact Dr. Estela Bensimon, Assistant Professor of Higher Education at Penn State University. Under the auspices of the National Center, Estela has been involved in a five-year longitudinal study of institutional leadership. In particular, she has been examining new presidents and how they "take charge."

Other sources for information about new presidents might be Dr. Kay Moore, Professor of Higher Education at Michigan State, and Dr. Madeleine Green at the American Council of Education in Washington, D. C. Both of them have done work on presidential demographics. Of course, an easier path might just be to review a year or two of the Gazette section of The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Best of luck with your dissertation.

Sincerely,

Richard Chait
Professor and Executive Director
National Center for Post-Secondary Governance and Finance
APPENDIX D

LETTER TO DR. MADELEINE GREEN
LETTER TO DR. MADELEINE GREEN

July 20, 1990

Dr. Madeleine Green
The American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, N. W., Suite 800
Washington, D. C. 20036

Dear Dr. Green:

I am writing you at the suggestion of Richard Chait. I am currently completing a second doctorate in higher education administration at the University of North Texas.

I am working on my prospectus for my dissertation. I am planning to do a study related to the selection of new presidents. Primarily, I am wanting to survey the chairmen of the search committees. I plan to focus on presidents who have been hired within the past two years. I have three questions for you:

1) Is there an organization that keeps a list of new presidents?

2) Are you aware of any research that has been completed in the area of factors influencing the final selection of a president?

3) Are you aware of any instruments that would be designed to identify characteristics of new presidents?

Thank you so much for your time.

Sincerely,

Gary Waller

GWW:jh
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RESPONSE FROM DR. MADELEINE GREEN
RESPONSE FROM DR. MADELEINE GREEN

July 30, 1990

Dr. Gary Waller
Assistant Professor of Administration
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
P. O. Box 22000
Fort Worth, TX 76122

Dear Dr. Waller:

Thank you for your letter of July 20. I shall reply to your questions as you pose them:

1. Who keeps a list of new presidents? This should be simple to answer, but unfortunately, it is not. We thought we had this information at ACE, but due to a variety of mishaps, we are now in the process of reconstructing it. The Chronicle is our major source. Also, the Higher Education Directory makes available its tapes. Contact Higher Education Publications, 6400 Arlington Boulevard, Falls Church, VA 22042. Telephone (703) 532-2300. ACE should have a pretty good list in about two months, which we are willing to share.

2. I am not sure what you mean by "factors influencing the final selection of a president." Do you mean selection criteria, circumstances in the institution, nature of search committee or process, or all of the above? There is very little hard research that I have come across about the search process; most of the literature is descriptive. I understand that David Reisman is working on a new book on presidential searches. Dick Chait has probably advised you to contact Marian Gade at the University of California, Central Office, who is an expert on the search process. Judith McLaughlin, at the Harvard School of Education, has collaborated with David Reisman on a number of projects and would be a helpful resource.

3. No, I am not aware of any instruments that would be designed to identify characteristics of new presidents other than our survey, which is limited to background information. (A copy of our questionnaire is
enclosed.) Again, I am not sure what you mean by "characteristics"—demographic data, skills and abilities, personality traits? If you are interested in the latter, there are a variety of psychological tests that could be used.

I hope this is helpful. Good luck with your dissertation.

Sincerely,

Madeleine F. Green
Vice President and Director
Center for Leadership Development
American Council on Education
APPENDIX F

INSTITUTIONS REPRESENTED BY CHAIRPERSONS
INSTITUTIONS REPRESENTED
BY CHAIRPERSONS

Abilene Christian University
Anoka-Ramsey Community College
Aquinas College
Barber-Scotia College
Bentley College
Bethany College
Brunswick College
California State University at Fresno
Cardinal Stritch College
Chabot College
Community College of Philadelphia
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University
Friends University
Galveston College
Guilford Technical Community College
Hardin-Simmons University
Hartford Seminary
Hollins College
Huntington College
John Tyler Community College
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Memphis State University
Middle Tennessee State University
Millikin University
Moore College of Art and Design
Normandale Community College
Northeastern Ohio Universities College of Medicine
Northern Montana College
North Hennepin Community College
Northwest Iowa Technical College
Oklahoma Panhandle State University
Palm Beach Atlantic College
Penn Valley Community College
Rio Salado Community College
Saint Bonaventure University
Saint John's College
Salem College
Salt Lake Community College
San Bernardino Valley College
School for International Training
Spokane Community College
Stanly Community College
Suffolk Community College
Sul Ross State University
Suomi College
Syracuse University
Thiel University
Trinidad State Junior College
University of Alaska
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor
University of Montana
University of New Hampshire
University of Pittsburgh
University of San Francisco
Viterbo College
Western Oklahoma State College
William Tyndale College
Wilson College
York College
APPENDIX G

SEARCH COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON SURVEY
SEARCH COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON SURVEY

Please answer the following questions. Some answers require a check mark, others require short, written responses. When completed, please return in the enclosed envelope.

1) How were you selected to serve on the search committee?
   _____ Elected
   _____ Appointed

2) Do you serve on the board for the institution?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

   a. If yes, in what capacity do you serve the board?

   How long have you been on the board? ________________

   Did you have previous experience in higher education?  _____ Yes  _____ No

   If yes, specify the capacity. ____________________________

   b. If no, what specific relationship to the institution led to your selection to the search committee?

   __________________________________________________________________________________________

3) What is your occupation? ________________________________

4) Are you an alumni of this institution?
   _____ Yes  _____ No

5) How many candidates were considered as finalists for the presidency? ________________
6) In your opinion, what influenced the search committee
to recommend your president over the other finalists?

7) Considering your answer in question number 6, to what
degree did the following influence the selection of
your president? Please circle the best description for
each category. Factors within parentheses should help
describe the categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Not Influential</th>
<th>Not Very Influential</th>
<th>Somewhat Influential</th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Most Influential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal** (age, sex, race, marital status, political/religious preference, education, experience, personal habits, competencies, personal attributes, education & administrative philosophy)

**Performance** (administrative responsibilities, board relations, faculty relations, student relations, staff relations, public relations, professional responsibilities, personnel policies)

**Participation** (faculty activities, student activities, professional associations, civic activities, political activities, religious activities, spouse involvement in activities, group organization activities)

**Friendship** (individual board members, college staff, students, organization leaders, education leaders, members of the press, individuals of economic importance, factional leaders)
LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Dear President _________:

I am a Ph.D. candidate in Higher Education Administration at the University of North Texas. Currently I am working on my dissertation.

My research involves the factors that influenced your selection as president of (name of institution). This research should reveal if there are unique qualities among the presidents that led to the search committee recommending them for the office of president.

The subjects of the research are presidents elected to their position as reported by The Chronicle of Higher Education (between June 1, 1990 and May 31, 1991). According to the Chronicle, you are in that category. I do realize your selection was prior to the release in the Chronicle and may have been prior to June 1, 1990. I still would appreciate your participation in the research.

Hopefully, the responses to this research will assist individuals and search committees in the future.

If you are willing to participate in the research, I need you to return the enclosed participation card that includes the name, address and phone number of the chairperson of the search committee that recommended you as president, and the president survey.

The chairperson will be mailed a copy of the survey to complete. You will find an enclosed copy of the survey. Please review the chairperson survey and indicate any changes that you feel should be made. If you do not believe changes are necessary, you need not return the chairperson survey.

You will find a self-addressed stamped envelope for your convenience to return the following items to the researcher: 1) Participation card that includes name, address and phone number of the chairperson of the selection committee, 2) President's survey, 3) Copy of the chairperson survey indicating changes that should be made.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in this research.

Sincerely,

Gary Waller, Ed.D./Candidate for Ph.D.
Enclosures (4)
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PERMISSION FORM
PERMISSION FORM

Institution Permission

Permission is granted for using (name of institution) in this research.

Chairperson of the presidential search committee was:

Name

Address

City, State, Zip

Telephone Number

Signed ____________________________, President
APPENDIX J

PRESIDENT SURVEY
PRESIDENT SURVEY

1) Type of Institution
   _____ Community College
   _____ College
   _____ University
   _____ Graduate School

2) Type of Support
   _____ State
   _____ Private
   _____ Church

3) Age of Institution
   _____ 0-5 years
   _____ 6-10 years
   _____ 11-20 years
   _____ 21-30 years
   _____ 31-50 years
   _____ 51-100 years
   _____ 101 +

4) How many presidents have served your institution?

5) Past presidents served for how many years? ____________

6) The previous president left office because of
   _____ Death; _____ Retirement; _____ Accepted another
   presidency; _____ Accepted another position in higher
   education; _____ Left the academic community;
   _____ Forced resignation

   If forced to resign, what was the main factor that led
   to the resignation?

   ___________________________________________
   ___________________________________________
   ___________________________________________
7) Your age
   _____ 30 or below
   _____ 31-35
   _____ 36-40
   _____ 41-45
   _____ 46-50
   _____ 51-55
   _____ 56-60
   _____ 61-65
   _____ 66-70
   _____ 70 or above

8) Your sex
   _____ Female   _____ Male

9) Educational Background (indicate highest degree received)
   _____ Doctorate: Kind and Institution______________________________
   _____ Masters: Kind and Institution______________________________
   _____ Other: Specify__________________________________________

10) Prior to assuming this position, most of your work experience had been in what area? (example: education, business)

   ________________________________________________________________

11) What position did you hold prior to this presidency?

   ________________________________________________________________

12) In your opinion, why were you selected for this position over the other finalists?

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

13) Why did you accept this position?

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX K

PARTICIPATING SCHOOL CODES
PARTICIPATING SCHOOL CODES

Code Legend:

*: No Search  CC: Community College  S: State Committee  C: College  P: Private Survey  U: University  C: Church Returned, Not Included in Findings  G: Graduate School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Number</th>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Type of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110*</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132*</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Number</td>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td>Type of Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137*</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154*</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160*</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170*</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175*</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

PRESIDENT FOLLOW-UP LETTER
Dear President __________:

Over three weeks ago, I sent you a letter explaining research I am conducting for my dissertation. I am a Ph.D. candidate in Higher Education Administration at the University of North Texas. The study will be strengthened with the participation of your institution.

When developing my dissertation proposal, the original selection dates were those mentioned in my first letter to you. However, when I presented my proposal for approval, we changed the dates to June 1, 1990 through May 31, 1991. The date changes were made in a small sample letter sent out for the purpose of content validation of the survey form. I assumed that was a permanent change in the word processor. I am aware your non-response could be due to the older dates in the original letter.

In case the materials I sent you have been misplaced, I am including additional copies of the permission form and the president survey. Thank you for taking the time to complete them.

You will find a self-addressed stamped envelope for your convenience to mail the completed forms to me.

Sincerely,

Gary Waller, Ed.D./Ph.D. Candidate

Enclosures (4)
APPENDIX M

LETTER TO CHAIRPERSON OF SEARCH COMMITTEE
LETTER TO CHAIRPERSON OF SEARCH COMMITTEE

Dear __________:

I am a Ph.D. candidate in Higher Education Administration at the University of North Texas. My dissertation topic is related to criteria in the selection of presidents for higher education institutions. This research should assist in determining the influencing factors that led to the candidate being chosen as president.

Subjects of the study are presidents that were elected during the period between June 1, 1990 and May 31, 1991, according to The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Your name was given to me by (name of president). Your president indicated you were chairperson for (name of institution) as they searched for a new president. Your president has given permission to allow your university to be involved in this research.

Your participation in this research will contribute to the usefulness of the results. Take a few moments to complete the enclosed questionnaire. Return your completed survey in the self-addressed stamped envelope.

Thank you for your willingness and time to participate in this special project.

Sincerely,

Gary Waller, Ed.D./Ph.D. Candidate

Enclosures (2)
APPENDIX N

CHAIRPERSON FOLLOW-UP LETTER
CHAIRPERSON FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Dear ________:

Three weeks ago I sent you a letter and survey form related to my dissertation research at the University of North Texas. Your participation in the survey will strengthen the findings.

In case you have misplaced the survey, I have included another for you. I have also included another self-addressed stamped envelope for your mailing convenience.

Thank you,

Gary Waller, Ed.D./Ph.D. Candidate

Enclosures (2)
APPENDIX O

FACTOR SCORES
## FACTOR SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School #</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School #</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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