



1-1-1986

The Development of Higher Education Administration as a Profession

Vineta S. Belden
Kansas State University

Helen G. Cooper
Kansas State University

Samone L. Jolly
Kansas State University

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/edconsiderations>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](#).

Recommended Citation

Belden, Vineta S.; Cooper, Helen G.; Jolly, Samone L.; and Sand, James L. (1986) "The Development of Higher Education Administration as a Profession," *Educational Considerations*: Vol. 13: No. 1. <https://doi.org/10.4148/0146-9282.1677>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Educational Considerations* by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. For more information, please contact cads@k-state.edu.

The Development of Higher Education Administration as a Profession

Authors

Vineta S. Belden, Helen G. Cooper, Samone L. Jolly, and James L. Sand

The forces that contributed to specialization and diversification are changing.

The Development of Higher Education Administration as a Profession

by Vineta S. Belden, Helen G. Cooper, Samone L. Jolly and James L. Sand

Historical Background

The development of higher education administration as a profession is a concept that evolved in recent history. With the exception of the office of the president, the idea of an individual fulfilling a purely administrative function within an institution of higher education was rare in this country until the end of the 19th century. Even the presidency was not totally administrative until late 1800s; prior to that he was not only *the* administrator, but also the primary teacher. (23)

Near the beginning of the century, various factors affecting higher education began to surface. Those factors, in turn, had an impact on higher education administration. The impact was two-pronged: specialization and diversification. Specialization refers to the increasingly narrow focus of each individual's function within the institution. Diversification implies that there is an increased number of functions undertaken. The dual impact is easily observable; however, the factors that prompted the change are more complex.

Specialization grew to meet the increasing complexity of higher education in general. Diversification, on the other hand, came as a result of institutional changes.

Factors bringing about increased specialization include an ever increasing number of people attending higher education institutions, the expansion of knowledge, and government involvement in higher education.

Relative to the increasing number of students, the most obvious reason is the increased population. As John J. Corson pointed out in *The Governance of Colleges and Universities*, "the population of college-going age . . . grew approximately 50 percent from the years 1939 to 1969 and an-

other 10 percent in the three years after that." (12) Not only did the size of the population grow, but the percentage of people within that population attending institutions of higher education also grew, along with the idea that all young people should have the opportunity for an education beyond high school. Coupled with this contention was the concurrent belief that graduating from a four-year institution would bring increased socioeconomic status. (23)

The expansion of knowledge is demonstrated by the transformation of college and university faculties. The early American colleges had a small faculty, generally recent graduates who stayed for a few years before moving on to a permanent occupation. They taught all subjects, and for the most part, stayed with a single class for four years. (10) As the body of formal knowledge grew, the number of faculty increased and changed from young generalists to ambitious, research-trained holders of the Ph.D., who were determined to make permanent careers of their academic disciplines. For example, by 1891, Harvard had reorganized into 12 divisions, each of which included at least one department. (41)

Karol and Ginsburg (23) concluded that all institutions and corporations are greatly affected by government involvement and regulations on all levels, and that institutions of higher education were not excepted. They point out that the latter are even more affected than most in several areas. The most obvious is funding, ranging from direct state funding to public institutions, to state subsidy programs for independent institutions, to financial aid programs that give indirect benefits to the institutions of their choice. (8) Other areas of government involvement cited are: approval of programs and degrees, chartering of institutions, affirmative action involvement in staff and student affairs, access provision for the handicapped and graduate assistantships. (23)

Alan Pifer in "The Responsibility for Reform in Higher Education" (12) describes our universities as "gigantic service stations principally for government and the larger corporations. He enumerates 13 functions which universities have been called on to perform, few of which are related to academics while others have no logical association with higher education, but have become expected services. These conditions have created a need to establish and administer functions that did not exist in the past. This, coupled with the rapid development of higher education, explains to some extent the problems of today.

The forces that contributed to specialization and diversification are changing. These changes are affecting, and will continue to affect, the development of higher education administration as a profession. First, enrollments, in general, have stabilized or decreased. This is due to both the shrinking of pool of typical college-aged students and the diminishing of the belief that a diploma from a four-year institution is the way up the socioeconomic ladder. An increasing number of people are seeing community or technical colleges as better long-range alternatives that get them into the job market faster with less financial investment.

Declining enrollments have also caused a struggle for survival in smaller institutions and major efforts to temper losses among larger schools. Stiffer competition among institutions has arisen as each tries to maintain previous levels of enrollment. This has strong implications for higher education administration. Institutions which are unable to stem this tide may find themselves with administrative departments exceeding current needs. Whereas specialization had been both a necessity and a luxury during the highwater mark of enrollment, it may now be necessary to

Vineta S. Belden, Helen G. Cooper, Samone L. Jolly and James L. Sand are graduate students at Kansas State University, Manhattan.

Educational Considerations, Vol. 13, No. 1, Winter 1986

cut back during recession. As a consequence, an administrator who formerly had a narrow full-time field of responsibility may now be asked to broaden that scope and perform duties once assigned to others. Flexible administrators will adapt; others may be in precarious positions as the institutions attempt to consolidate positions to reduce expenditures.

Although specialization will tend to decrease, diversification, on the other hand, will remain stable or probably increase to meet the new consolidated functions. In addition, some departments undertake functions not previously attempted, in order to maintain department size.

Overall, higher education administration will be less characterized by specialization. But, individual administrators, along with institutions, will continue to diversify in order to preserve the status quo.

Stages of Program Development

The first stage of program development of the graduate educational administration curricula begins with the first quarter of the 20th century. In its early development, the focus of the curriculum was primarily on the practical content, featuring information about educational policies in cases where administrators needed common understanding for implementation purposes or specific problems of practice. (13) As programs grew, concepts were borrowed from other disciplines. The concept of "job" became the critical focus for studying administration—dividing the job into different functions and organizing work to increase efficiency were the key considerations. For example, job orientation using the industrial administration model was copied by educational institutions of higher learning into curriculum content; e.g., Luther Gulick's planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting. Graduate students and professors spent much of their time researching practical problems.

In the second quarter of the 20th century, the focus of study and training shifted from the jobs to people. Human relations emerged from the research findings of informal activities within various organizations. An example, is the "halo effect" from the Hawthorne study on the productivity. These findings stimulated research to find solutions/answers to this phenomena and later led to formal studies concerning human behavior in the work environment.

By the 1940s, democratic administration was highlighted in books and widely expounded in programs as well as practice. The emphasis was on functional tasks and human relationships. Job functions became content within curricula as personnel management, school-community relations, business management, curriculum development, and supervision. Ideas, such as "individual worth and dignity," were stressed. (13)

The "new movement" of the 1950s began to impact on administrator preparation from the major research institutions, especially in the United States, Canada and Australia. The move toward the "science of administration" as a goal to the production of effective theories of administration prompted research to study descriptions, explanations and predictions about administration and organizational behavior. More social science content was incorporated into the administrative program of study, as well as reality-oriented materials used with case and simulation situations. The focus moved away from the administrator as a human-relations expert to one of the administrator needing to be a skilled analyst who used theories of groups, organizations and communities in order to cope with management tasks

and challenges. In other words, the "new movement" embraced the concept of "administration qua administration," (13, 22, 29) whereby administration was viewed as similar in all organizations—educational, business, government, etc. During the 1960s, the "what is" theory continued. But, practicing administrators began to challenge this simplex approach to the complex problems they encountered. In turn, professors began to question the appropriateness of this model. The difficult policy issues in society during the late '60s and early '70s moved the emphasis to organizational missions and environments focusing on their uniqueness (13, 22, 29)

In the 1970s, research began to be more diverse. Qualitative and inductive approaches to knowledge development were being seen as appropriate processes in administration. The policy-research centers addressed both the "is" and "what ought to be" of administrative programs. Organizational development continued to be the theme for research studies. The specific question in the late '70s as studied by Daniel Griffiths and others, was "what knowledge is most valid and useful to those studying and practicing educational administration?" (13, 20, 17) As the 1980s emerged so did a pattern of pluralism. Knowledge in administration began to change to the viewpoint that administration content and/or practice was self-limiting in terms of scope and transferability (especially in the educational, societal and cultural contexts). (13, 20, 22, 29)

The impact of the "new movement" continues into the 1980s. This is particularly true of doctoral programs in the United States. Administrative theory courses are frequently offered within most of these preparatory programs. (13)

A new meaning of management is emerging out of the cybernetic systems theory. Adam Smith contends "... that formal organizations are (or are like) a giant computer with its input and output, its feedback loops, and its programs. This machine—the organization—is in turn guided by a servo-mechanism—the techno-administrative elite." (7) Education is now moving toward mass education through the use of computerized instruction in the classroom. (14)

Trends

The trends influencing educational administration preparatory programs are basically four: population, internationalization, societal change, and external agencies offering inservice training. The population dynamics continue to influence schools (birth rate growth and decline causing overabundance of programs developed in the '60s, and '70s). Today, this makes the challenge one of preparing fewer administrators more effective. The second trend affecting preservice educational administration is the internationalization of education administration. Organizations, such as the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration, the European Forum on Educational Administration, the Inter-American Society for Educational Administration and the University Council for Educational Administration, have diffused administrator study and preparation worldwide. Journals (i.e., *Journal of Educational Administration and Educational Administration Quarterly*) have also influenced this diffusion. The third trend is the one of unusual societal changes which force leaders in education to update and redesign preparatory programs to meet the resultant needs created. The fourth trend is the increasing number of external agencies creating inservice training. As professional organizations grew and matured, they began to assume greater responsibility for filling the gap between preservice and practice. This is due to the criticism by prac-

tioners of the "utility of training programs in preparing them to deal with the realities of managerial work and potential radical changes brought about by technological advances." (13, 17, 24, 28, 44) Basically, the complaints focus on three features of preservice training:

1. Lack of graduate faculty with public school administrator experience.
2. Lack of application of theory knowledge to actual situations.
3. Lack of theory relevance due to non-usage of practitioners in teaching/course development. (13, 17, 24, 28, 44)

Management Theories Adapted by Higher Education Administrators

Until the 20th century, management functions were primarily performed on a small scale basis. Management was not a major topic of concern. However, the increasing number of managers and complexities in management created by the industrial revolution led to the development of management theory.

Rausch (33) outlines the evolution of management theory from four major foundations: management science, the behavioral sciences, the management cycle, and management by objectives. **Management science**, whose establishment as a separate discipline is credited to Frederick Taylor, concentrates on the efficiency of the way the individual employee performs tasks. The **behavioral sciences**, which developed considerably later than management science, explored the way people behaved in their work environment and the influence their behavior had on the amount and quality of work output. The **management cycle** deals with how to make the manager's work more effective so that the people who report to the manager will achieve improved results. **Management by objectives** is an outgrowth of the management cycle that deals with the supervision of goals. It is a significant refinement of, and in some major ways supersedes, the management cycle, although many managers today view it as an independent concept.

The Theory Z technique developed by William Ouchi, builds on all four foundations and uses them to create a comprehensive framework to provide guidance for administrators in higher education who want to improve the performance of their units. Theory Z management is a model for positive administrative change.

The higher education administrator must thoroughly understand the management concepts discussed in order to apply the appropriate concept to match his or her leadership style. Application of the appropriate management concept to leadership style can be a foundation for achieving effectiveness and excellence in the organization.

By the turn of the 20th century, leadership in American public education had gravitated from the part-time educational evangelists who had created the common-school system, to a new breed of professional managers who made education a lifelong career and who were reshaping the schools according to canons of business efficiency and scientific expertise. The educational administrators of this progressive era had an interest in moral and civic training, a passion for efficiency, and a desire to combine new bureaucratic techniques with traditional ideals of character. (42) Instead of trying to mobilize local citizens to act, the 20th century administrators sought to take schools out of the political arena and to shift decision making upward and inward in hierarchical systems of management.

In the fall of 1910, America was captured by a new idea that came out of the nation's capital. That idea was a new system of industrial management known as "scientific management," developed by Frederick Taylor. As early as February 1911, educators began responding publicly to the demand to apply scientific management to school administration. One of the leading educational administrators in the period between 1915-1934, Ellwood P. Cubberley, dean of the School of Education at Stanford, described the emergence of scientific management and of educational efficiency experts as "one of the most significant movements in all of our education history." Cubberley added that this movement would "change the whole character of school administration." (10)

Higher education experimented with the succeeding management approaches: applying information technology and automation, management by objectives (MBO), modern organization theory and contingency theory. But by the 1960s and 1970s, administrators began to wonder who controlled the university/college system. Administrators did not know how to behave. During the 1970s, existing management techniques and applications appeared inadequate to cope with declining productivity and deterioration of employee morale and motivation. Management practitioners and philosophers continued to search for a better approach to solving today's complex organizational problems.

Currently, the Theory Z style appears to have positive aspects. Its principal objective is developing an organization characteristic with a cohesive culture. The organizational style is a democratic/human relations process. There is an organizational climate of caring, support and mutual trust. The result of this wholistic orientation is greater productivity and increased employee satisfaction. Theory Z, adapted for use in higher education, challenges the traditional static notion of authority and provides a model for positive administrative change for the 1980s (Redinbaugh and Redinbaugh, 1983 0. 30).

Leadership Skills: 1985 and Beyond

In the past, leaders have often simply emerged. They have drifted into positions of leadership or have been drafted for leadership roles. Reliance on emergent leadership is no longer sufficient. More highly organized and deliberate attempts to develop leadership are called for. Leadership development programs are often sponsored by local governments, school districts, business organizations and institutions of higher education.

Prospective leaders are taught what is known about leadership through the use of diagnostic instruments in an attempt to ascertain a participant's management/leadership styles, personality characteristics and psychological attributes, etc. Cunningham (16) describes some of the leadership skills that can serve as valuable aids of leadership/management in the future

1. Focusing on the present and future simultaneously—dealing with change.
2. Appraisal skills—ability to pass judgment on a range of matters.
3. Managing symbols—behavior creates images in constituencies that become basis for appraisals.
4. The leader as teacher—know the mission, goals and objectives and teach them continuously.

The Presidency

The presidency, the highest administrative office on a college or university campus, should represent the ultimate and best indicator of where higher education administration is heading. To better understand the role of president, it is necessary to again reflect on the history of higher education, its growth, historical changes, social developments and the economy.

Using Kansas State University, one of the first land-grant universities in the country, as an example, its choice of presidents mirrors this history. The first three presidents—Denison, Anderson, and Fairchild—were ministers; the next nine—Will, Nichols, Waters, Jardine, Farrell, McCain and Acker, with the exception of Milton Eisenhower—were primarily academics who worked their way up through the ranks of first faculty member, then department head, and eventually dean or other successive administrative or leadership positions. (11, 43)

The levels of administration have remained basically the same: state Legislature and governor at the top; Board of Regents next; president reporting to the Board of Regents; and across the organizational chart, academic and support staff.

On the academic side of the traditional provost or vice president for academic affairs leads deans and department heads below with little change. The difference has occurred in the support staff area—vice presidents for business, student affairs, facilities and numerous levels below to provide accounting, personnel, housing, legal and counseling services. The numbers and levels have multiplied. (7)

The dispersion of power from the president has resulted in the present reassessment of the position. Comments such as "omnipotent to impotent," and "minister to manipulator" are becoming realistic definitions or descriptions. (26, 28, 46) The emphasis on knowledge of business and management practices, fund raising, and communication is consistently promoted, indicating that the president and university leadership is going farther away from the academic background to the professional administrator. (18, 26, 27, 29)

How true is this contention? Kansas State University is again seeking to fill the position of university president. The advertisement and position description is asking for someone who can:

"... articulate a vision of what the university can be in the coming decades... inspire public confidence... communicate... an appreciation for the appropriate place of instruction, research, student recruitment and retention, cooperative extension and intercollegiate athletics... present evidence of exemplary leadership... include accomplishment in human motivation, strategic planning... possess scholarly academic credentials; an earned doctorate or appropriate terminal degree."

None of these requirements differ a great deal from what was needed or sought for the past 50 years. Especially the "academic credentials." Nowhere does it require studies in administration, degrees in management, or other evidence of educational preparation.

After studying the history and development of higher education administration, through the growth period, both in size, complexity and sophistication, the question needs to be asked again. Is higher education administration becoming a profession—are the leaders of our universities trained in "a vocation requiring knowledge of some departments of learning or science?" (Rand McNally definition of

a profession). Is the next generation going to represent people trained as administrators, rather than academics? Public opinion and the literature review of higher education say it is. Practical and current indications say no—at least not on the academic side or at the level of the president. There is a preponderance of professional types on the service side of the organizational chart and they may eventually extend to the level of the Board of Regents, Legislature and the governor.

However, the other side appears to be staying with the status quo. A review of the "Bulletin Board" section of **The Chronicle of Higher Education** supports this contention. The primary requirement for deans and department heads is still a scholarly faculty background and is carried through to the position of president. Except for small, private, special institutions, most schools want to promote the academic image as the prime focus. The day when the department of mechanical engineering hires a non-mechanical engineer graduate of higher education administration for department head, does not seem to be nearing. As Provost Neil L. Rudenstine of Princeton University was quoted in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, "I don't think you can be an academic administrator unless you are first an academic... I think it would be odd to start out trying to be an academic administrator." (40)

It appears that in the future the requirements for president will continue to be that of academician, but with specific traits to meet the challenges of both internal and external forces. The primary concerns will continue to be the dealing with "competition between groups or individuals for power and leadership." This quote is the definition of politics from the Webster dictionary. Therefore, the image of the next generation of presidents is not the professional administrator, but the scholar/politician.

Conclusion

In summary, higher education administration will need to change course in the next decade. Historically, it has paid little attention to the internal and external factors influencing its environment. Traditional methods of academic administration were adequate for almost a century of growth. Today, however, higher education is being challenged by insufficient financing, outdated curricula, ineffective use of resources, and declining enrollments. To overcome these odds it may need to become less specialized, and more diversified at both the individual and curriculum level. This must be reflected in the knowledge available and required by all educators, since these professional skills may be necessary for survival.

Vineta S. Belden, Helen G. Cooper, Samone L. Jolly and James L. Sand are graduate students at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.

References

1. Andrews, J., "International Perspective on the Preparation of Educational Administrators." In: Farquhar, R.H., Housego, I.E., (eds.) **Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration**. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia. 1980.
2. Bacharach, S.B. and S.M. Mitchell. "The Sources of Dissatisfaction in Educational Administration: A Role-Specific Analysis." **Educational Administration Quarterly**. Winter 1983. 19(1) 101-128
3. Bekalis, M.J., "Power and Purpose in American Educa-

- tion," *Phi Delta Kappan*, September 1983, 7-18.
4. Balderston, F.E. **Managing Today's University**. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.
 5. Blackwell, T.E. **College and University Administration**. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.
 6. Bledstein, B.J. **The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America**. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1976.
 7. Brown, A., "How the Administration Grows: A Longitudinal Study of Growth in Administration at Four Universities," *Research In Higher Education*, 14, 1981, 335-387.
 8. Brown, R.H., "Bureaucracy as Praxis: Toward a Political Phenomenology of Formal Organizations," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1978, 23, 364-382.
 9. Brubacher, J.S. and W. Rudy. **Higher Education in Transition**. New York Harper & Row, 1976.
 10. Callahn, R.E. **Education And The Cult Of Efficiency**. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.
 11. Carey, J.C. **Kansas State University: A Quest for Identity**. Lawrence, Kan.: Regents Press of Kansas, 1977.
 12. Corsan, J.J. **The Governance of Colleges and Universities**. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1975.
 13. Culbertson, J. "Educational Administration: Where We are and Where We are Going." In: Farquhar, R.H., Housego, I.E. (eds.), **Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration**. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, 1980.
 14. Culbertson, J.A., "Leadership Horizons in Education," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Summer 1983, 19(3), 273-296.
 15. Culbertson, J., et al. **Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders**. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1972.
 16. Cunningham, L.L., "Leaders and Leadership: 1985 and Beyond," *Phi Delta Kappan*, September 1985, 17-20.
 17. Educational Research Service, "Inservice Programs for School Administrators and Supervisors," *Educational Research Service*, Arlington, Va. 1974.
 18. Ferrari, M.R. **Profiles of American College Presidents**. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1970.
 19. Greenfield, T., "Theory about Organization: A New Perspective and its Implications for Schools." In: Hughes, M.G. (ed.), **Administering Education: International Challenge**. London: Athlone Press, 1975.
 20. Griffiths, D.E., "Intellectual Turmoil in Educational Administration," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 15(3), 43-65.
 21. Griffiths, D.E., "Evaluations in Research and Theory: A Study of Permanent Resources," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Summer 1983, 19(3), 201-221.
 22. Hess, F., "Evolution in Practice," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Summer 1983, 19(3), 223-248.
 23. Karol, N.H. and Ginsburg, S.G. **Managing the Higher Education Enterprise**. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1980.
 24. Kent, R.A. (ed.). **Higher Education in America**. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1930.
 25. Kerr, C. **The Uses of the University**. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
 26. Knight, W.H., "The American College and University President: From Minister to Manipulator," Graduate Paper, Kansas State University.
 27. Mayhew, L., "Emerging Concepts of the Presidency," *Journal of Higher Education*, 42(5), 353-367.
 28. McClenney, B.N., "The President as Manager," *Community and Junior College Journal*, April 1978, 48(7), 26-33.
 29. Miklos, E., "Evolution in Administrator Preparation Programs," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Summer 1983, 19(3) 153-177.
 30. Miller, T.K., Winston, R.B., Jr., and Mendenhall, W.R., (eds.). **Administration and Leadership in Student Affairs**. Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development, Inc., 1983.
 31. Orlin, L.L., "The Concept of an Apolitical University," *The Journal of General Education*, Summer 1981, 23(2), 93-101.
 32. Owens, R.G. **Organizational Behavior In Education**. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981.
 33. Rausch, E. (ed.). **Management in Institutions of Higher Learning**. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1980.
 34. Redinbaugh, L.D. and D.F., "Theory Z Management at Colleges and Universities," *Educational Record*, Winter 1983, 26-30.
 35. Rudolph, F. **The American College and University: A History**. New York: Random House, 1962.
 36. Silver, P. and D. Spuck. **Preparatory Programs for Educational Administrators in the United States**. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1978.
 37. Spindler, G., "The Role of the School Administrator," In: **Education and Culture: Anthropological Approaches**. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.
 38. Stauffer, T.M. (ed.). **Quality—Higher Education's Principal Challenge**. Washington, D.C.: American Council of Education, 1981.
 39. Stoke, H.W. **The American College President**. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.
 40. **The Chronicle of Higher Education**. "Launching a Successful Career in Academe: 32 Administrators and Professors Offer Advice," September 4, 1985, 42.
 41. **The Chronicle of Higher Education**. "Typical Chief Academic Office," November 27, 1985, 1.
 42. **The Control of the Campus**. Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982.
 43. Tyak, D. and Hansot, E. **Managers of Virtue**. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1982.
 44. Willard, J.T. **History of Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science**. Manhattan, Kan.: Kansas State College Press, 1940.
 45. Willower, D.J., "Evolution in the Professorship: Past, Philosophy, Future," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Summer 1983, 19(3), 179-200.
 46. Wygal, B.R., "The President as Manipulator," *Community and Junior College Journal*, April 1978, 48(7), 6-8.
 47. Zuelke, D.C., "Somebody Does It Right: Field Experience for Preservice Administrators," *Phi Delta Kappan*, December 1983, 296.