

THEY EARNED DEGREES IN
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

A Follow-Up Study of Graduates
with Specialist and Doctor's Degrees
in Educational Administration

THEY EARNED DEGREES IN
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

A Follow-Up Study of Graduates
with Specialist and Doctor's Degrees
in Educational Administration

By
Clifford P. Hooker, Professor
Department of Educational Administration
University of Minnesota

Spring, 1978

1170
3851
91221

List of Tables

Number		Page
1	Population in the Study.	1
2	Age when Highest Degree was Awarded.	3
3	Year when Highest Degree was awarded	4
4	Institution Granting Master's Degree	6
5	Position when Highest Degree was Earned.	8
6	Present Position	10
7	Current Annual Income.	12
8	Sex and Income	14
9	Race and Income.	15
10	Highest Degree and Income.	16
11	Journal Articles Published	18
12	Professional Work Expected of Professors	19
13	Value of Program components.	20
14	Ways to Improve Program.	21
15	Training Emphasis of Department.	23

POPULATION IN THE STUDY

The highest earned degree, sex, and race of the graduates who returned questionnaires are shown in Table 1. The 370 responses from the 465 graduates with specialists' and Doctor's degrees whom the Department of Educational Administration could identify represent an 80 per cent return. The distribution of persons who failed to respond did not differ significantly from those who completed questionnaires on any of the known variables such as sex, highest degree, race, and income. There was some indication, however, that a higher proportion of the most recent graduates returned completed questionnaires.

The emphasis on training at the Doctor's degree level is apparent in Table 1. More than three-fourths of the graduates have completed this level of education. Also, it is interesting to observe that the Ph.D. graduates outnumber Ed.D. graduates by more than two to one. While this may be explained in part by the fact that the Ed.D. degree is relatively new, this

TABLE 1
POPULATION IN STUDY
(N = 370)

Degree		Sex		Race	
Specialists	86 (23%)	Male	331 (89.6%)	Indian	7 (2%)
Ed. D.	92 (25%)	Female	38 (10.3%)	Black	20 (5%)
Ph. D.	190 (51.8%)	Blank	1 (.1%)	White	336 (91%)
Blank	2 (.2%)			Chicano	4 (1%)
				Blank	3 (1%)

fact does not account for most of the difference in the popularity of the two degrees. As shown later in this report only a few specialist's degrees and Ph.D. degrees were awarded prior to the Regents approval to grant Ed.D. degrees in 1967.

Two additional facts about the population in this study are worthy of note at this point. There is a preponderance of white males. Women account for but 10.3 per cent of the graduates, and only eight per cent of the graduates are of a minority race. This condition is not limited to the graduates in Educational Administration however. In 1976 Hooker¹ found that but 6.6 per cent of the school administrators in Minnesota are females. Minorities accounted for only 2 per cent of the total. Given this comparison it is evident that the Department of Educational Administration is leading the state in the training and placing of females and minorities in leadership roles in education.

¹Clifford P. Hooker, The Supply and Demand of Public School Administrators, Department of Educational Administration, University of Minnesota, Spring, 1976. pp. 8-9.

AGE WHEN HIGHEST DEGREE WAS AWARDED

As expected the persons completing Specialist's and Doctor's degrees are a relatively mature group. Most of them have a background of teaching and administrative experience before finishing their training in administration.

As shown in Table 2 the median age of the graduates was between 35 and 39 at the time the degree was awarded. Strangely this is only six years below the median age of all Minnesota school administrators.² Clearly

TABLE 2
AGE WHEN HIGHEST DEGREE WAS AWARDED

Age	No.	% of Total	Cum. Adj. %
Under 25	1	.3	.3
25 - 29	23	6.2	6.5
30 - 34	84	22.7	29.4
35 - 39	94	25.4	55.0
40 - 44	93	25.1	80.4
45 - 49	46	12.4	92.9
50 - 54	22	5.9	98.9
Over 55	4	1.1	100.0
Blank	3	.8	100.0
TOTAL	370	----	100.0

advanced graduate study for many Educational Administration students is a mid-career experience.

²See Clifford P. Hooker, Ibid., pp. 6-7.

YEAR WHEN HIGHEST DEGREE WAS AWARDED

The data in Table 3 reveal more about the Department of Educational Administration than its graduates. First, it is clear that the Department is a relatively new unit in the College of Education. One-half of the graduates have completed degrees in the past five years and over three-fourths of the production has occurred since 1969. These facts make it virtually impossible to make a truly long-range follow-up study. Those career changes and insights which develop over a longer time-span must wait to be illuminated by another researcher at a later date.

TABLE 3
YEAR WHEN HIGHEST DEGREE WAS AWARDED

Year	No.	% of Total	Cum. Adj. %
1976	32	8.7	8.7
1975	47	12.8	21.6
1974	47	12.8	34.4
1973	33	9.0	43.4
1972	24	6.6	50.0
1971	33	9.0	59.0
1970	31	8.5	67.5
1969	33	9.0	76.5
1968	23	6.3	82.8
1967	15	4.1	86.9
1966	7	1.9	88.8
1961-65	31	8.4	97.3
1955-60	8	2.2	99.5
Before 1955	2	.5	100.0
Blank	4	1.1	-----
TOTAL	370	100.0	100.0

from the state universities to the University of Minnesota would seem to be reasonable. A stronger liaison between the Department of Educational Administration and the State Universities is needed. It would have the potential for recruiting the best graduates from programs in the state universities and help the Department of Educational Administration at the University expand its role and image to the training of leadership talent for the entire state--not just the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

POSITION WHEN HIGHEST DEGREE WAS EARNED

Persons close to programs in Educational Administration have long recognized the dual functions of pre-service and in-service training. Many students are holding important administrative posts while pursuing an advanced degree, and others are preparing for their first position as an administrator. The data in Table 5 support this perception and add some refinement. The preponderance of students were administrators at the time they received their highest degree. It follows that classes in Educational Administration at the University included a large component of in-service education for them. However, as the data in Table 5 indicates, many of these same students were aspiring for promotions to higher levels of administration and to other positions. In this sense, the pre-service needs of

TABLE 5
POSITION WHEN HIGHEST DEGREE WAS EARNED

POSITION	NO.	%	CUM. ADJ. %
Teacher	15	4.1	4.1
Assistant Principal	47	12.7	17.1
Principal	76	20.5	38.0
Central Office	56	15.1	53.4
Superintendent	34	9.2	62.8
College Teacher	56	15.1	78.2
2 Yr. College Admin.	13	3.5	81.8
4 Yr. College Admin.	12	3.2	85.1
Government Agency	18	4.9	90.1
Other	36	9.7	100.0
Blank	7	1.9	100.0
TOTAL	370	100.0	100.0

students were apparent. Given this duality in goals and the diversity of positions held by students in Educational Administration, the offering of meaningful instructional experiences is extraordinarily complex.

PRESENT POSITION

The diversity of the graduates in Educational Administration is reflected clearly in Table 6. While about 60 per cent of them are employed in elementary and secondary school systems, the balance occupy a variety of positions in colleges and government agencies. Moreover, about one in six identified as "other" in Table 7, listed positions not included on the questionnaire.

TABLE 6
PRESENT POSITION

POSITION	NO.	%	CUM. ADJ. %
Teacher	8	2.2	2.2
Assistant Principal	28	7.6	10.1
Principal	77	20.8	31.7
Central Office	50	13.5	45.7
Superintendent	48	13.0	59.1
College Teacher	33	8.9	68.3
2 Yr. College Admin.	17	4.6	73.1
4 Yr. College Admin.	24	6.5	79.8
Government Agency	15	4.1	84.0
Other	57	15.4	100.0
Blank	13	3.5	100.0
TOTAL	370	100.0	100.0

Some of the persons work for publishing houses, labor unions, and data processing companies, for example.

Recognizing that many Educational Administration students hold administrative posts at the time they receive advanced degrees one might wonder

about any position mobility following receipt of the degree. A comparison of the data in Tables 5 and 6 show some interesting career changes by the graduates. As expected there was a substantial erosion in the number of persons holding the lower level positions, such as teacher and assistant principal. The number of principals and central office administrators remained stable while there was an increase from 33 to 56 in the number of superintendents. These data, when viewed collectively, seem to reflect the normal progression of persons along the ladder to higher positions of responsibility. Even in those positions where the numbers have not changed, such as principal and central office administrator, it would be erroneous to conclude that the graduates have not been promoted. A more reasonable interpretation of the data is that persons from below these levels have replaced the incumbents who have been promoted to still higher ranks in administration.

The career changes for graduates who are not employed in the elementary and secondary school systems are far less predictable. Almost one-half of the college teachers moved on to other employment following the completion of their highest degree! Apparently several of these individuals moved went to four-year college administration, where the number doubled. Also, there was an important increase in the "other" category, reflecting the proliferation of positions in the education industry and the ability of Educational Administration graduates to function in a variety of roles.

CURRENT ANNUAL INCOME

The rather limited range of salaries in the education industry is revealed in Table 7. The salaries tend to cluster near a mean of approximately

TABLE 7
CURRENT ANNUAL INCOME (1976 - 77)

INCOME	NO.	%	CUM. ADJ. %
Under 10,000	3	.8	.8
10,000-14,999	3	.8	1.7
15,000-19,999	28	7.6	9.4
20,000-24,999	58	15.7	25.5
25,000-29,999	135	36.5	62.9
30,000-34,999	84	22.7	86.1
35,000-39,999	32	8.6	95.0
40,000-44,999	15	4.1	99.2
45,000-49,999	2	.5	99.7
50,000-Above	1	.3	100.0
Blank	9	2.4	100.0
TOTAL	370	100.0	100.0

\$30,000. Seventy-five per cent of the salaries were between \$20,000 and \$35,000, and 36 per cent of them were within the modal range of \$25,000 to \$29,999.

Another, and more impressive, observation is that most graduates of the Department of Educational Administration are paid relatively high salaries. Certainly the stereotype of the poor struggling educator is not supported by these data. Given salary increases of approximately 12 per cent since the data were collected, the mean salary in 1978 is approximately \$36,000.

SEX AND INCOME

Studies of the supply and demand of Minnesota school administrators by Hooker³ in 1973 and 1976 motivated him to conclude in the later study:

Possibly the strongest language in the 1973 study was used to report the shocking underrepresentation of women in management positions in education in Minnesota. The observation was made: 'The extinction of the female species among administrators is so nearly complete that only increases in the number of women in school administration would be worthy of note by future investigators.'

After examining the data for the 1976 study Hooker stated gloomily:

Regrettably to follow the advice given in the 1973 study would leave nothing 'worthy of note' in this report. The number of women in school administration positions in Minnesota declined from 202 in 1973 to 181 in 1975.

The data cited in the 1973 and 1976 studies suggest that women are not wanted or do not seek employment in school administration positions in Minnesota. The evidence in Table 8 is equally depressing for women. Those who managed to survive in the "white male club" were paid significantly less than men with equal levels of training. Women are over-represented nearly five to one in salaries below \$20,000 and completely missing from the three highest salary ranges in Table 8. The dearth of women in leadership roles in education might be related to the relatively small number of women who have completed advanced degrees. It is difficult to know, however, if few women are employed because of this fact or possibly few women seek such degrees because of the perceived discrimination in employment. This "chicken and egg" question may never be resolved. No such explanation, however, is readily available to account for the salary differentials which are shown in Table 8. Women earn approximately \$6000

³Clifford P. Hooker, Ibid, p. 8.

per year less than their male peers with the same professional preparation. Although a conclusion from these data that women are paid less than men

TABLE 8
SEX AND INCOME (1976-77)

INCOME	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
Under 10,000	1	.3	2	5.2	3	.2
10,000-14,999	2	.6	1	2.6	3	.2
15,000-19,999	19	5.8	9	23.8	28	7.6
20,000-24,999	51	15.6	6	15.8	57	15.3
25,000-29,999	126	38.5	9	23.8	135	36.1
30,000-34,999	80	24.5	4	10.5	84	22.7
35,000-39,999	30	9.2	2	5.2	32	8.6
40,000-44,999	15	4.6	0	0	15	4.0
45,000-49,999	2	.6	0	0	2	.2
50,000-Above	1	.1	0	0	1	.1
Blank (Income)	4	.2	5	13.1	9	---
TOTAL	331	100.0	38	---	369*	100.0

* One person did not indicate sex.

for the same work in educational institutions is unwarranted, the more limited conclusion that women with the same academic qualifications are employed in lower paying positions is inescapable.

RACE AND INCOME

Perhaps the most significant observation about Table 9 is the failure of the data to reveal any of the discrimination (or "reverse discrimination") which is often suspected. The salaries for all races tend to cluster near the mean of approximately \$30,000. Variations from this norm for American Indians and Chicanos may be attributable to the small number of persons of these races who are included. Similarly, the wider range of salaries for whites may be a function of the preponderance of this group in the total population of the study.

TABLE 9
RACE AND INCOME (1976-1977)

INCOME	Amer. Indian		Black		White		Chicano		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 10,000	0	0	0	0	2	.6	0	0	2	
10,000-14,999	0	0	1	5.0	2	.6	0	0	3	
15,000-19,999	1	14.3	4	20.0	23	6.8	0	0	28	
20,000-24,999	4	57.1	3	15.0	51	15.1	0	0	58	
25,000-29,999	0	0	8	40.0	124	36.9	1	25.0	133	
30,000-34,999	2	28.6	2	10.0	78	23.2	2	50.0	84	
35,000-39,999	0	0	1	5.0	30	9.0	1	25.0	32	
40,000-44,999	0	0	0	0	15	4.6	0	0	15	
45,000-49,999	0	0	0	0	2	.6	0	0	2	
50,000-Above	0	0	0	0	1	.3	0	0	1	
Blank (Income)	0	0	1	5.0	8	2.3	0	0	9	
TOTAL	7	100.0	20	100.0	336	100.0	4	0	367*	

* Three persons did not indicate race.

HIGHEST DEGREE AND INCOME

Students who are considering graduate study in Educational Administration often discuss the relative merits of the Specialist and Doctor's degrees. The analysis tends to follow a cost-benefit model. Will the Doctor's degree deliver benefits which are commensurate with the additional work and expense?

The data in Table 10 provide a partial answer to this question. The financial benefits of a Doctor's degree, when compared with a Specialist's degree, in Educational Administration are relatively meager. The principal

TABLE 10
HIGHEST DEGREE AND INCOME (1976-1977)

INCOME	<u>Specialist</u>		<u>Doctorate</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Under 10,000	1	1.2	2	.7
10,000-14,999	0	0	3	1.1
15,000-19,999	10	11.5	18	6.5
20,000-24,999	12	14.0	45	16.0
25,000-29,999	38	44.2	96	34.0
30,000-34,999	18	20.9	66	23.2
35,000-39,999	2	2.4	30	10.6
40,000-44,999	1	1.2	14	5.1
45,000-49,999	0	0	2	.7
50,000 & Above	0	0	1	.4
Blank (Income)	4	4.6	5	1.7
TOTAL	86	100.0	282	100.0

Two persons failed to report highest degree.

gains are at the top end of the scale. Seventeen per cent of the persons with the highest degree earn more than \$35,000 while only four per cent of the holders of Specialist's degrees are in this income bracket.

JOURNAL ARTICLES PUBLISHED

Ideally a follow-up study includes some measure of the success and performance of the graduates. In practice, however, most investigators have found this to be most difficult. Criteria of success are not easy to establish and performance standards are even more elusive.

Tables reported earlier in this study show the salaries and positions of the graduates. These are indicators of success. The single effort to make a direct assessment of performance was a question about the number of journal articles published since graduation. The rather gratifying results are shown in Table 11. Almost two-thirds of the graduates have done some

TABLE 11

NUMBER OF JOURNAL ARTICLES PUBLISHED BY GRADUATES

ARTICLES	NO.	CUM. %
None	132	36.8
1-2	110	67.4
3-4	56	83.0
5-6	17	87.7
7-8	13	91.4
9-10	14	95.3
11-12	2	95.8
More than 12	15	100.0
Blank	11	100.0
TOTAL	370	

publishing and a few have been rather prolific. Considering that one-half of the graduates have finished their degrees in the past five years, the number of journal articles published is rather impressive.

PROFESSIONAL WORK EXPECTED OF PROFESSORS

The graduates were asked to rate the importance of some rather common types of activities which occupy the attention and time of professors. A three-point scale--very important, important, and unimportant was used. The respondents were not restricted in the number of activities which they could rank at any point on the scale.

The data in Table 12 give a small glimpse of an apparent dilemma which Graduate School professors encounter. The graduates rated teaching, both campus and extension classes, far above research production. But, as every professor knows, the reward structure at the University is highly skewed toward research and writing. Happily though, there is a strong belief, supported by some evidence in the literature, that research production actually improves the quality of teaching. Accordingly, the dilemma of student expectations and the reward structure may be more imagined than real.

TABLE 12
PROFESSIONAL WORK EXPECTED OF PROFESSORS

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Rating</u>			
	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Unimportant</u>	<u>Blank</u>
Teach Extension Classes	27.6	41.4	18.0	13.0
Teach Campus Classes	76.0	12.2	1.0	10.8
Consulting	29.2	50.2	9.5	11.1
Publish Research	15.9	45.7	24.1	14.3

VALUE OF PROGRAM COMPONENTS

The professors of Educational Administration have good reason to be proud of the evidence which is reported in Table 13. The graduates rated Educational Administration courses; thesis or field study, and internship--all under the aegis of Educational Administration professors--as the most important components of their programs. The margin over other departments in the "very important" column was over two to one. This finding may come as a surprise, to many, including the advisers in Educational Administration. Most advisers include large blocks of credits from other departments in the programs which they file for their advisees. In many cases these "outside credits" account for one-half of the entire program. The press for such courses generally comes from the advisers and not from the students. Given the relatively low worth of some of these courses, as seen by the majors in Educational Administration, perhaps the advisers should inquire further into the quality and relevance of such courses before urging students to enroll in them.

TABLE 13

VALUE OF PROGRAM COMPONENTS

PROGRAM COMPONENT	VERY IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	UNIMPORTANT	BLANK
Ed. Ad. Courses	65.9	28.7	2.2	3.2
Research Training	31.4	47.6	12.4	8.6
Collateral Field	36.2	43.0	11.6	9.2
Ed. Psy. Courses	24.9	53.8	12.7	8.6
Curr. & Super. Courses	34.1	45.7	11.6	8.6
Hist. & Philosophy Courses	15.1	49.7	25.4	9.8
Thesis or Field Study	53.8	34.6	6.8	6.8
Internship*	37.6	15.1	5.9	41.4

* Adjusted frequency 64.1 Very Important; 25.8 Important; 10.1 Unimportant.

WAYS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

The Department of Educational Administration has received a considerable amount of solicited and unsolicited advise on how to improve the quality of its graduates. Two committees from outside the University and one from within have proffered a long list of recommendations. One item on the questionnaire for this study was included to get the graduates to rate as very important, important, or unimportant the major actions which have been recommended. The results are shown in Table 14.

TABLE 14
WAYS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

ACTION	VERY IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	UNIMPORTANT	BLANK
Increase Residence	7.3	13.2	67.6	11.9
Raise Adm. Standards	11.1	34.6	43.0	11.3
Restrict Enrollment	8.6	31.4	47.3	12.7
Employ Women Profs.	12.4	25.1	50.8	11.7
Employ Minority Profs.	12.7	26.5	49.2	11.6
Profs. Write & Research	7.8	24.1	57.0	11.1
Revamp Ed. Ad. Courses	25.9	44.1	17.3	12.7
Demand More of Students	24.6	44.3	20.0	11.1
Insist on Better Teaching	55.4	29.2	6.8	8.6
Profs. More Available	50.8	31.1	7.8	10.3
Recruit Women Students	11.4	26.8	48.1	13.7
Recruit Minority Students	12.7	27.6	46.5	13.2

Again the policy makers in Educational Administration have more than one drummer to follow. The graduates simply disagree with the experts on most proposed actions. The graduates agree that better teaching and more access to professors would improve the program. However, 8 of the 12 proposed courses of actions were rated "unimportant" by approximately 50

per cent of the respondents. They were especially negative about the importance of increasing the residence requirement and expecting professors to write for publication--two highly cherished recommendations of the experts. Also, the "affirmative action" items regarding minority and women students and faculty received low marks. There was some agreement that courses in the Department should be revamped and professors should demand more of students. Most of the support for these actions is in the "important" rather than the "very important" column.

TRAINING EMPHASIS OF DEPARTMENT

Budget cutting at the University, expanding offerings in Educational Administration at the State Universities and St. Thomas, and shrinking demand for school administrators have been cited as justification for a more limited mission for the Department of Educational Administration. One way to bring the department's resources and mission into closer alignment would be to concentrate on the training of specialists for some administrative positions and phase out the programs for others.

The graduates were asked to give their views regarding the importance of the specializations now available in the Department. The results are shown in Table 15. Clearly, the graduates feel that the Department should continue to train persons for the various administrative positions in elementary and secondary school systems. The importance of specializations in post-secondary institutions, however, was less widely accepted. While a little more than one-third of the graduates rated the post-secondary specialization as "very important" a relatively large number rated them "unimportant" or they left the item blank.

TABLE 15
TRAINING EMPHASIS OF ED AD DEPARTMENT

SPECIALIZATION	VERY IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	UNIMPORTANT	BLANK
Elementary Principal	71.4	18.4	2.2	8.0
Secondary Principal	73.5	17.6	1.1	7.8
Central Office	55.7	29.5	4.8	10.0
Superintendent	70.5	19.2	1.9	8.4
College Teacher	34.6	35.4	15.9	14.1
2-Year College Admin.	38.4	38.1	10.8	12.7
4-Year College Admin.	40.8	34.6	11.6	13.0

