

**THE TWO- AND FOUR-YEAR CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
IN PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION:
PERCEIVED SOURCES OF STRESS, DEGREE OF DISTRESS,
AND COPING STRATEGIES**

by

Edward S. Baker

**Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of**

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Educational Administration

APPROVED:

Bruce N. Chaloux, Co-Chairman

Ronald L. McKeen, Co-Chairman

Jim C. Fortune

Linda F. Little

Robert Richards

**August, 1988
Blacksburg, Virginia**

THE TWO- AND FOUR-YEAR CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
IN PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION:
PERCEIVED SOURCES OF STRESS, DEGREE OF DISTRESS,
AND COPING STRATEGIES

by

Edward S. Baker

Committee Co-Chairmen: Bruce N. Chaloux and Ronald L. McKeen

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to identify perceptions of selected two-year and four-year higher education chief executive officers as to the sources of stress associated with the presidency, and what, if any, coping strategies they have developed. This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What perceptions do selected two-year and four-year higher education chief executive officers have of sources of stress associated with their job that may cause distress?
2. What is the degree of distress associated with each source of stress as perceived by each individual?
3. What are the coping strategies utilized by each individual when distress replaces the normal tension and pressure associated with his job?

A survey packet containing a descriptive questionnaire and open-ended questions was used to determine the perceptions of selected two-year

and four-year public chief executive officers in the states of Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Five Carnegie Classifications of colleges and universities were selected in order to establish a control group (N = 140) with similar types of distress that may be associated with the presidency based on the level of the degree offered and the comprehensiveness of the mission of the institution.

The data collected from the 92 useable returned questionnaires were entered into a data base for computer analysis and calculations. Specifically, descriptive statistics of the mean, standard deviation and Z-score were used to calculate the degree of distress for each source of stress. Open-ended questions were used to clarify responses on the questionnaire and to examine coping strategies utilized by the respondents.

Based on the results, eight primary sources of job stress were identified. The top three were budget, state coordinating/governing agency and career conflict with spouse. Positive and potential negative initial and preferred coping strategies were listed by the respondents.

In conclusion, presidents were able to identify primary sources of stress in order to develop positive coping techniques. Further research is needed to explore stress and coping within the leadership of higher education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to gratefully extend his sincere appreciation to:

Bruce Chaloux, co-chairman, whose guidance and leadership provided the final impetus for the completion of this study;

Ron McKeen, co-chairman, whose direction and support were predominate from start to finish;

Jim Fortune, committee statistical advisor, for contributing an expertise that is unequalled;

Linda Little and Robert Richards, committee members, for sharing their knowledge of stress and coping;

, typist, whose friendship, skill and patience were evident from the first course to the completion of this study;

, who tied the loose ends with tender loving care;

, , , and

, administrators at Chesapeake College, who provided assistance through subject expertise and by having faith in this writer;

, his parents, who never had the opportunity to pursue higher education, but somehow envisioned it for him;

, his daughters, who were thrust into this commitment, yet offered love, patience and support.

DEDICATION

To [redacted], who provided sensitivity, inspiration, understanding and most of all love to make this study and my life complete.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Stress	3
Coping/Stress Management	7
Problem Statement	9
Purpose of Study	10
Significance of Study	11
Methodology Used in Study	12
Limitations of Study	15
Overview of the Chapters	16
II REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE	17
The College and University Chief Executive Officer	18
State Coordination/Governance	36
Stress: Eustress/Distress	50
Coping/Stress Management	55
Stress and the Business Chief Executive Officer	67
Chapter Summary	74
III METHODOLOGY	76
Design of the Study	77
Selection of Population	80
Collection of Data	81
Statistical Treatment	82
Chapter Summary	84

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

IV	THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY	85
	Research Questions	85
	Analytic Design	86
	Demographic Information	86
	Survey Questionnaire: Results	91
	Open-ended Questions	99
	Question 1	99
	Question 2	102
	Question 3	104
	Question 4	106
	Question 5	108
	Question 6	110
	Chapter Summary	112
V	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . .	113
	Conclusions	116
	Presidential Profile	116
	Sources of Stress	116
	Excessive Sources of Stress	117
	Skills and Activities that Cause Distress	118
	Immediate Reaction/Response to Distress	119
	Preferred Coping Strategies/Stress Management	119
	Business Chief Executive Officer Comparison	120
	Most Distressful Time	121
	Implications and Recommendations	121
	Recommendations for Further Study	127

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>PAGE</u>
1. State Coordination/Governance	48
2. Position Held Prior to Present Job	88
3. Respondent Ages	90
4. Source of Stress/Degree of Distress	92
5. Excessive Degree of Distress	101
6. Distressful Skills and Activities	103
7. Initial/Immediate Reaction to Distress	105
8. Preferred Coping Strategy	107
9. Corporate Chief Executive Officer Comparison	109
10. Most Distressful Time of Year	111

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Jay Carsey ended his 17-year career as president of Charles County Community College in Maryland by vanishing on a plane and leaving everything and everyone behind: his job, his home, his friends, and his wife. Attached to a college car in the airport parking lot was a brief two-sentence letter of resignation to his board of trustees. Sara Rimer, in a June 20, 1982 article on the front page of the *Washington Post* reported "there are as many theories about why he did such a radical thing as there are people who knew him" (p. A12). He mailed his wife of 14 years a note that simply read, "I am close to emotional and physical collapse and do not want to drag you down with me" (p. A12). Carsey's close friend and dean for 17 years, John Sine, has reflected long and hard on the disappearance of his friend and colleague and summed up the situation by stating, "perhaps the question is not so much why he did it as what keeps people from doing it more frequently" (p. A12).

George B. Vaughan contended that most presidents would tend to place the Carsey case in the perspective that identifies it as being far from typical, yet he does not rule it out of the realm of possibility. In his book, The Community College President (1986), Vaughan emphasized "the important question is not why Carsey committed the ultimate act of burnout short of

suicide, but rather what are the stresses associated with the presidency and in what ways are presidents combating stress?" (p. 130).

David Riesman, Harvard sociologist, has been studying college presidents for three decades and said, "there are no lonelier people in the world than college presidents. They have illusion of power but they don't really have power. They have prominence without significance. The faculty views them as failed academics . . . It's an absolutely frightful job" (Cited by Rimer, 1982, p. A12).

Fisher (1984) suggested that "from the first day, the president is expected to perform as a master of everything - an effective combination of Lincoln, Kennedy, Queen Elizabeth, and Mother Theresa" (p. 3). Fisher continued by adding, "to be suddenly thrust into a leadership role that demands additional and quite different qualities can be all but totally bewildering and at times overwhelming" (p. 4). Vaughan (1986) supported Fisher's statement by reinforcing "the president has so many roles that I don't see how it would be possible for any human being to fill all of them" (p.133).

These roles have changed for the chief executive officer. As early as 1962, Dodds proclaimed that the president of the future will not be able to function as just an educator by indicating "even the most educationally minded president faces a constant struggle against becoming enmeshed in a network of supporting activities: business management, public relations, and,

fund raising" (p. 1). The traditional role of intervention with the students, faculty, trustees and alumni is changing. More demands are being thrust on the office of the college presidency as Prator (1963) cited in an interview with a college president who commented on his career by declaring, "into every life some rain must fall and there were times when I thought I would drown" (p. 20).

The college and university president is continuously facing crises according to researchers Dodds (1962), Prator (1963), Cohen (1974), Schuler (1981), Bucci (1983), Fisher (1984) and Vaughan (1986). Complaints from clients, dissension among their staff, competition from other public agencies, declining enrollments, and local, state, and federal financial and administrative external control are some problems associated with the college leader.

Stress

Stress means different things to different people. It is not only a normal response but also essential for living. In the stress research literature, there appears to be confusion and misunderstanding about the concept of stress and the terminology used to describe it. Although the literature cites several different meanings of the word stress, most center around four basic components: the stimulus or stressor, the response, the whole spectrum of interacting factors and the stimulus-response interaction.

Walter Cannon, a noted physiologist employed at the Harvard Medical School, was the first researcher to identify a stress reaction. Curious about Cannon's response studies, a young endocrinologist named Hans Selye studied it in detail. His research was first published in his classic book The Stress of Life (1956). His second book, Stress Without Distress (1974) provided a simple definition of the term stress: "a nonspecific response of the body to any demand made upon it" (p. 14). As Selye pointed out, in order to understand his definition one must understand what he means by nonspecific. Each demand made upon our body is, in a sense, unique and specific. Yet, each demand requires an adjustment. This adjustment is nonspecific; it requires adaptation to a problem, irrespective of what that problem may be. Selye (1974) contended "it is immaterial whether the agent or situation we face is pleasant or unpleasant; all that counts is the intensity of the demand for readjustment or adaptation" (p. 15). Lazarus and Folkman (1984) referred to a sphere of meaning in which stress belongs by stating, "Psychological stress is a particular relationship between the person and the environment that is appraised by the person as taxing or exceeding his or her resources and endangering his or her well-being" (p. 19).

Mullen et al. (1986) indicated that "stress is a response to a stimulus. A response involving interaction between the brain and subsequent reactions throughout varying organs of the body" (p. 53). These complex reactions, as

described by Selye (1974), Curtis and Detert (1981), Lazarus and Folkman (1984), Hales and Williams (1986), and Greenburg (1987), maintain the homeostasis or balanced state of the body. Homeostasis involves coordinating processes that keep the body from deviating so far from the norm that physical, mental or emotional illness, disease or even death might result. The physiology of the stress response is essential for homeostasis. Selye (1974) suggested that stress cannot be defined in terms of particular environment/situations but must instead be looked upon as a reaction of the person to any kind of disturbing influence.

Sometimes the word stress is used to refer to the things that upset us. Selye (1974) coined the term "distress" which is generally taken to mean too much stress or negative stress. For this study, distress is defined as the inability to respond to stress on a positive basis or as any negative, unpleasant, undesirable, or depressing source of stress. Thus, the term stress is synonymous with the term distress in this study. Any of these situations associated with distress lead to greater susceptibility to illness or disease. Selye further expands the definition of stress by suggesting that the opposite of distress is eustress, or a type of stress that is associated with life events in which an individual is taxed, challenged and perceives a potential for personal growth.

Two elements must be present to cause stress: a stressor and a stress activity. Mullen et al. (1986) defined a stressor as "the agent or stimulus that elicits the stress response" (p. 50). As defined by Greenburg (1987), "the reaction associated with the stressor is termed the stress activity" (p. 9). As described earlier, stressors may be positive or negative. Each day people encounter a variety of stressors with a wide range of intensity. The intensity of a stressor is generally measured by the response the stressor elicits. Greenburg (1987) listed four primary categories of stressors: (a) biological - such as heat and cold, (b) psychological - such as depression, anxiety, and worry, (c) sociological - such as unemployment and death of a loved one and (d) philosophical - such as the use of time or the purpose of life.

Mullen et al. (1986) view the intensity of a stressor as a continuum of stressors ranging from a micro-stressor, such as getting up and getting to work on time to a macro-stressor, such as the death of a spouse or losing a job.

For the purpose of this study, the stimulus or stressor that has the potential of eliciting a negative stress reaction (distress) is labeled as "sources of stress". Chief executive officers responded by indicating their degree of distress associated with 32 sources of stress identified as potential stressors that might negatively influence presidential effectiveness.

Coping/Stress Management

A challenging, rewarding task for one person may be flooded with distress and anxiety for others. How one appraises self and situation makes all the difference. Proper coping/stress management directs us to channel stress, thus promoting stimulation, challenge and growth experiences. This process is ongoing and lifetime oriented. It helps us to find out who we are and how to deal more effectively with life's insults and frustrations as well as its joys and pleasures. The goal of coping/stress management is not to eliminate all stress, but to limit the harmful effects of distress while maintaining eustress associated with stimulation and motivation.

The concepts of coping/stress management have been researched for well over 40 years. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) speculated that "there is little coherence in theory, research and understanding to what is meant by these concepts" (p. 117). These concepts are found in two very different forms of literature, one derived from animal experimentation and the other from psychoanalytic ego psychology. The former approach is based on Darwinian thought: the animal's survival hinges on discovering what is predictable and controllable in the environment in order to avoid, escape or overcome noxious agents. As Ursin (1980) stated, "The gradual development of a response decrement in the animal experiments as well as the human

experiments is coping. The animal is learning to cope through the lowering of drive tension by positive reinforcement" (p. 264).

In the psychoanalytic ego psychology model, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) defined coping as "realistic and flexible thoughts and acts that solve problems and thereby reduce stress" (p. 118). They concluded by suggesting that the main difference between the treatment of coping in the psychological model and the animal model is the focus on ways of perceiving and thinking about the person's relationship with the environment.

In this study, respondents were asked to address two open-ended questions pertaining to coping and stress management. The first was designed as a means of recognizing and understanding the initial reaction of the stress response. This response may be negative, utilizing alcohol or drugs, or positive, exercising or simply talking to someone. The second was intended to identify what chief executive officers prefer to use after determining that they are experiencing a moderate to excessive degree of distress. Thus, for the purpose of this study, Schuler's (1985) definition of coping was used: "a process of analysis and evaluation to decide how to protect oneself against the adverse effects of any stressor (source of stress) and its associated negative outcomes" (p. 351).

Problem Statement

Much of the literature (Kauffman, 1980, Duea, 1981, Schuler, 1981, August and Gamson 1983, Bucci, 1983, Melendez and de Guzman, 1983 and Vaughan, 1986) characterizes the college presidency as a profession where frustrations and pressures exceed normal limits and interfere with one's ability to perform at a level that is acceptable to the individual and, in many cases, at a level that is acceptable to the institution. If Kerr's (1963) characterization of the college president as one who feels immune to or somehow insulated from the effects of stress is accurate, then we might anticipate an increase in the number of burnouts in the presidency such as was the case for Jay Carsey. The nature of stress, the source of stress and the potential impact of stress must be recognized and acknowledged if appropriate coping and management skills are to be developed and used. There is evidence that presidents and their families live under constant scrutiny (Kauffman, 1980). Coupled with this factor is the great loneliness of the job. The president cannot please all faculty members, students, trustees, alumni, and community members. Some of the dissatisfaction chief executive officers experience is closely related to the external pressures on colleges and universities.

Stress and coping work together in a balance. According to Curtis and Detert (1981), Chmielewski (1982) and others, particular coping and

management skills seem to be a function of the characteristics of the source of stress. Once chief executive officers learn to identify sources of stress that may lead to burnout, they can begin to deal with these factors in a positive, productive manner. This understanding can allow them to pursue their primary role as the educational leader on campus more effectively. A greater sensitivity to the possibility of burnout among all members of the college community may well be a prerequisite for effective leadership. Chief executive officers must work not only to prevent burnout in themselves, but in others as well.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to identify the perceptions of selected two- and four-year higher education chief executive officers as to the sources of stress associated with the presidency, and what, if any, coping strategies they have developed. This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What perceptions do selected two- and four-year higher education chief executive officers have of sources of stress that may cause distress associated with their jobs?
2. What is the degree of distress associated with each source of stress as perceived by each individual?

3. What are the coping strategies utilized by each individual when distress replaces the normal tension and pressure associated with his job?

Significance of Study

In order to develop practical basic options for living a well balanced lifestyle, setting goals, prioritizing actions, following time management plans, developing habits for practicing sound physical and mental health procedures, controlling anxiety and emotions, and practicing simple stress stoppers and relaxation techniques, college and university presidents must first learn to identify sources of stress. This knowledge is a prerequisite for developing positive coping and management skills to reduce the frequency and the intensity of the stress response. The coping efforts identified by the chief executive officers in this study were based on their responses to stressful appraisals that signal harm, loss, threat or challenge. These may be negative or positive based on what they do to cope with stress, as compared to what they would prefer to do, as a coping or managing skill.

According to Vaughan (1986), "Most presidents seem to view stress as part of the job and handle it accordingly" (p. 140). There seems to be a lack of specific knowledge about how this situation may eventually affect them and their colleagues. This study can provide chief executive officers with a basic awareness of some primary sources of stress, as identified by their peers, and

the ways by which their colleagues attempt to cope with these tensions and pressures.

Methodology Used in Study

A descriptive survey questionnaire was used to determine the perceptions of selected two- and four-year public chief executive officers in the states of Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia. This target population was expected to supply a varied group of college presidents representing stressed and unstressed members of the profession. The geographic area was chosen to allow this researcher the opportunity to contact respondents in person or by phone for clarification. As part of the strategy to obtain accurate information and to achieve an above average response rate, at least one respondent in each of the target states was personally contacted. With this controlled geographic data collection effort, this researcher attained an above average useable return rate as identified in the related literature.

As part of the pilot study, a sample questionnaire was distributed to 14 members of a doctoral level field studies class requesting that their chief executive officer read and evaluate. This sample instrument was revised based on comments from the respondents, the instructor, classmates and various members of this researcher's doctoral committee. The revised survey was distributed to a selected group of administrators (N = 12) in this

researcher's geographic area. Personal interviews were conducted by this writer in order to reduce ambiguity throughout the survey packet.

A pre-experimental design examined the various perceptions that existed at the time of the study, Summer, 1987. Sources of stress, their degree of distress, if any, and various coping strategies and management skills utilized by the respondents were surveyed. The survey packet used in this study (see appendices A-D) included a demographic information page consisting of five questions to determine basic data including: (a) position held prior to the presidency, (b) internal/external promotion information, (c) length of time in the job, (d) age, and (e) degrees held; and a survey containing 32 sources of stress divided into four main categories: (a) interactions with, (b) job responsibilities, (c) self-imposed characteristics of the job, and (d) miscellaneous. The degree of distress was determined by the respondent circling a corresponding number representing no distress "0" to excessive distress "5". A comments column was provided for the respondent to clarify any source of stress and response if needed. In addition to the questionnaire, six open-ended questions were addressed: (a) excessive stress responses, (b) stressful job-related skills and activities, (c & d) coping strategies, (e) more/less stressful times of the academic year, and (f) comparing responsibility and accountability with corporate executive officers.

The 1987 Carnegie Foundation classification of colleges and universities was used to select the institutions to be surveyed. The survey target population included all public institutions in the five states that fall in the following categories established by the Carnegie Foundation: comprehensive universities and colleges I, comprehensive colleges and universities II, liberal arts colleges I, liberal arts colleges II, and two-year colleges and universities. The Carnegie Foundation classification was selected in order to establish a control group with similar types of distress that may be associated with the presidency based on the level of the degree offered by the institution and the comprehensiveness of their missions. This established system of classification provided this researcher with a more reliable and accurate data base.

The 1987 *HEP Higher Education Directory* was used for accuracy and verification of information. Surveys were color-coded (two- and four-year institutions) and a code number was placed on the demographic sheet to protect the anonymity of each respondent. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was provided. A three-week reply time was included with a statement, "If this researcher has not received a reply by the above date, a call will be placed to your secretary to arrange a personal or telephone interview".

The data obtained from this survey instrument was tabulated, coded, and programmed into a statistical computer package. In order to examine the

veracity of distress responses associated with the sources of stress, descriptive statistics of the mean, standard deviation and standard or Z-score were calculated. Any Z-score greater than zero was identified as a primary source of job stress.

The open-ended questions were addressed by placing respondent's answers into categories and reported based on the percentage of responses in each category. The two open-ended questions pertaining to coping and stress management were addressed in the same manner. However, this researcher's category and response placement system were tested utilizing Q-methodology. Ten professionals associated with stress and coping were asked to place the respondents' answers into the following five categories established by this researcher: physical exertion/exercise, relaxation/meditation, talk to someone, solve/deal with the problem and potential negative reactions. This Q-sort technique developed by Stephenson (1953), allowed this researcher to test the validity of the initial placement of responses into the five categories.

Limitations of Study

This investigation and findings from this study are limited to chief executive officers representing public institutions from five Carnegie Foundation classifications in the five states from which data was collected. It is noteworthy, however, that the descriptive data about the chief executive

officers in these states is comparable with data from various national studies about college and university presidents.

Overview of the Chapters

Following this introduction, the specifics of the study are presented in Chapters II through V. Chapter II contains a review of related research and literature. Chapter III contains descriptions of the subjects for survey, the instrumentation, procedures, and analyses used for the investigation. Chapter IV contains the results of the analyses of the data. Finally, Chapter V presents a summation of the finding along with conclusions, implications, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to identify perceptions of selected two- and four-year public higher education chief executive officers as to the sources of stress associated with the presidency, their degree of distress, and what, if any, coping strategies they have developed. Because this study emphasized job-related stressors (sources of stress) and their degree of distress associated with public higher education chief executive officers and how they cope with the possibility of exhaustion, the literature on the college and university chief executive officer, stress and coping/stress management was reviewed to ascertain findings in these areas. The respondents in this study identified their interaction with the state coordinating/governing agency as a primary source of stress. This source of stress also received the most "excessive" degree of distress responses. Thus, this researcher examined the coordinating/governing structure in each of the states in this study. A secondary purpose was to compare the overall responsibility/accountability of the college and university president with the corporate executive officer. The stress and coping literature correlated with the business chief executive officer was reviewed in order to relate and compare pertinent information.

This chapter includes the following sections: the college and university chief executive officer, state coordination/governance, stress: eustress and distress, coping and stress management, and the business chief executive officer.

The College and University Chief Executive Officer

In the fall when students, faculty and staff prepare to begin a new academic year, there is someone making plans to guide the institution through the year ahead. There is also a generation of chief executive officers who have now gone on to other things. Robert F. Carbone (1981) examined the experiences and present situations of ex-presidents. His research includes the whole sweep of American colleges and universities focusing on those who have left the job of president. Data gathered on these 1,406 former presidents provides a comprehensive and useful profile of this generation of former chief executive officers and insights into the make-up of the contemporary college and university presidency.

Highest degree earned: The Ph.D. was held by 48 percent of the respondents, 14 percent earned Ed.D's, three percent had doctorates in theology, one percent in legal studies, and the remainder held other types of doctorates.

Most recent position: Positions outside of postsecondary were identified by 22 percent of the respondents as their most recent position prior

to the presidency. More than a third were members of some religious order. It must be noted that this percentage reflects the large number of church-related colleges and universities in the private sector. The deanship contributed 21 percent, while only 12 percent reported being vice-presidents. Only 11 percent moved from one presidency to another. There appeared to be proportionately more community college presidents in this category than presidents from four-year colleges and universities. Just 10 percent of the presidents surveyed moved directly from the classroom to the president's office.

Field of academic study: The largest contingent of presidents, 27 percent, earned their highest degrees in education. Nearly half the community college presidents and a quarter of the state college presidents did their academic work in schools of education. Nineteen percent recorded their highest degree in the humanities, while 15 percent earned their highest degree in philosophy, theology, or religion. Twelve percent of those surveyed held their final degree in the social sciences. The academic fields of sciences and mathematics, business, law, engineering, and medicine accounted for less than 10 percent from the respondents in this survey.

Length of service: According to Carbone (1981) "to be sure, the day of exceedingly long presidential terms may be over" (p. 10). One-fourth of all presidents in the survey served only one to four years. Of the 345 short-term

presidents, 24 were in office only a single year. Thirty-five percent of the respondents in the sample served from five to ten years, and just under 18 percent held the office from 11 to 19 years. Only eight percent headed their institutions for more than 30 years.

Carbone's study looked at former college and university presidents without regard for the types of institutions they headed. Because of the nature of this study involving public four-year institutions and community colleges, this researcher has chosen to report findings associated with the president from two of the subsets of the institutions surveyed.

In state colleges and universities, Carbone (1981) reported the degrees earned to be: 59 percent Ph.D., 23 percent Ed.D., and 17 percent Master's. Positions previously held were: 17 percent former president, 17 percent vice president, and 14 percent other academic positions. The lengths of service were 31 percent 5-10 years, 27 percent 11-20 years, 19 percent 1-4 years, and eight percent more than 20 years.

With community and junior colleges, the reader should be cautious in generalizing the following data to all community colleges. Although Carbone surveyed nearly 1,100 community and junior colleges, only 295 institutions responded. The highest degrees earned were: 33 percent Ed.D., 27 percent Ph.D., and 23 percent Masters. Previously held positions were: 29 percent Dean or Director from the same campus, 23 percent outside postsecondary

education, 14 percent other presidencies, and nine percent vice presidents. Lengths of service were 31 percent 5-10 years, 29 percent 1-4 years, 27 percent 10-20 years, and five percent more than 20 years.

Carbone (1981) published his survey results in the book, Presidential Passages. As stated earlier, the questionnaire was completed by former presidents in order to obtain a higher return rate. His study sample provided approximately a 50 percent return rate. Carbone (1981) cited, "Each day a president finds at least one letter, accompanied by a questionnaire asking for information about the institution. Such inquiries are usually bucked down to institutional research and placed on the stack" (p. 6).

Green (1988) reported the results of a survey conducted by the Center for Leadership Development of the American Council on Education. Executive officers of 2,105 regionally accredited higher education institutions returned surveys. Overall, the data supported Carbone's (1981) profile of the presidency. Major findings were as follows:

The typical college president was white, male, married, and 53 years old. He has served his present institution for nearly seven years. Most college presidents (85 percent) were married, but women presidents were far more likely than men to be divorced or never married. Husbands of college presidents were twice as likely to be employed as were wives. More than 75 percent of all presidents held doctorate degrees: 56 percent held the Ph.D. and

22 percent held the Ed.D. However, community college presidents are far more likely than four-year presidents to hold the Ed.D. degree or have specialized in education. Most presidents (60 percent) had substantial administrative experience by holding the position of president or vice president before their current presidency. Most career movements (75 percent) occurred within the same type of institution.

The college and university presidency is an anomalous role, for no career line serves as preparation for it. Prator (1963) reported that there have been limited efforts to provide formal training for those who have assumed or are about to assume the presidency. Since 1955, under the directorship of Professor Robert Merry at Harvard, a summer institute is held for newly appointed presidents. This President's Institute selects about three dozen recently appointed presidents each year. The new presidents and their spouses attend a parallel series of lectures and discussions designed to aid them in their dual responsibilities. "Many members believe that although they do get ideas on how better to conduct their office, they benefit most from losing the sense of isolation which the office imposes" (p. 104). The University of Michigan's Center for the Study of Higher Education has an institute which holds annual sessions to study the problems of college administration. Approximately 60 college and university administrators, including presidents, attend for a period of one week. The American Council

on Education also offers educational leadership institutes for new college and university presidents. As previously noted, various workshops and summer retreats are held for chief executive officers by universities, and according to Riesman (1978), "these sessions usually lead to the important discovery that one's private miseries are shared by others, not a cure for loneliness, but some solace. Problems are shared in an unusually frank atmosphere" (p. 10).

In studies conducted by Kerr (1982), Cohen and March (1974) and Kaufman (1980), new presidents reported that their first year's experience was exhausting. They felt burned out and wondered how they would be able to maintain such a schedule year after year. They reported that they had no basis for judging what requires their time and what does not. Invitations to speak and to attend various social and ceremonial occasions were accepted on the basis they were new in the community and that they should not offend anyone. Bennis (1976) has commented on this phenomenon by citing, "individuals who are new to the burdens of high positions are especially vulnerable because they are trying to prove themselves. They end up with a kind of battle fatigue, overworked, acting as policemen and/or ombudsmen and what's worse, seriously undermining the legitimacy and effectiveness of the other executives reporting to them" (p. 16).

Kauffman (1980) has determined that "nothing is more important to a college or university president than a successful relationship with that

institution's governing board. It is the governing board that determines or arranges for the forms of institutional governance. It is the governing board that delegates authority to the president. Without a sound relationship with the governing board, the president cannot be effective" (p. 52). Cohen and March (1974) reported the results of a survey conducted by Rauh in 1968. Trustees of 5,180 public and private colleges and universities were asked to answer a series of questions on qualifications for the presidency. They indicated that the three top attributes of a public president that were essential were: (a) experience in college administration, (b) experience on college faculty, and (c) holder of an earned Ph.D. or Ed.D.

The expectations of a new college president have been discussed. Conflict between presidents and boards over expectations that may not be reasonable and difficult to live with are common. Some board members have political or legislative experience and may assume that they have power and authority to act as individuals rather than putting forth their proposals for board vote.

Kaplowitz (1978) has described the impact of open-meeting or sunshine laws on governing boards of public colleges and universities. These laws include provisions related to due notice to the public of all meetings and agenda. Of major concern here is the effect of such laws on president/governing board communication. Two key questions arise within the bounds

of each state's legislation: what constitutes a meeting, and what topics, if any, justify going into executive session that is not open to the public? Kauffman (1980) ascertained "the functioning of a board and manner of communication of a president with that board, are severely affected by open meeting laws" (p. 59). He suggests five actions or behaviors that might improve the president/board relationship:

1. There should be regular efforts made to clarify the mutual expectations of both boards and presidents.
2. The president must be educator and teacher to the institution's various publics, but especially the board.
3. A president should avoid any private or personal agreements with individual board members.
4. The board itself should take some responsibility for improving its effectiveness through new appointments.
5. Boards should assume that problems and conflicts are part of the normal day-to-day functioning of any institution.

Joseph F. Kauffman (1980) interviewed 32 presidents representing private and public institutions as a basis for preparing his book, At the Pleasure of the Board. He contended that the role of the college president today contains several dimensions that logically flow from the tasks to be performed. "The tasks are not all that different from what they have been

over many years. Yet, as the situation changes, effective performance of those tasks requires six different skills and competencies" (p. 13). The results of his survey indicated the following presidential tasks or functions: (a) leadership, (b) management, (c) control, (d) representation, (e) communication, and (f) interpretation. Kauffman (1980) reinforced that although the president is responsible for these functions, and must be accountable for them, the delegation of such functions to a management team or cabinet is possible and desirable.

Kerr (1963) originally described the university and college president as a friend of students, a colleague of faculty members and a good fellow who associates with the alumni. The 1970's brought new areas of accountability and responsibility to the position and required the president to be more than just an amiable person. Kauffman (1980) contended that a major problem of the president today is accountability. External regulations, the governing board, the faculty, and the state legislature provide a series of diverse functions, constituencies and frustrations to which presidents are subjected.

Presidents in statewide systems must implement decisions of the central coordinating or governing board, as well as articulate the essence and value of the institution. The faculty may view the president as too responsive to the state agency, while the local institutional board may find him too uncooperative. Austin and Gamson (1983) emphasize "every

president must become accustomed to pleasing some constituencies while disappointing others, and political skills are an important ingredient of a president's success" (p. 47).

According to Cohen and March (1974), presidents spend between 50 and 55 hours on work-related activities during the week and another five to ten hours on weekends. "The American college president works about 20 hours per week more than the average one-job wage earner" (p. 126). These figures were derived from a 42 college sample according to secretarial logs from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. The average college president spent 35 percent of his time in his own office, 22 percent out of town, 16 percent at home, 14 percent in town, and 12 percent on campus outside of his office. Perkins (1967) estimates that the typical individual who wants to see a president can anticipate a delay of three or four days for an appointment.

College presidents, like other executives, must make difficult decisions and try to solve problems. Stressful situations experienced by people in all walks of life are familiar to college administrators as well. Pressure, deadline changes, responsibility and career and life directions are some sources of stress that affect most individuals. In addition to these common causes of stress, many sources of stress are unique to the academic chief executive officer. This section will examine research pertaining to sources of stress

associated with the job of the college or university president and their perceptions of these sources of stress.

A study to determine the major problems of the college and university president and whether specific job or educational backgrounds tend to affect their perception of these problems was conducted by Prichard, Buxton and Sintek (1972). Questionnaires were sent to every tenth college and university president on the American Universities and Colleges list. A total of 85 questionnaires were sent and 55 were completed and returned.

Their research concluded that financial matters are the primary problem confronting most college and university presidents, followed by work tasks, faculty, governing bodies and students. The data from the study indicate that younger presidents, 35-44 years, tend to complain of work routines and details in office. The older presidents, 55-59 years, specified students as their chief concern.

The data suggest that, irrespective of the amount of time spent in either the teaching or administrative levels, no amount or type of preparation negates major problems associated with the presidency, although "previous job history and occupational experience do tend to immunize the incumbent from certain types of problems. Long tenure as a faculty member tends to result in a decrease in faculty problems and long tenure as a dean or vice-president tends to result in a decrease in work routine problems" (p. 106).

A final question raised in their study was whether certain academic preparation better prepares the president for his position. The data reveal that holders of the Ph.D. tend to consider faculty and students as major problems, while holders of the Ed.D. consider their chief problems to be work routines and finance. The authors concluded that academic preparation was important although it did not rank as high as job history, age or length of tenure.

Vaughan (1986) undertook a small research project designed to determine if community college presidents recognized in themselves signs of stress that may lead to burnout. He noted that these presidents identified their jobs as stressful positions listing common symptoms such as a lack of enthusiasm, loss of tolerance for others, a feeling of being stuck, a loss of creative drive and a feeling of being lazy. Vaughan concludes by stating "stress comes not only from stressful situations but also from how the individual president perceives and deals with a given situation: one person's routine pressure may be another's stress. What is taken in stride at one time in a person's career may, at a different stage, become a stress-producing crisis for the individual" (p. 134).

In a study that compared presidents' and school superintendents' perceptions of stress associated with their duties, Duea (1981) cited seven potential sources of stress as identified by public college and university

presidents: (a) planning and administering the budget, (b) governing public and board relations, (c) personnel tasks, (d) program development and improvements, (e) student affairs, (f) alumni affairs and (g) fund raising. In areas such as time consumed and task importance, the public chief executive officers agreed that the budget, program development and governing boards provided the highest rated administrative tasks. Alumni affairs and fund raising ranked first with the private chief executive officers as their most time consuming projects while public relations and attending civic affairs ranked number one on their task importance list. Duea and Bishop (1980) examined various tasks of the college and university president in terms of importance and time consumption. A total of 544 responses representing 266 public and 336 private colleges were received. Presidents of both public and private institutions perceived local governing board relations, planning and administering the budget and program development and improvements to be significantly more important to their overall functioning than their handling of student affairs and personnel tasks. Tasks that were rated as consuming the most time included fiscal responsibilities, tapping traditional and non-traditional funding sources and responding to enrollment declines.

The causes of stress for college senior-level administrators were studied by Bucci (1983) based on discussions with 60 administrators from 44 institutions in the United States and England. Four primary categories of

stress were identified: (a) stress from the general environment, (b) stress from job-related but external sources, (c) stress from internal and/or psychological sources and (d) stress stemming from student encounters. Bucci (1983) maintained that these administrators adopted an attitude of reality acceptance toward the first two and focused on trying to cope with the latter two stress sources since they are internal and subject to control.

As stated earlier, the experience of the chief executive officer is changing as external pressures increase. Kauffman (1980) pointed out that presidents feel considerable autonomy and power and report general satisfaction with their work. However, increased state and federal regulations often weaken the autonomy of campus officials in highly centralized state systems.

Regulations tied to the disbursement of monies from the federal government and statewide master planning have limited institutions' capacity to determine their own fate. Various authors (Kauffman 1980, Kerr 1982, Fisher 1984) have condemned state and federal demands for greater accountability. The impact of government intervention has been referred to as "the most serious problem encountered by higher education". Taken by itself, any single action may not be unbearably intrusive but the combined impact of many actions can nearly suffocate an institution. Presidents have remarked that they have felt caught in a confusing bureaucratic web that

demands accountability but provides few incentives for responsible decision-making.

Austin and Gamson (1983) cited "the salary levels for academic executive officers are not as high as might be expected, given the pressure of the work" (p. 48). The median salary of chief executive officers of a single institution in 1987-88 was \$74,483 according to an article in the March 9, 1988 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education. For presidents of all universities, the median was \$90,000, at four-year colleges \$73,226, and at two-year colleges \$65,600. These salaries represented a one-year increase of 6.4 percent from the 1986-87 survey. According to Bowen (1978), university and college presidents are paid less than one-half the salaries of corporate chief executive officers. Recognizing that financial remuneration is minimal for all that the position involves, researchers Cohen and March (1974), Kauffman (1980), Carbone (1981), Austin and Gamson (1983), and Fisher (1984) urge that college and university presidents be highly respected for the service they perform. As Kauffman (1980) contends "we must restore the concept of service to the role of the presidency. The incentives of honor, security, or material gain are simply not there any longer, if they ever existed. Only the concept of service can be an appropriate incentive. We must restore a proper respect for service in an enterprise openly disparaged in an industry, utility, or supermarket" (p. 12).

Dodds (1962) indicated "the office of the academic president differs from that of the chief executive of the usual business corporation in that the ultimate function of his institution, its end product, is education rather than financial profit or production of material goods" (p. 13). In the 60's, the president was challenged to enhance and preserve educational leadership. Although this task is expected today, the almighty F.T.E., full-time enrollment, looms as a bottom line goal for most institutions. As one respondent in this researcher's study stated, "the quickest way to lose your job is to screw up financially".

The presidency also offers an opportunity to make major impact on a college or university and on higher education. Research conducted by Buxton, Pritchard, and Buxton (1976) indicated that presidents of state-controlled colleges and universities list the challenging nature of their work and their role in the community and state as two of the most positive aspects of their work. They indicated that professional autonomy is the source of greatest satisfaction. "Presidents are very satisfied with the power and prestige associated with the office and with presidential participation in institutional policy formulation" (p. 81). Solomon and Tierney (1977) added that satisfaction and power, influence, challenge, responsibility and autonomy are all positive related aspects of the chief executive officer's job in higher education. Austin and Gamson (1983) ascertained that presidents

"derive great satisfaction from their relationships with students, faculty, and administrators" (p. 52). It must be noted that these areas can contribute to a form of distress for the president as well.

The power of the presidency and the status of the position can offer a positive effect on the individual. Researchers Cohen and March (1974), Kauffman (1980) and Nason (1980) have contended that the president's power is especially high in establishing budget priorities, long-range planning, personnel policy and selection, program development and decisions concerning the physical plant. It must be added that current pressures may threaten autonomy, especially in centralized state systems. Buxton, Pritchard, and Buxton (1976) noted "the role, function and structure of the college presidency have undergone dramatic changes. No longer is it a position of stability and seclusion from an increasingly complex world" (p. 79).

In his book Power of the Presidency, Fisher (1984) researched the five methods of power as associated with the college or university president. He ranked them from the most to the least effective for an institutional chief executive officer. They are as follows:

1. Charisma - Based on the admiration and liking that people feel for an individual. "This is not the charisma of divine inspiration, a special gift, grace or talent that some have and most have not, but rather a quality of trust

and confidence that virtually any college or university president can honestly cultivate" (p. 40).

2. Expert - A reflection of the deference accorded a perceived authority. "The president should quickly become and remain an authority in those fields that relate to the presidential office" (p. 39).

3. Legitimate - Based on a group's acceptance of common beliefs and practices. "Studies show that people generally follow legitimate leaders with whom they agree. Once power is transformed it is not resisted unless it is abused or ineffectively used. Thus, social control of one's behavior becomes an expected part of college and university life" (p. 35).

4. Reward - The ability of one individual to accomplish desired outcomes by favors, recognition or rewards to group members. "Studies have revealed some noteworthy and slightly disconcerting observations. For example, high status persons, like college and university presidents, tend to compromise the stated goals of their organization or group more readily than others" (p. 31).

5. Coercive - Employing threats and punishments to gain compliance. "When a college president is not granted sufficient authority to exercise power, he or she may be more inclined to use covert and coercive means to obtain ends. However, an astute leader uses it seldom, for it is the least effective kind of power for a college president" (p. 29-1).

In conclusion, the college or university president offers a combination of pleasure and pain. It is a role that is played differently by each individual with demonstrably different effects.

State Coordination/Governance

When chief executive officers were asked to identify primary sources of stress associated with the college or university presidency, the source of stress entitled "Budget" was identified as the primary job responsibility source of stress that created the highest degree of distress for the respondents. It must be noted that the interaction with a state coordinating/governing board was cited as the most excessive degree of distress for the respondents during the budget process. Because of the high degree of distress relative to the above areas, each state's structure for the governance of public higher education was examined (See Table 1).

In his book, Higher Education in the Fifty States, M.M. Chambers (1970) states, "Wholesome relationships between higher education and state government are more necessary than other functional areas of state service. It is difficult for an educational institution to conduct a sound educational program if its operational procedures are set by legislative act or outside agencies exercise undue and restrictive financial control" (p. 9).

In the five states surveyed in this study, financial control is exercised by one or more of the following organizations: a state-wide governing board, a

state-wide coordinating council or a local institutional board. In his book Statewide Coordination of Higher Education, Robert Berdahl (1971) identifies three types of state coordinating/governing agencies: a coordinating board composed entirely or in the majority of public members and having essentially advisory powers, a coordinating board composed entirely or in the majority of public members and having regulatory powers in certain areas without, however, having governing responsibility for the institutions under its jurisdiction and a consolidated governing board that functions as the governing body for the public senior institutions or as a consolidated governing board for multiple institutions, with no local or segmental governing bodies. Some governing boards have power in the areas of budget review, capital outlay review and federal programs while others have not been able to push very effectively for the achievement of special goals in the above fiscal areas. Berdahl (1971) notes that "the coordinating boards would appear to have the best planning records and the statewide governing boards to be in the strongest position to ensure implementation" (p. 84).

State financial and administrative officials can adversely affect the educational and academic process when they exercise specific and detailed control over matters which can be handled within the institution. When the chief executive officer has little or no control of the budget process, the situation can result in a primary source of distress for the president. Unduly

detailed and oppressive central fiscal controls can detract from the autonomy of state universities and colleges.

According to Chambers (1970), "A state-wide board, without coercive power and committed not to engage in political struggles, committed to the flexible development of the state-wide system and not to its restriction and harassment, can serve useful purposes. A style and technique of liaison and intercommunication - not hierarchical control - is called for" (p. 22).

It is important for the reader to place each respondent's comments in context with the level of control exercised by their state agency or local institutional governing board. Because of the potential impact of agency intervention, the structure of public higher education in each of the five states involved in this study is described below. The type of governing agency affecting fiscal budgetary regulations will be identified. Since this survey was completed in the summer of 1987, a review of the previous legislative session as well as proposed items for the 1988 session was researched in order to identify potential sources of stress that may have influenced the respondents in this survey.

Maryland

Coordinating Board, Public Majority, Advisory Powers

The State Board of Higher Education was created in 1962. The agency was established to serve as an advocate for the common interests of the nine

state colleges. The coordinating board carries forth its broad responsibility for coordinating the overall growth and development of post-secondary education through activities involving research, planning and information systems, finance and facilities, academic affairs, institutional approval and evaluation and equal education for special academic programs. The state board provides the coordination for most of the four-year institutions. The University of Maryland, Morgan State University and St. Mary's College, are primarily governed by their local institutional board of regents.

Two-year institutions have their budgets reviewed by the State Board for Community Colleges. Both organizations present their recommendations for budget and fiscal matters to the governor.

Although decisions by the governor and the state coordinating boards are very significant in the final budget process, most chief executive officers indicated that working with their local institutional boards provided the primary source of distress in the budget process.

In 1987, Maryland did well financially with a 19 percent increase in budget. The State Board of Higher Education increased revenue for areas such as student aid, recruitment and grants associated with the development of programs with corporations and public schools.

In 1988, Maryland's colleges and universities sought a large increase in the budget. Governor Schaeffer indicated he would support major increases

in appropriations if the General Assembly approves changes in governance structure of the state's four-year colleges and universities. The governor has proposed that all of those institutions be governed by the University of Maryland Board of Regents. The plan is opposed by black legislators who say they fear it will hurt the state's historically black colleges, and by St. Mary's College, a four-year institution governed by its own board.

New Jersey

Coordinating Board, Public Majority, Regulatory Powers

In 1969, the State College Autonomy Bill was created so that major decision making could be made by the local boards and administrators of the state colleges. This system of "Self Government" has enabled the institutions to function under the Department of Higher Education without major influence from the State Board of Higher Education.

The State Department of Higher Education is a branch of the state government headed by a chancellor with a five-year term.

The State Commissioner of Education and the State Board of Higher Education form the Board of Trustees for state colleges. These positions are appointed by the State Board of Higher Education with governor approval.

The New Jersey Board of Higher Education has regulatory powers in certain areas without, however, having governing responsibilities for the nine public institutions under its jurisdiction.

In 1917, the New Jersey legislature gave the name of "State University of New Jersey" to Rutgers but did not impair the private character of Rutgers University. The Board of Trustees of Rutgers was established in 1956 as a corporate body with a general advisory relationship to the Board of Governors.

In 1987, a 13 percent budget increase enabled New Jersey to increase state spending for colleges. The primary areas that were increased included: financial aid for part-time students, daycare for needy students, recruitment/retainment of minority students and the development of new programs.

Governor Kean wanted to raise the quality of higher education by giving institutions more autonomy to make fiscal decisions. Thus, chief executive officers were finding a potential source of distress, with their local institutional boards. Kean's "Governor's Challenge" program allowed state colleges to compete for state money for improvement.

In 1988, a 14.5 percent budget increase request was submitted. Included were funds for improving undergraduate education, expanding faculty development programs, and attracting minority students and faculty members. New financial aid programs for non-traditional students, single parents and part-time students were requested.

The Governor has supported significant increases in state funds for higher education in recent years, and college officials are optimistic that they will continue to receive generous increases.

New Jersey is one of the two states in this study that has an active union/collective bargaining system established for its state colleges and universities at the two- and four-year level. Chief executive officers in New Jersey reported a moderate to excessive level of distress in the source of stress category labeled "interaction with the union".

New Jersey chief executive officers indicated a high-moderate to excessive level of distress while interacting with the governing board.

Pennsylvania

Coordinating Board, Public Majority, Advisory Powers

In 1963, the State Board of Education was created to govern the fifteen state public institutions. Seventeen members of the State Board are appointed by the governor and the senate to serve overlapping terms of six years. Chambers (1970) contends, "the novel feature of the new Board was that it was to consist of two panels: Council of Basic Education to govern schools below the level of higher education and the Council of Higher Education with duties appertaining to higher education, including the community colleges" (p. 326). Three members-at-large were entitled to attend

meetings of both panels. The governor selected the chairman of the board and the chairman of each panel.

Along with other legislative acts to improve higher education, Pennsylvania legislative leaders proposed raising the five percent general sales tax to six percent and it was done. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education represented unprecedented gains over previous years. This placed Pennsylvania above Michigan and Texas into fourth place behind California, New York, and Illinois.

The 1987 Pennsylvania legislature increased the budget 10 percent in order to purchase more instructional equipment, and open a teaching academy for teacher preparation programs. Legislators discussed a new state master plan for higher education. Governor Casey created more opportunities for students to attend state colleges by developing new student aid programs and setting limits for tuition increases.

Pennsylvania is the other state in this study which has a union/collective bargaining unit for its colleges and universities. Responses showed similar levels of moderate to excessive stress in the interactions with the union "category".

In 1988, higher education leaders were asking for a 15.1 percent budget increase for the State System of Higher Education. College officials are optimistic about the forthcoming budget debate according to the January 13,

1988 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education. Governor Casey and legislative leaders have spoken of the need to increase state support for higher education. Bills expected to be introduced include: reduction of crime on campus and regulation of business activities of non-profit organizations.

Virginia

Coordinating Board, Public Majority, Advisory Powers

Described as a highly centralized state where financial matters are governed at the state level, the State Council for Higher Education acts as the main coordinating board for public four-year institutions. Although presidents have control of their institution's budget allocation, they have little input in the state's appropriations process.

Two-year institutions are governed by the State Board for Community Colleges, chaired by a chancellor.

Public institutions have very little power in the areas of budget and personnel. The primary role of the local institutional board is to communicate needs to the president and provide political clout when needed.

As described by one college administrator "any distress associated with our budget comes from the state level; they even send my paycheck from a state office."

In 1987, Virginia's budget in the area of higher education was less than in the past, although increasing faculty salaries was a major priority. State tax laws were changing to conform with the new federal tax law. Colleges and universities were trying to seek a share of the projected windfall.

In 1988, a 15.8 percent increase over the current biennium was requested. Virginia's overall economy has been thriving in recent years and Governor Baliles has been a strong supporter of higher education. College officials are very optimistic that they will receive a high percentage of their budget request. The general assembly proposed plans to include a college savings bond program to help parents save for their children's tuition and financial aid for students working in public service jobs thus allowing part-time students to participate in the financial aid program.

There is legislative interest in limiting the number of out-of-state students attending public colleges and universities because qualified Virginians are being turned away.

West Virginia

Consolidated Governing Board - No Local or Segmental Governing Bodies

In 1969, the West Virginia legislature set up a new state-wide Board of Regents. The ten state colleges were transferred from a Board of Governors to the Board of Regents achieving a state governance structure that existed half a century earlier.

The new Board of Regents is composed of nine members appointed by the governor upon senate confirmation. The state superintendent of free schools became the sole governing board of all public higher education institutions. Each institution is permitted to have a small advisory board, wholly without powers of governance (Chambers, 1970).

West Virginia has always shown relatively strong support for higher education. In 1969, the legislature actually approved some five million dollars more than the conservative incoming governor had recommended for operating expenses of higher education for the fiscal year. Chambers (1970) cites, "the people of West Virginia have a high level of understanding and appreciation of the service of public higher education to the future of the state" (p. 400). In 1968, the state ranked twenty-third as to the state tax investment per citizen in annual operating expenses of higher education. This amount was three percent below the national average, indicating that the support of higher education could hardly be said to be straining the economy.

The 1987 legislative session recognized the state's weak financial situation. Most of their proposals tied programs to economic development. The State Board of Regents raised faculty salaries, expanded economic development centers, increased student aid and established new programs to attract distinguished professors. State institutions received more flexibility in

managing their finances and are able to carry over some of the unused money to the new fiscal year.

West Virginia's economy continues to falter. Although the legislature has requested a 21.1 percent increase in the budget for 1988, the magnitude of the increase being sought is probably unrealistic. Legislative leaders say they want to give more money but simply do not have any to give.

In 1988, legislative battles could erupt over the structure of the Board of Regents. The existence of the Board must be extended this year or it will be abolished. According to a January 3, 1988 article in the Chronicle of Higher Education, Governor Moore is expected to propose changes in the Board of Regents or try to eliminate it. Some legislative leaders and campus administrators want to limit the power of the statewide Board and grant more authority to campus boards. The present source of stress for the college or university president was cited as the Board of Regents.

Table 1
State Coordination/Governance

STATE	CATEGORY	TITLE OF PRIMARY AGENCY	YEAR FIRST CREATED	NO. OF PUBLIC 4-YR INSTITUTIONS	ADDITIONAL REMARKS 4-YR INSTITUTIONS	TITLE OF 2-YR AGENCY OFFICE	NO. OF 2-YR INSTITUTIONS	ADDITIONAL REMARKS 2-YR INSTITUTIONS
Maryland	Coordinating Board-Public Majority Advisory Power	State Board of Higher Education	1962	9	Morgan State/ St. Mary's Public Not Gov. by Coun.	State Board for Community Colleges	17	Local 2-yr Institutional "Governing" Boards
New Jersey	Coordinating Board-Public Majority Regulatory Powers	Board of Higher Education	1965	9	Union/Collective Bargaining of Higher Education	Office of Community Colleges Department	19	Union/Collective Bargaining
Pennsylvania	Coordinating Board-Public Majority Advisory Powers	State Board of Education	1963	15	Union/Collective Bargaining	Department of Education: Community Colleges	18	Union/Collective Bargaining
Virginia	Coordinating Board-Public Majority Advisory Powers	State Council for Higher Education	1956	10	State Budget Office and State Council Collectively Review Institutional Budget Requests	Virginia Community College System	24	State Board for Community Colleges Dispenses Budget Based on Minimal Institutional Input
West Virginia	Consolidated Governing Board	Board of Regents	1969	10	Local Institutional Boards are Advisory Without Powers of Governance	Community Colleges and Vocational Education	8	4 (50%) of the 2-yr Institutions are Branches under the Wings of a Parent Institution

In conclusion, Berdahl (1971) commented "although the federal government, through its enormous fiscal powers, may ultimately come to play the dominant role in higher education, state financing will continue to be indispensable for the indefinite future. In any case, universities and colleges will always have to function to the context of state law and thus will be subject to statewide coordination and planning" (p. 239).

The presidential level of distress examined in this study indicated no significant difference between the states with a coordinating council and states with a governing board. All states have the right to assure that the institutions within their jurisdiction operate in the broad public interest. Researchers (Chambers 1970, Berdahl, 1971) point out that they must recognize a need to raise the degree of autonomy in our state universities and colleges. When the autonomy of an institution is raised, the level of distress concerning budgetary matters will be lowered for the chief executive officer. Chambers (1970) remarks that the governance of our public institutions need not reflect specific and detailed control from a statewide governing board or power-laden coordinating board. He suggests "when the autonomy of the university and college is diminished or destroyed by removing decision-making from the campus to the state house or some other remote point, creating a species of absentee landlordism, it tends to short-change and insult the constituency, and to debase the institutions" (p. 9).

Stress: Eustress/Distress

Stress begins at birth and remains with us throughout our lives.

Normal stress is necessary and vital. However, too much can be dangerous. In recent years, the medical profession has had to take another hard look at stress diseases. This look has led to growing recognition of the role of stress.

Since stress is a part of our everyday lives and stress researchers (Friedman and Rosenman, 1974; Selye, 1974; Curtis, 1981; Chmielewski, 1982; Melendez, 1983; Lazarus and Folkman, 1984; Schuler, 1985; and others) have been able to relate stress with the three leading causes of mortality: (a) heart disease, (b) cancer and (c) stroke, it was important to trace the research associated with the term stress.

Lazarus and Folkman (1984) traced the term stress to the 14th century to mean "hardship, straits, adversity, or affliction. In the 17th century the term was used in the context of the physical sciences and later made systematic in the early 19th century" (p. 2). The 19th century associated stress as a basis of ill-health based on studies done with normal body reactions to internal and external forces. The French physiologist, Claude Bernard, originally proposed this theory based on "a common characteristic feature of all living things to maintain an internal constancy, despite changes in the surroundings" (p. 19) (Cited by Curtis and Detert, 1981). In 1932, Walter B. Cannon, Harvard physiologist, labeled this self-regulating system in living

things as "homeostasis" or the body's way of returning to a balanced state after the equilibrium was upset (Cited in Lazarus and Folkman, 1984).

In 1936, Hans Selye was using the term stress in a technical sense to mean an orchestrated set of bodily defenses against any form of stimulus. In the early 1950's, he published an annual report on his research. This work was pulled together in 1956 in a major book called The Stress of Life. His second book, Stress Without Distress was published in 1974 to update his research and present his views on the body's reaction to stress. These two publications contributed so much to the research on this subject that most authors refer to Selye's studies as an introduction to their own work. He was given the unofficial title as "the world's leading authority on stress" in 1974 by his publishers.

It soon became evident to Selye (1974) from animal experiments that organ changes involving the body's immune defense reaction were being produced by "cold, heat, infection, trauma, hemorrhage, nervous irritation, and many other stimuli. Here was an experimental replica of the syndrome of just being sick" (p. 25). This reaction was first described in 1936 as a syndrome produced by various agents. It subsequently became known as "the General Adaptation Syndrome (G.A.S.) or the biological stress syndrome. It has three stages: (a) the alarm reaction, (b) the stage of resistance, and (c) the stage of exhaustion" (p. 26).

Selye (1974) defined stress as "the nonspecific response of the body to any demand made upon it" (p. 14). Selye (1974) coined the term eustress to designate desirable stress. Mullen, et al. (1986) described eustress as "a desirable stress in which an individual is taxed, challenged and perceives a potential for personal growth" (p. 52). The opposite of eustress is distress or negative stress. For the purpose of this study, the term stress will be synonymous with the term distress, generally taken to mean too much stress or experiencing too many stressors in a short period of time. Sometimes the word stress is said to refer to the things that upset us which are really stressors. "A stressor is the agent or stimulus that elicits the stress reaction" (p. 50). Curtis and Detert (1981) grouped stressors into five categories or types: (a) social stressors, such as noise and crowding; (b) psychological stressors such as anxiety and worry; (c) psychosocial stressors such as death of a spouse; (d) biochemical or physical stressors such as heat, cold or alcohol and drugs; and (e) philosophical stressors, which result from a value system conflict or an inability to decipher direction and/or purpose to your life. Insel and Roth (1988) reinforced Curtis and Detert's research by indicating that there were four stressors that seem to be most strongly linked to stress: (a) change, (b) frustration, (c) overload and (d) deprivation.

Defining and describing stress poses major conceptual problems.

Whitman, Spendlove, and Clark (1984) described reactions to stress that

included arousal, depression, anxiety, boredom, anger, physical discomfort and discomfort in general. They identified physical symptoms associated with psychological and physical stress as changes in heart rate, blood pressure, skin conductancy and various hormonal responses. In addition to physical symptoms, they cited that stressful situations produce "psychological, cognitive, behavioral, and social reactions" (p. 8).

There are three stress models, the medical-biological, the psychoanalytical and the person-environment that are discussed in the literature. Hans Selye, the stress pioneer, is probably identified with the medical model more than any other individual. His general adaptation syndrome includes both psychological and biological stressors. The psychoanalytical model focuses on the individual's conflicts between biological and societal pressures.

Hales and Williams (1986) determined that some people seem to invite disproportionate amounts of stress into their lives. Hurried, aggressive, impatient and easily angered, people have been labeled "Type A" based on experiments conducted by Friedman and Rosenman (1974). Type A people are those engaged in a relatively chronic and excessive struggle to obtain an unusually excessive number of things from the environment in too short a period of time. In contrast, the typical Type B person is low-keyed, contemplative and relaxed. Type A people are not necessarily more

successful than Type B's, according to Friedman and Rosenman (1974), because Type A behavior is often disruptive and counterproductive, and Type B behavior may be more organized and efficient. Not all stress experts agree that people can be so neatly classified as Type A or Type B, but the Type A/Type B distinction is an interesting one to bear in mind when we research behavior (Cited in Levy, Dignam, and Sirreffs (1984).

In addition to a variety of stressors, there is also an intensity range in the strength of the response the stressor elicits. A primary or macro-stressor is one that initiates the stress response. Secondary or micro-stressors are events that result from the first stressor that keep the stress response activated. Stimulus overload is an example of a primary stressor for a chief executive officer in higher education. This occurs when there is too much to be done and not enough time in which to do everything. Moving frantically from one task to another will soon elicit the stress response. Then worry, as a secondary stressor, is likely to begin to raise anxiety levels and keep the stress response activated for a long period of time. Too much distress can lead to health problems: physical, mental and emotional. Yet short-term distress forces us to turn our conscious attention to the source. This type of stress can also be a challenge.

In conclusion, learning to identify, reduce or control stress, not avoiding it, is the challenge. Presidents must accept this challenge and develop positive coping and stress management techniques.

Coping/Stress Management

One of the research questions that guided this study was: What are the coping strategies utilized by each individual when distress replaces the normal tension and pressure associated with their jobs? This issue was addressed with two "open-ended" questions on the survey. The first, "What do you do most often when distress occurs?" was presented as a means of recognizing and understanding the initial reaction of the stress response. According to Selye (1974), Mullen, et al. (1986) and Greenberg (1987), this "alarm" stage awakens the body to the stressor. During this stage individuals experience typical signs and symptoms of the stress response, such as muscle tension and an increased heart rate. As mentioned previously, the body attempts to adapt or resist the stressor and return to a normal state. Unsuccessful adaptation may lead to a negative reaction such as depression or an association with alcohol and drugs. Successful adaptation leads to an increased level of resistance to disease and illness and a disappearance of the alarm reaction. This, in turn, will channel stress promoting stimulation, challenge and growth experiences. The second question, "What distress coping strategy or management skill do you prefer to use when distress

occurs?" was intended to identify what chief executive officers elect or choose to do to cope with insults and frustrations associated with their professions.

According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), coping involves changing both cognitive and behavioral efforts to manage environmental and internal demands and conflicts which tax or exceed a person's resources. Pearlin and Schooler (1978) state that coping refers to behavior that protects people from being psychologically harmed by problematic social experience. For the purpose of this study, Schuler's (1985) definition of coping, "a process of analysis and evaluation to decide how to protect oneself against the adverse effects of any stressor and its associated negative outcomes" (p. 351) will be utilized.

Schuler (1985) proposes that effective coping depends upon an individual's cognitive skills: "these skills enable an individual to analyze a stress situation, develop and select a coping strategy, implement the strategy and then get feedback on its effects in order to evaluate it" (p. 370).

Lazarus and Folkman (1984) conclude by summarizing that "definitions of coping must include efforts to manage stressful demands, regardless of outcome. No one strategy is considered better than any other. The goodness of a strategy is determined only by its effects in the long run" (p. 134).

Particular attention has been paid to coping with stress. Lazarus (1966), Pearlman and Schooler (1978), Curtis and Detert (1981), Chmielewski (1982) and Schuler (1985) have determined that coping appears to involve several strategies: the first is direct action, which involves positively dealing with a source of stress (e.g., devoting more time to fiscal matters to more easily meet budget deadlines, or placing faculty raises as a top priority in order to motivate present or attract new instructors. Direct action is the more desirable strategy if such action can be effective. The second strategy is to use palliative techniques, which essentially accept the source of stress but attempt to mitigate the emotional experience of stress which follows. Palliative techniques fall into two categories: mental techniques that alter the president's perception of his circumstances such as putting things into perspective and trying to see the humorous side and physical techniques such as muscle relaxation exercises, the use of alcohol and drugs, and physical exercise such as jogging, swimming and weight training.

Pearlman and Schooler (1978) suggest that there are basically three ways or strategies of coping: (a) changing the potentially stressful situation before it occurs, (b) controlling the meaning of stressful experiences once they occur and (c) managing the effects of the stress response. Which coping tactics an individual chooses depends on how they appraise problems and their repertoire of available tactics. If a problem can be changed, then the coping

efforts chosen are likely to be attempts to solve the problem head-on. If it is clearly a situation that cannot be changed, then the coping strategy will unlikely involve emotion focused coping that reduces involvement.

According to Hales and Williams (1986), awareness is the first step to learning how to manage stress in your life. They suggest monitoring yourself regularly for signs and symptoms of excessive stress. They list 11 warning signals that you should not ignore. They are as follows:

1. Physical symptoms, including chronic fatigue, headaches, indigestion, diarrhea and sleep problems.
2. Frequent illness or excessive worrying about illness.
3. Self-medication, including overuse of aspirin and other non-prescription drugs.
4. Problems concentrating on studies or work.
5. Feeling irritable, anxious or apathetic.
6. Working or studying longer and harder than usual, exaggerating the importance of what you do to yourself and others.
7. Denying that any problem exists.
8. Becoming accident-prone.
9. Breaking rules, whether it's a curfew at home or a speeding limit on the highway.

10. Avoiding people.

11. Going to extremes: drinking too much, spending a lot of money, gambling, etc. (p. 51)

Maslach and Jackson (1984) have suggested that if persistent stressors continue over a long period of time, effects of coping can eventually result in emotional withdrawal, a primary aspect of burnout.

It has been stated that there is an optimum amount of stress. It is impossible and undesirable to eliminate all stress. As Selye (1974) has stated, "complete freedom from stress is death" (p. 20). Stress management does not subscribe to the goal of completely eliminating all stress. Most researchers in the field suggest three major options: eliminate the stress, reduce the stress level or develop a positive coping strategy.

According to Levy, Dignam and Shirreffs (1984) in order to establish a personal stress management program, one must begin by deciding which stressors in your life are unavoidable or at least beyond one's control. There is, for example, little we can do about our national deficit or cold winters or hot, humid summers. Step two would involve making a list of the stressors one can avoid totally. In the case of the college president, there may not be very many of these, unfortunately. All of the other stressors in one's life can be dealt with, at least, or be modified. Some stressors may be subject to even

more control: those you contribute to, or even create, through poor planning, putting things off or expecting the worst.

Quick and Quick (1984) described methods of coping that are concerned with helping the individual to alter the frequency and the intensity of the demands or stressors which he or she face. These individual-level preventive management techniques fall into three groups: (a) primary prevention-managing personal perceptions of stress, the work environment and one's lifestyle, (b) secondary prevention-relaxation training, physical and emotional outlets and (c) tertiary prevention-counseling and psychotherapy or medical care (p. 217).

The research of Pearlin and Schooler (1978) suggests that individual coping efforts, when used in isolation, are inadequate. In a large-scale, prospective survey, they found problem-focused coping to be most successful in preventing strain in marital and family relationships. In contrast, emotion focused coping, designed not to change the situation but to reduce one's environment, was the most effective response to work-related stress.

Hales and Williams (1986) have stated that "sometimes just becoming aware of potential stresses can help" (p. 61). They list three types of daily stress situations: first, stressors that are foreseeable and avoidable which for the college president may include office or phone interruptions. A reduction of these stressors may involve telling the secretary to hold all messages and

appointments for a period of time. Second, stressors that are neither foreseeable nor avoidable, for example, the unexpected resignation of a cabinet member, and third, stressors that are foreseeable but not avoidable such as going to the board of trustees meeting or changing to a new funding formula.

In Stress Without Distress, Hans Selye (1974) lists his guidelines for living out a less stressful life. Admit that there is no perfection, but in each category of achievement something is tops; be satisfied to strive for that. Do not underestimate the delight of real simplicity in your lifestyle. Whatever situation you meet in life, consider first whether it is really worth fighting for. Try to keep your mind constantly on the pleasant aspects of life and on actions which improve your situation. Nothing paralyzes your efficiency more than frustration; nothing helps it more than success. Even after the greatest defeats, the depressing thought of being a failure is best combated by taking stock of all your past achievements, which no one can deny you when faced with a task which is very painful yet indispensable to achieve your aim, don't procrastinate; cut right into an abscess to eliminate the pain, instead of prolonging it by gently rubbing the surface. Finally, do not forget that there is no ready-made success formula which would suit everybody (p. 141-143).

Hales and Williams (1986) list ten guidelines that can help to live with stress without distress: (a) Learn to accept philosophically what you cannot

change and have no control over, (b) Exercise regularly to relieve physiological and mental tension, (c) Seek accurate information about your sources of stress. Knowledge can bring floating fears down to earth, (d) Share worries with someone you trust, love, or respect. Be sure to talk out problems., (e) Learn to listen to your body talk. When you are under stress, you will get physical warnings. Listen to your body, then back up and ease off, (f) Balance work and recreation. A set routine for relaxation will help. Immerse yourself in the activity you choose and completely enjoy it., (g) Avoid relying on alcohol and drugs to help you cope. Drug dependence for stressful situations can quickly develop without any action-oriented solutions occurring, (h) Avoid obsession with self. Do something for others when you are upset. You'll take your mind off yourself and gain esteem from other sources., (i) Don't take yourself so seriously. You are human and make mistakes. Be able to laugh at yourself., (j) Get enough rest and sleep on a regular basis. Take good care of your body. (p. 63)

Montoye, Christian, Nagle and Levin (1988) describe various methods a person can use for reducing stress. Some people discover on their own an activity that works for them. These individuals may not need to know some of the primary techniques utilized in stress management. Aerobic exercise can be used to reduce stress in both immediate and long-term ways. When a person does a single aerobic workout (i.e., dancing, jogging, swimming,

biking) he or she feels less tension for two to five hours afterward; psychologists refer to this short-term effect as a reduction in state anxiety, which is the anxiety you experience at any given time. There may also be a long-term stress reducing benefit of aerobic exercise. A person who exercises regularly may reduce his or her characteristic level of stress, or trait anxiety. A person who used to feel uptight at the slightest provocation may find that after exercising regularly for several weeks, he or she no longer becomes nervous as readily.

Montoye et al. (1988) further suggest the use of relaxation training as a procedure that helps people recognize tension in their muscles, and trains them to release that tension. Daily practice of the technique maintains the skill; then, whenever a person experiences muscular tension during the course of the day's activities, he or she can relax the affected muscles. One can learn relaxation from a therapist in individual or group sessions or from books and tapes. The procedure starts by finding a comfortable area and feeling relaxed as possible. Tensing muscles in an isolated area of the body for five to ten seconds and then slowly releasing the tension is the basic format utilized. The suggested sequence to use for relaxing muscles is as follows: arms, face, neck, torso, and legs. Dominant extremities are first, with nondominant extremities following.

These researchers include systematic desensitization as a method for

reducing stress that involves gradual exposure, via the imagination, to a stress-producing situation while a person is very relaxed. If the relaxation can be maintained in the imaginary situation, it may be possible to transfer it to the real situation. Pick an example, such as the fear of public speaking. Make a list of the stressful speaking situations from your past ranking the most stressful first and the least stressful last. With the list in front of you, put yourself into a relaxed state (i.e., using the relaxation training previously discussed). Next, imagine that you are in a situation at the bottom of your list, the one that evokes the least anxiety. When you can imagine that situation without becoming anxious, or when you can dissipate any anxiety that you feel, move on to imagining the next situation. Work your way up the list in this manner until you can imagine the most stressful situation either without becoming anxious or with the ability to reduce anxiety by means of relaxation. The payoff will come when you find that you can cope with the actual situations without becoming anxious.

It is also possible to reduce stress by dealing directly with the thoughts that give rise to it; cognitive restructuring is their fourth technique that can help accomplish this. To use this technique, you must become aware of the self-statements that result in feelings such as anxiety, fear, depression, or anger. As you think back to a situation that had a strong negative emotional charge for you, it isn't easy to recall the various thoughts you had at the time.

However, it is useful to uncover them, because you can bring about changes in the feelings by identifying and modifying the thoughts that initiated them. It can be helpful in this situation to keep a diary of your thoughts and feelings associated with a particular situation. Review the diary to see whether you are producing unnecessary stress by thinking types of thoughts that are counterproductive to your emotional well being. Counterproductive thinking includes: filtering - focusing on negative aspects of a situation while ignoring its positive features; polarized thinking - viewing the world as black and white, rather than in shades of gray; catastrophizing - focusing on the worst case scenario when thinking about an upcoming event.

The final method recommended by Montoye et al. (1988) is biofeedback, a stress management procedure in which information about some physiological aspect of stress (i.e., muscle tension, percentage of body fat, resting heart rate, blood pressure, brain waves, etc.) is presented and used to reduce stress. According to Greenberg (1987), "Biofeedback is just a fancy name for receiving information about what is occurring in your body at a particular time" (p. 172). Greenberg lists three phases of biofeedback: (a) measuring the physiological parameter, (b) converting this measurement to some understandable form, and (c) feeding back this information to the person who is learning to control his or her body processes.

An example of biofeedback would be to determine a person's

percentage of body fat, recommend a healthy range of body fat for the individual based on their age, height, and sex and prescribe a positive method to reach this goal (i.e., a reduction of kilocalories associated with an activity increase over a period of time that would enable the individual to lose approximately two pounds per week until the goal was reached).

The literature on coping and stress management in higher education is limited. Studies have been conducted with professionals and business executives as subjects. Galton (1983) cited a study that was conducted to distinguish the more successful copers from the less successful ones. Fifteen "effective, successful, and physically and mentally healthy" (p. 172) corporate vice presidents, physicians, lawyers and educational administrators, with a work week of at least 60 hours, were chosen as subjects.

A questionnaire on lifestyle, attitude toward work and personality was completed. Results were compared with an earlier study of 15 professionals who worked similar hours but suffered from exhaustion and physical and emotional illness. The comparison of the two groups established the following six characteristics demonstrated by the healthy subjects: the ability to (a) postpone thinking about problems until it is appropriate, (b) spot fatigue and respond accordingly, (c) engage in regular physical exercise, (d) have interests outside their work, (e) demonstrate a sense of humor, and (f) laugh at themselves. In contrast, the unsuccessful group reacted in the opposite way

by always ruminating and being obsessed about work problems.

When demands are appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of the person, a positive coping/stress management process is needed. What a person actually thinks or does within a specific context depends on their ability to understand coping and evaluate the various stages of change in the coping process.

Stress and the Business Chief Executive Officer

The literature has described the college president as a business manager as well as an educator. The majority of presidents in this study indicated their job was similar to their corporate counterparts. This section examines stress and coping in the business world.

As a business executive, there is no escaping stress. It is as much a part of the business world of today as the annual report. It is felt by the young man or woman driving upward, by the middle-aged executive whose career may have peaked and by the person at the top with heavy responsibility. Galton (1983) speculates that American industry is losing as much as \$20 billion annually in lost workdays, hospitalization and early deaths caused by executive stress reaction.

This section of related research will examine the sources of executive stress in the business world that can lead to depression and general anxiety, to alcoholism and drug addiction, and to a breakdown in normal relations with

friends, family and colleagues. Although stress may make some people tick, it sickens others.

Kiev and Kohn (1979) conducted one of the first national surveys to ascertain attitudes and behaviors from executive managers in relation to on-the-job stress. Questionnaires were mailed to 6,000 members of the American Management Association. The purpose of the survey was to investigate managers' perceptions of stress in terms of: (a) how they cope with stress, (b) what managers define as stressful on and off the job and (c) the extent to which they experience stress. The principal findings of the study were:

1. The great majority reported that stressful situations on the job arose at times, but not with great frequency.

2. The most stress producing factors are work and time pressures, disparity between a manager's own goals and the expectations of the organization, the political climate of the organization and lack of feedback on job performance.

3. Stress outside the work environment stemmed from ordinary life events (i.e., financial worries, problems with spouse and children and physical afflictions).

4. The most effective coping technique was to analyze the stressful situation and decide what is worth worrying about, delegate work to subordinates and set priorities for effective counter measures to job stress.

5. Most managers felt that their health was not adversely affected by their work and took stress in stride without exhibiting maladaptive work habits, emotional symptomatic responses or other nonproductive behaviors such as excessive smoking or drinking.

Contrary to Kiev and Kohn's findings, Veninga and Spradley (1981) indicated that the American Academy of Family Physicians released an extensive study that sought to find out what percentage of business executives experienced significant work stress. Eighty percent of the business executives reported that they usually or always worked under stress. Those surveyed reported four typical kinds of job pressures: work, overload, pressure from superiors, deadlines and low salaries. "Perhaps the most important findings of this study had to do with the effect of stress on health. Those workers who reported high levels of work stress had two, three and even four times the number of health problems. They had allergies, migraines, backaches, nervousness, headaches, depression, insomnia and other classic job-burnout symptoms" (p. 12).

Cooper and Marshall (1978) examined occupational sources of stress related to heart disease and mental illness. Their findings produced five primary sources of stress at work. They included: (a) sources intrinsic to the job such as working conditions, deadlines, job design, and technical problems; (b) role conflict, ambiguity and responsibility; (c) career development; (d)

relationships at work including peers, boss and threats from below; and (e) pressures from organizational structure and climate such as bureaucratic pettiness and lack of participation. Personal stressors fell into two main categories: extraorganizational sources such as a midlife crisis, family problems or financial difficulties and individual sources such as anxiety, frustration, tolerance and Type A behavior.

Yates (1979) cited a major study conducted by the University of Michigan for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Over 3,000 men in 23 occupations ranging from factory workers to university administrators were surveyed to determine sources of job stress. The study concluded that employees that report a high degree of boredom in their work are likely to feel that their skills and abilities are not being used well, consider their work low in complexity and to have a poor fit between the amount of complexity they want and the amount that their jobs provide. "Boredom may produce stress as fast as, or perhaps even faster than, the traditional killers of the Industrial Revolution - long hours, heavy workloads and pressing responsibilities" (p. 37)

Studies conducted by Pelletier (1985) indicated that it is the minor hassels such as misplacing or losing things, physical appearance and too many things to do that represent an immediate source of stress that disturbs the working day. He concludes by stating that "these little hassles which plague

people every day may be more injurious to mental and physical health than major traumatic life events" (p. 59).

Pelletier (1985) lists 13 sources of stress more common to the business manager. They include: (a) work overload and excessive time demands and rush deadlines, (b) erratic work schedules and take-home work, (c) ambiguity rewarding work tasks, territory and role, (d) constant change and daily variability, (e) role conflict, (f) job instability and fear of unemployment, (g) responsibility, especially for people, (h) negative competition, (i) type of vigilance required in work assignments and team-building toward goals, (j) ongoing contact with stress carriers such as workaholics, (k) sexual harassment, (l) accelerated recognition for achievement, and (m) detrimental environment conditions of lighting, ventilation, noise, and personal privacy.

Business executives, like presidents, can be a source of stress for others. This, in turn, can backfire and cause a series of problems for the supervisor. Chapman (1970) maintains that the utilization of five basic human relation foundations sincerely, frequently, and naturally will provide a prescribed form of action that promotes a positive supervisor/employee relationship. The five foundations are: (a) give clear and complete instructions, (b) let each person know how he/she is getting along, (c) give credit when due, (d) involve people in decisions, and (e) keep an open-door policy.

To be a successful executive one has to learn to cope with stress.

Considering the ever-mounting complexities, uncertainties and pressures of business, often coupled with complex family, economic and social factors, one must live with stress. The sources of stress have been identified. This section will reflect the research associated with the coping/management aspect. The effects of stress are not determined by stress itself, but by how we view and handle that stress. We either handle it properly or let its negative effects get the better of us and we suffer distress.

Distress in organizations is becoming an important concern for chief executive officers. By reducing or managing distress these negative effects may be significantly reduced, benefitting the individual and the organization. Reducing or managing distress is the essence of coping, and understanding of coping can aid in attaining the benefits of dealing with distress successfully.

Axline (1987) discussed general indicators of the stress crisis that might interfere with or impair functioning of the executive. He suggests professional counseling for these top executives who recognize and admit the need to talk to someone, "the ultimate test of a professional counselor's or therapist's effectiveness is improved understanding, comfort and functioning for the executive. The overall objectives of therapy are to enable the person to feel better about himself or herself, to rationally consider the consequences of his or her behavior and to seek alternatives for leading a fuller more

satisfying life" (p. 45). The author indicates that many executives have little knowledge of professional resources when trying to identify a therapist. He suggests one should check, very carefully, the practitioner's references and credentials.

Beehr and Bhagat (1985) examined social support by supervisors as a means of coping. Four types of social support were reviewed. They included: (a) emotional - providing esteem, affect, trust and listening; (b) appraisal - providing affirmation, feedback and social comparison; (c) informational - providing advice, suggestion, directives and information; (d) instrumental - providing aid in kind, money, labor, time, or modification of the environment. They concluded, "although the effects of social support on stress and health have been the target of study for less than a decade, social support is beneficial in the context of occupational stress because such past research seems to imply that support is generally beneficial, and it seems to be a common sense notion that people can help others in almost any situation" (p. 381).

The female executive is not immune from stress. Research has indicated that women suffer from distress similar to men. Chusmer and Durand (1987) reported when women work in "men's-work" jobs, they generally experience stress from discrimination in performance evaluation, pay, promotion practices, hazing, unsupportive bosses, and nonacceptance of

others. "So whether they are employed in male- or female-dominated professions, women are likely to experience stress in one form or another" (p. 43). The authors list several key steps to reduce stress caused by improper socialization at work. They include: (a) learn to accept and encourage women in equal roles, (b) eliminate male-only practices by not participating or supporting these practices, (c) keep sexuality out of work relationships, (d) equalize promotion opportunity, (e) know the law, (f) re-evaluate salary policies and (f) eliminate sex-role biases and misconceptions of male workers.

In summary, there is no escaping stress in the business world. It affects the young, middle-aged and old regardless of race or sex. Industry loses billions annually related to physical, mental and emotional illness. College and university presidents and their corporate counterparts can learn from each other.

Chapter Summary

In addition to everyday common stressful situations experienced by people everywhere, many sources of stress are unique to the academic chief executive officer. Potential specific sources of stress that have a high degree of distress must be identified. Signs and symptoms of stress that can lead to physical, mental and emotional exhaustion must be recognized. Positive coping and stress management techniques need to be understood and practiced. Finally, more research needs to be conducted which exclusively

examines stress and coping in higher education, compares presidents and corporate executives and probes the interaction of the college and university chief executive officer with his state coordinating/governing agency.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Kauffman (1980), Carbone (1981), Schuler (1981), Duea (1981), Bucci (1983), Kerr (1984) and Green (1988) have conducted studies using college and university chief executive officers as the population for study. Each used a survey questionnaire technique to ascertain the information for their study. The sample used by these researchers consisted of a random selection of persons with the number determined by modern sampling techniques because the population was large, for example, over 2,000 in Green's case. For the present study, the population is not so large ($N = 140$) and a 100 percent sample was chosen. This research design permits the examination of various perceptions existing at the time of the study.

Since no standardized instrument was found in the literature that could be used to address the constructs of this study, a researcher-developed instrument was used. Mouly (1978) maintained that one of the problems associated with questionnaire use is insuring that it adequately covers the constructs under investigation. To do this, Van Dalen (1979) suggested constructing questionnaires by taking into account: a) a defining of the precise property to be measured, b) constructing appropriate items to cover each property and c) developing a format that is easy to read, answer and one that gives results that are easy to tabulate. Mouly (1978) added that each item

in the questionnaire must make a definite contribution to the overall purpose of the study, or face elimination.

Van Dalen (1979) indicated that closed-form questionnaires are preferred for use when dealing with a population as they are easy to administer, help direct the respondent's mind to each property and facilitate analysis and tabulation of data. Mouly (1978) contended that Likert Scales are well-suited for closed-form questionnaires. These are forms of continuous variable scales that contain options that allow a respondent to indicate the degree to which a questionnaire item appeals to his or her sensibilities. Van Dalen (1979) added that respondents using such a scale are afforded the opportunity to circle or mark points on a scale in order of their importance.

Kerlinger (1973) suggested that open-ended questions supply a frame of reference for respondent's answers, but put a minimum of restraint on the answers and their expression. They are flexible, yet have possibilities of depth, enable the researcher to clear up misunderstanding, ascertain a respondent's lack of knowledge, detect ambiguity, encourage cooperation and achieve rapport and make better estimates of respondent's true intentions, beliefs and attitudes.

Design of Study

The purpose of this study was to identify primary sources of stress associated with the job as reported by selected two- and four-year public

higher education chief executive officers, the degree of each source, and what, if any, coping strategies are used. More specifically, the study addressed the following research questions:

1. What perceptions do selected two- and four-year higher education chief executive officers have of sources of stress that may cause distress associated with their jobs?
2. What is the degree of distress associated with each source of stress as perceived by each individual?
3. What are the coping strategies utilized by each individual when distress replaces the normal tension and pressure associated with his job?

A descriptive survey questionnaire utilizing both closed-form and open-ended questions was used to determine the perceptions of 140 chief executive officers. A frame of reference was established for the respondents through directions and definitions presented at the beginning of the instrument.

Likert-type, six point rating scales were correlated with 32 potential sources of stress associated with the presidency. Space was provided to add any additional sources of stress that were not included in the original 32 identified sources of stress. The 32 sources of stress on the survey were derived from pilot studies, related research, interviews and doctoral committee input. Respondents were asked to indicate what degree of distress was associated with each source of stress. The six-point Likert scale ranged from 0 (no distress) to 5 (excessive distress). Kerlinger (1973) noted that when

there are five to seven possible categories of response, a greater variance in total scores results.

According to Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachy (1962), the Likert scale is based on the assumption that man's actions are guided by his cognitions, by what he thinks, believes and anticipates. The thought and action of the individual reflect his wants and goals that continuously develop and change and are organized around the self. The arousal of a particular set of wants depends upon the momentary physiological state, situations and cognitions of the individual.

The major purpose for using a descriptive survey questionnaire was to ascertain interpersonal response traits and attitudes, a more or less stable and consistent disposition of the individual to respond in a characteristic way. Personality measurement is mostly of traits. An attitude, on the other hand, is an organized predisposition to think, feel, perceive and behave toward a referent or cognitive object (Kerlinger, 1973). This research was conducted based on the following assumptions:

1. Chief executive officers are able to identify sources of stress associated with their jobs and the degree of distress associated with each source of stress.
2. Attitudes reflected represent organized perceptions of each response based on the ideal self, or the person's conception of what he ought to be like, act and the set of values he holds for himself. The ideal self provides a standard against which his behavior and achievement are evaluated. The ideal self is influenced by social factors and the person's conception reflecting the values of his reference groups.

3. Respondents completed the questionnaire at a time of the year (June/July) when their job was less distressful, thus giving them more time to respond to each question.

In addition to the Likert scales, there were six open-ended questions provided to ascertain respondent's perceptions and attitudes on the following: sources of stress that cause the most problems and why, specific skills and activities that cause distress, what is done and preferred to be done when distress occurs, comparison of job responsibility and accountability with corporate executive officers and times of the year when the job becomes more or less distressful.

Selection of Population

The target population of the study was selected to provide a heterogeneous group of college presidents. All sizes of rural, urban and suburban institutions were represented. Overall, the population provided a reasonable indicator of stressed and unstressed presidents nationwide. The geographic area was chosen to allow this researcher the opportunity to contact respondents in person or by phone. A chief executive officer was appointed in each state to help solicit a higher response rate.

Statewide coordination of each of the five states was researched to determine primary structures, functions and relationships of the various types of agencies. The primary purpose of this research was to focus on the sensitivity with which the state agency performs its role as intermediary

between the state and the institution and how this framework might determine a chief executive officer's response based on personal interaction with each source of stress.

The 1987 Carnegie Foundation classification of colleges and universities was used to select the institutions/chief executive officers to be surveyed. The survey target population included all (N = 140) public institutions in the five states that fell into the following five categories: comprehensive universities and colleges I, comprehensive colleges and universities II, liberal arts colleges I, liberal arts colleges II and, two-year colleges and universities. The distribution of two- and four-year public institutions that were listed in the five Carnegie classifications were as follows: Maryland 17, 9; New Jersey 19, 10; Pennsylvania 18, 16; Virginia 24, 10; and West Virginia 8, 9. A total of 140 institutions supplied the population for this study.

Collection of Data

The data for this study were collected from mailed survey questionnaires, and semi-structured personal and phone interviews conducted in the summer of 1987. This method allowed the researcher to obtain different types of in-depth information, be available to clarify terminology and ask clarifying and probing open-ended questions.

Mullen et al. (1986) reflected that survey data that rely on voluntary information are subject to many sources of error. People deliberately distort the truth, inadvertently fail to recall events correctly or refuse to participate. Kerlinger (1973) noted, "Responses to mail questionnaires are generally poor. Returns of less than 40 to 50 percent are common. Higher percentages are rare. At best, the researcher must content himself with returns as low as 50 to 60 percent" (p. 414). The selection of the geographic region surveyed, the type of respondent and the follow-up phone calls allowed this study to exceed the expected return rates presented by Kerlinger.

A total of 65.71 percent of usable responses were received. It must be pointed out that this researcher received an additional 21 responses from presidents and institutions indicating that the survey could not be completed for a variety of reasons. They included individual policy, vacation, illness and current change in the chief executive officer position. As stated earlier, there were 65.71 percent (N = 92) usable responses; however, this researcher received a response from 80.71 percent (N = 113) of the 140 original chief executive officers/institutions surveyed.

Statistical Treatment

The purpose of the study was to identify perceptions of selected two- and four-year public chief executive officers as to the sources of stress associated with the presidency. The researcher also sought to estimate the

degree of distress associated with each source of stress as perceived by each individual and to identify the coping strategies utilized when a moderate to excessive degree of distress replaced the normal tension and pressure associated with the job.

In order to examine the veracity of distress responses associated with the sources of stress, descriptive statistics of the mean, standard deviation and Z-score (standard score) were calculated. Any Z-score greater than zero was identified as a primary source of job stress. There were a total of eight sources of stress that were labeled "primary". All 32 sources of stress were ranked based on their Z-score in descending order, with the highest source of stress (Budget $Z = 0.61$) listed first and the lowest source of stress (Alumni, $Z = -1.52$) ranked 32nd. Respondents' comments associated with each source of stress were included in Chapter IV in order to provide reader clarification.

The six open-ended questions were addressed using the Q-sort technique. Stephenson (1953) recommended this method to characterize a set of philosophical, psychological, statistical, and psychometric ideas oriented to research on an individual. Color-coded response cards were created for each of the six open-ended questions. Each presidential response was written on a card and placed in a category. Categories were created to allow treatment of the responses. The categorization system for questions three and four was tested by this researcher for validity by having ten individuals perform a Q-

sort. Results were compared with the original Q-sort performed by this researcher. Results were computed by reporting the percentage of the total responses found in each category. Categories of responses associated with each question are presented in the following chapter.

Chapter Summary

One hundred forty chief executive officers were surveyed providing a useable response rate of 92. Distribution and collection of the survey packet was conducted by this researcher. The data were analyzed to answer the research questions. Results are presented in Chapter IV, followed by conclusions, implications and recommendations in Chapter V.

CHAPTER IV

THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Ninety-six chief executive officers responded to a mailed survey packet (Appendices A-D) during the summer of 1987. These responses were tabulated and analyzed.

This chapter is devoted to a presentation of the results of the study and an in-depth analysis of the data. The chapter is divided into the following subsections: research questions, analytic design, demographic information, survey questionnaire: results, open-ended questions: results and chapter summary.

Research Questions

Three research questions were entertained. These were:

Research Question 1 - What perceptions do selected two- and four-year higher education chief executive officers have of sources of stress that may cause distress associated with their jobs?

Research Question 2 - What is the degree of distress associated with each source of stress as perceived by each individual?

Research Question 3 - What are the coping strategies utilized by each individual when distress replaces the normal tension and pressure associated with his job?

These research questions were tested using the population which is described in the following paragraph.

Analytic Design

The planned analytic design consisted of a survey population of all public two-and four-year chief executive officers representing institutions in the five Carnegie classifications stated earlier. All institutions in the five Carnegie classifications in the following states were included in this study: Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia. A total population of 140 was selected for this study. Of the written and verbal responses, a total of 65.71 percent (N = 92) usable questionnaires and open-ended questions responses were obtained. Descriptive statistics including the mean, standard deviation and Z-score were calculated from the sources of stress/degree of distress questionnaire. Responses from the open-ended questions were placed in categories created by this researcher.

Q-methodology was used to test the researcher's category classification method with responses from the two open-ended questions that addressed coping and stress management. A Q-sort involving ten participants was executed for this purpose.

Demographic Information

The following narratives and tables provide the general profile for the respondent population.

Of the total useable sample, 66.31 percent (N = 61) represented two-year institutions and 33.69 percent (N = 31) governed four-year colleges and

universities. Rural institutional location comprised 45.65 percent (N = 42), urban constituted 33.70 percent (N = 31), while the remaining respondents indicated a suburban 27.17 percent (N = 25) locality.

Position held prior to present job produced the following configuration:

Table 2

Position Held Prior to Present Job

<u>Prior Position</u>	<u>Percentage of Respondents</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>
Deanship	35.87	33
Vice President	32.61	30
Presidency	19.57	18
Instructor, State Agency or Outside of Education	22.83	21

When asked, "Were you promoted to your present job from within the institution?", the following responses were reported. Out of a total group of 92 respondents, 67.4 percent (N = 62) indicated that they came from outside their present institution, while 32.6 percent (N = 30) were promoted from within.

The highest degree earned by the respondents was the Ph.D. 47.83 percent (N = 44) followed closely by the Ed.D 45.65 percent (N = 42). Only 6.52 percent (N = 6) reported the master's as their highest degree earned. The population in this study complied with the review of literature, as the majority of two-year chief executive officers reported their highest degrees as Ed.D's while their four-year counterparts indicated that the Ph.D. was their highest degree earned. The majority of the respondents acknowledged that their major for their doctoral area of academic specialization was education, 41.30 percent (N = 38). A math/science major, 10.86 percent (N = 10) was indicated as the second highest degree area concentration followed by psychology/sociology 8.70 percent (N = 8), business/economics 7.61 percent (N = 7) and English/humanities 5.43 percent (N = 5). The following areas of degree specialization comprised the remaining population as no single area of concentration exceeded 3.26 percent (N = 3): history, philosophy, physical education, political science and vocational education. The ages of the population were placed in four of the six possible categories:

Table 3

Respondent Ages

<u>Age</u>	<u>Percentage of Respondents</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>
under 30	0	0
30 - 37	0	0
38 - 45	28.26	26
46 - 53	33.70	31
54 - 60	33.70	31
over 60	4.35	4

Survey Questionnaire: Results

Research questions 1 and 2 pertained to the identification of sources of stress associated with the job of the college and university presidency and the degree of distress of each source of stress.

The descriptive statistical procedures used to test the degree of distress associated with each source of stress enabled this researcher to rank each of the 32 sources of stress in this study based on the highest degree of distress as reported by the respondents. The primary analytical model imposed was a Z-score to convert descriptive measurement to a common standard score. The mean of the Z-score used in this study was "0" with a standard deviation of "1". Sources of stress were listed numerically (1-32) from the highest Z-score level of distress ($Z = 0.61$) to the lowest reported level of distress ($Z = -1.52$).

Table 4

Source of Stress/Degree of Distress

<i>Ranking Order: Degree of Distress</i>	<i>Source of Stress</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	<i>Z-Score</i>
1st	Budget	87	3.23	1.19	0.61
2nd	State/local fiscal policy	85	2.98	1.27	0.37
3rd	Career conflict with spouse	83	2.93	1.34	0.32
4th	Paperwork	85	2.70	1.18	0.15
* 5th	Union/collective bargaining	52	2.65	1.71	0.09
6th	Planning/maintenance of facilities and equipment	85	2.58	1.18	0.06
7th	Faculty	86	2.56	1.18	0.05
8th	Risk-taking	85	2.52	1.19	0.01
9th	Social Obligations	86	2.49	1.33	-0.01
10th	Local institutional governing board	86	2.29	1.30	-0.16
11th	Being accountable	85	2.32	1.11	-0.16
12th	Competing with colleagues	85	2.24	1.07	-0.25
13th	Receiving insufficient recognition	86	2.15	1.32	-0.27
14th	Fund raising	87	2.20	1.08	-0.28
15th	Traveling	86	2.09	1.30	-0.34
16th	Living under constant scrutiny	83	2.05	1.27	-0.41
17th	Loneliness of the job	83	2.06	1.27	-0.41
18th	Overseeing internal area of the institution	84	2.06	1.02	-0.43
19th	Receiving inadequate salary	85	1.91	1.24	-0.48
20th	Present/future enrollment trends	85	1.93	1.13	-0.50
21st	Cabinet/administrative council	86	1.88	1.17	-0.53
22nd	Imposing high self-expectations	86	1.86	1.12	-0.57
23rd	Personal interest interference	84	1.75	1.56	-0.60
24th	Community	83	1.83	1.05	-0.64
25th	Complying with federal government policy	85	1.68	1.24	-0.66
26th	Preparing for a career beyond the presidency	85	1.69	1.10	-0.73
27th	Office interruptions	85	1.69	1.00	-0.81
28th	Meetings	85	1.61	1.20	-0.81
29th	Students	85	1.64	0.94	-0.91
30th	Job security	86	1.49	1.05	-0.96
31st	Family interference	81	1.28	1.10	-1.11
32nd	Alumni	85	1.26	0.67	-1.52

* All respondents were from Pennsylvania and New Jersey, the only two states in this study with a union/collective bargaining system.

To provide greater clarification and to expand on the perceptions and feelings of the presidents, relevant respondent comments were selected by this researcher for each of 32 sources of stress.

1st - Budget. The primary source of stress, as indicated by the respondents in this survey, was the budget.

As one respondent noted, "The entire budget process is my main area of stress. From initial preparation and presentation during the budget hearings, to final approval from the state level. When it is over, I have little or no control over the final process".

2nd - Complying With State/Local Fiscal Policy. Several respondents addressed this source of stress by commenting that each area (state and local) should be a separate source of stress. Overall state fiscal policy was identified as a higher degree of distress through comments. However, statistics recorded were based on both areas as one source of stress. State policy was associated with a state governing or coordinating board while local policy involved decisions correlated with the local institutional board and community fiscal support.

As one chief executive officer points out, "State legislators are unwilling to pay the price for quality, but they always expect it. It is always a continuous battle". Inadequate salaries for faculty and equipment and facilities were listed as contributing factors for lack of quality.

3rd - Career Conflict With Spouse. As reported in the literature review, a president's work week averages 55 hours. One respondent reported a 70 plus hour work week. There is little time to spend with a spouse. The majority of presidents are identified as "Type A" individuals with a workaholic type of approach to their jobs. The literature review has produced chapters dedicated to the role of the president's spouse. It must be noted that although sex was not a variable included in this study on the demographic page, all but three of the respondents were males. Thus, it is assumed that vast majority of the married respondents in this study have referred to a career conflict with their wives.

4th - Paperwork. This source of stress may be associated with other sources of stress as one respondent indicated, "Most of my paperwork comes from the Department of Higher Education". Several presidents indicated that this was an area that required them to delegate some of the responsibility. Although this source of stress seems self-explanatory to the reader, one president summed it up by remarking, "The form of paperwork that upsets me the most is filling out surveys and questionnaires like yours", even though he returned a complete survey packet.

5th - Union (Collective) Bargaining. It must be noted that this type of system existed in two of the states included in the study: New Jersey and

Pennsylvania. Thus, this researcher only used responses from the presidents representing institutions in these two states.

A New Jersey president stated, "The union representatives constantly arouse distrust in order to keep control of its membership. They seem to hire people with specific personalities in order to accomplish this task".

6th - Planning/Maintenance of Facilities and Equipment. "Everyone expects the best: the state, the faculty, and the community. However, the allocated funds are inadequate to address the expectations in this area."

7th - Faculty. The comments column was used by several respondents to indicate that this source of stress was of particular concern. "Our faculty seem to have trouble seeing the big picture. They are very demanding and always resist change", stated a two-year president. A four-year chief executive officer proclaimed, "The one specific activity that causes me the most distress is my formal address to the faculty. They provide a constant tug-of-war".

8th - Risk-taking. This source of stress was selected from the literature review (Kauffman, 1980). Respondents indicated that risk-taking associated with conservative local institutional boards provided the highest degree of distress. "When you have to go out on a limb, it seems you are all by yourself. If it works out, they were behind you all the way. If it doesn't, they are there to throw the gasoline on the fire", remarked one president.

As indicated, the top eight sources of stress in this study recorded a Z-Score of "0" or above and were labeled primary sources of stress for this study. The following 24 sources of stress had Z-Scores from -0.01 (9th) to -1.52 (32nd).

9th - Social Obligations. "Community social demands take most of my time", remarked one president.

10th - Governing Board. This source of stress was identified by the respondents as the local institutional governing board. The majority of respondents indicated that they worked well with their board or they didn't. Comments ranged from, "A great group of hard-working dedicated people" to, "Hypersensitive to press commentary. They always want to look good and they pressure me in the areas of hiring and contract awards".

11th - Being Accountable (Observation/Evaluation). "Living in a fish bowl is part of the job", cited a president. Although there are published documents to help local boards evaluate presidents, most experts agree that presidential evaluation is difficult. Who should do it? The criteria to be utilized and lack of experience on the job by the evaluator are common questions presented in this area.

12th - Competing With Colleagues. Several respondents indicated that they enjoyed this form of competition. As one stated, "Being competitive is part of the 'Type A' personality".

. . .
13th - Receiving Insufficient Recognition. "Just make sure you are always nice to the public relations people," commented one president.

14th - Fund Raising. This source of stress was more of a concern for the four-year institutional representatives. One stated, "We are always in competition with other community agencies, each year it becomes more difficult".

15th - Traveling. "Although it is part of the job, sometimes I just enjoy getting away from campus," declared one president.

16th - Living Under Constant Scrutiny. "I am always justifying my actions to the local board and community," stated one president.

17th - Loneliness of the Job. The literature indicates that there are no lonelier people in the world than the college or university president.

18th - Overseeing Internal Areas of the Institution. One president said, "College presidents had better be good delegators, you must use your vice president and deans".

19th - Receiving Inadequate Salary. "I have to be the lowest paid president in America," lamented one West Virginia president.

20th - Present/Future Enrollment Trends. "Our low enrollment is my main concern. The future of this institution depends on improving our enrollment figures," declared a Pennsylvania four-year president.

21st - Cabinet/Administrative Council. A Virginia president contended, "If one of them thinks they should be sitting behind your desk, you're in trouble".

22nd - Imposing High Self-Expectations. "I have always set high goals. When I don't achieve them it is very bothersome," noted a Maryland two-year college chief executive officer.

23rd - Personal Interest Interference. "I take on too many projects there is no time left for me," maintained a university president.

24th - Community. "There are too many community demands on my time," another said.

25th - Complying With Federal Government Policy. It is assumed that this source of stress would rank higher if private institutions were included in this study. Although federal interaction exists, state policy was ranked much higher.

26th - Preparing For a Career Beyond the Presidency. "A former president can always get a job," one respondent noted.

27th - Office Interruptions. "A college president has to be organized, office interruptions disrupt my routine," declared another.

28th - Meetings. "My busy schedule, especially the meetings, bother me the most," reinforced one president.

29th - Students. "That's why we are all here," commented a two-year college president.

30th - Job Security. A president suggested that "you could compare this job to a baseball manager". The literature indicated that the average tenure in the presidency is around seven years.

31st - Family Interference. "They seem to understand," a president commented.

32nd - Alumni. It must be noted that the majority of presidents surveyed in this study are two-year chief executive officers and the literature pointed out that the alumni of two-year institutions tend to associate more with four-year institutions or not at all.

Open-ended Questions: Results

This study contained six open-ended questions. Usable responses to each questions were selected from the total response population (N = 92). The number of usable responses fluctuated with each question. They were placed in categories by this researcher and reported as percentages of the usable responses.

Question 1 - Utilizing your excessive stress responses, what sources of stress cause you the most problems and why? There were 59 usable responses to this question. In this study, 33 of the total respondents (N = 92), did not cite any excessive sources of stress on their questionnaire. Eighteen

and sixty-four hundredth's of a percent (N = 11) cited the state coordinating/governing board as their primary excessive source of stress. They stated that this agency was a problem because they had little or no control over major decisions directed toward their institutions. The remaining responses were categorized as follows:

Table 5
Excessive Degree of Distress

<u>Percentage of Respondents</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Sources of Stress</u>
18.64	11	Statecoordinating/ governing agency
15.25	9	Budget
13.56	8	Local institutional governing board
11.86	7	Union/collective bargaining
10.17	6	Enrollment
6.78	4	Self-expectations
6.78	4	Insufficient facilities and equipment
5.08	3	Loneliness on the job
3.39	2	Students
3.39	2	Office interruptions
3.39	2	Faculty
1.69	1	Family

..

It must be noted that although the budget process was recorded as the primary source of stress for the chief executive officers in this study, the top five excessive sources of stress: state agency, budget, local board, union/collective bargaining and enrollment have a direct influence in the budget process.

Question 2 - List specific skills and activities that cause you distress. Public/formal speaking was identified as the activity/skill that caused the most distress. Twenty-one and forty-three hundredth's of a percent (N = 9) of the respondents to this question cited the following types of speaking engagements that caused them distress: addressing various groups during the budget hearing process (state legislators, community and local board), formal addresses to the faculty and numerous community social obligations. Nineteen and five hundredth's of a percent (N = 8) indicated personnel decisions and problems that involved evaluation, retention, tenure and promotion.

Table 6
Distressful Skills and Activities

<u>Percentage of Respondents</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Skills/Activities that Cause Distress</u>
21.43	9	Speaking engagements
19.05	8	Personnel decisions
14.29	6	Local governing board meetings
11.90	5	Union/collective bargaining negotiations
9.52	4	Meetings
7.14	3	Time Demands

The remaining respondents, 16.67 percent (N = 7) each listed one of the following: writing, risk-taking, political pressure, meeting deadlines, paperwork, situations out of their control and delegation.

Question 3 - What do you do most often when distress occurs? This question was intended to determine the respondent's initial or immediate reaction/response to distress and thus, partially answer the third research question in this study. What were the coping strategies utilized by each individual when distress replaces the normal tension and pressure associated with their jobs? There were 76 usable responses to this question.

Table 7

Initial/Immediate Reaction to Distress

<u>Percentage of Respondents</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Distress Coping Strategies</u>
21.05	16	Indicated that they would immediately attack and solve the problem
19.74	15	Cited various forms of exercise and/or physical exertion that included jogging, walking, lifting weights, and swimming
17.11	13	Remarked that their initial reaction would include some form of relaxation, rest, meditation, and quiet thought
15.79	12	Suggested that they like to "get away" - going to the beach, farm and mountains, as well as turning to a hobby such as collecting, gardening and fishing
14.47	11	Potential negative outcome responses, based on the opinion of this researcher, were placed in this category. They included the use of alcohol, drugs and tobacco, depression, worry, loss of temper, and as one president remarked, "unfortunately I have no outlet".
11.84	9	Responded by simply talking to someone

Question 4 - What distress coping strategy or management skill do you prefer to use when distress occurs? This question was included to ascertain what the respondents do when they have time to think and plan after a distressful situation. This question, as well as Question 3, was included to answer the third research question of this study, as mentioned earlier. There were 66 usable responses for this question.

Table 8

Preferred Coping Strategy

<u>Percentage of Respondents</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Preferred Distress Coping Strategy</u>
28.79	19	Prefer to exercise or perform some other physical exertion
25.76	17	Prefer to think, meditate, or relax
24.24	16	Prefer to attack and solve the problem
13.64	9	Prefer to talk to someone
6.06	4	Prefer to get away
		Only one respondent suggested a potential negative reaction by stating, "I still prefer to smoke"

As mentioned in Chapters I and II, this researcher employed the use of Q-methodology to test the validity of his initial placement of the responses to open-ended questions three and four. Ten professionals, associated with stress and coping, were utilized for this purpose. All ten placed the 92 responses in the exact categories as this researcher, thus providing verification of the initial response placement.

Question 5 - How would you compare the overall responsibility/accountability of your position with corporate executive officers? There were 74 usable responses to this question.

Table 9

Corporate Chief Executive Officer Comparison

<u>Percentage of Respondents</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Compared Overall Responsibility/ Accountability</u>
58.11	43	Said that their responsibility/ accountability was similar or the same with the business chief executive officer
32.43	24	Indicated that the college or university president had more responsibility/ accountability
8.11	6	Remarked that they had no way to compare the two positions and only one president felt he had less

Question 6 - Do you find specific times of the year when your job becomes more/less distressful? When and why? There were 78 usable responses to this question.

Table 10

Most Distressful Time of Year

<u>Percentage of Respondents</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Distressful Times of the Year</u>
60.26	47	Cited the spring semester as their more distressful time of the year. The budget process, graduation and closing out the year were reasons given for their response.
30.77	24	Indicated that their jobs were more or less distressful throughout the academic year
8.97	7	Pointed out that the fall semester provided them the most distress. Concern over enrollment figures and just getting started all over were reasons associated with their responses.

Chapter Summary

Overall, presidents identified their jobs as stressful. They listed eight primary sources of stress headed by the involvement with the budget process. Their interaction with the state coordinating/governing agency recorded the most excessive degree of distress responses. Public/formal speaking was the skill or activity that caused them the most distress. They initially reacted to distress by attacking the problem, but preferred to exercise if they had time to plan a coping strategy. Their overall responsibility/accountability was rated similar to their corporate counterparts and the spring semester was identified as the most distressful time of the academic year.

Chapter V presents conclusions based on the summation of the results of this study along with implications, recommendations and suggestions for further study.

CHAPTER V

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

The preceding chapters described the need for this study, the problem for the research investigation, a review of the pertinent literature, a detailed presentation of the research methodology employed and an analysis of the data obtained from the research questionnaire. This chapter summarizes the major points of the study, presents conclusions and implications and makes recommendations for implementation of the research findings.

The purpose of this study was to identify the perceptions of selected two- and four-year public higher education chief executive officers as to the sources of stress associated with the presidency, their degree of distress and what, if any, coping strategies they have developed. For the most part, the findings of this study involving chief executive officers representing institutions located in five states, confirm and correlate with the data associated with national studies involving the college and university president.

This researcher examined the degree of distress correlated with perceived sources of stress associated with the public higher education officer. Distress was defined as any unpleasant, undesirable or depressing source of stress. Thirty-two potential sources of stress were identified in the literature review and pilot study as stressors that might negatively influence

presidential/executive officer effectiveness. Coping strategies that were developed by the respondents to reduce or eliminate stress were also examined. The researcher compared an initial/immediate reaction to distress with preferred coping strategies and stress management skills utilized when distress occurs. Preferred coping was defined as a process of analysis and evaluation to decide how to protect oneself against the adverse effects of any stressor (source of stress) and its associated negative outcomes.

The literature supports the contention that the job of college and university president/chief executive officer can be stressful. Although much has been written on the college and university president, little research has been conducted to determine if presidents recognize in themselves any signs of stress which, if not placed in proper perspective, can result in the loss of some of the characteristics associated with the successful college and university president. It must be noted that how an individual president perceives and deals with a given stressful situation is very important. One chief executive officer's routine pressure associated with the job may be another's major source of stress. State coordinating/governing boards, local institutional boards and collective bargaining are examples of sources of stress that may be slight or excessive degrees of distress depending on the state, institution and perception of the individual.

A survey questionnaire was constructed in which chief executive officers were asked to relate their perceptions of the degree of distress with 32 sources of stress associated with the college and university presidency. Six open-ended questions were included in order to clarify questionnaire responses and examine coping strategies utilized.

The questionnaire was sent to 140 public college and university chief executive officers representing institutions in five of the 1987 Carnegie Classification categories located in the states of Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia: a 100 percent sample. As a result of two mailings and follow-up phone calls, 92 usable questionnaires were received which constituted a 65.71 percent response rate.

The primary statistical procedure used to identify major sources of stress was the Z or standard score. Any source of stress that had a positive degree of distress (on or above the mean, $Z = 0$) was labeled a primary source of stress. Five categories of immediate or preferred reaction to distress was created by this researcher: attack and solve problem, exercise, physical exertion, relaxation, meditation, get away and potential negative responses. Responses were placed in the five categories and reported based on the percentage of responses in each category. Q-methodology was utilized by this researcher to test the classification/response system. Ten individuals were

asked to place the 92 usable responses in the five categories. All ten individuals performed the Q-sort exactly like the researcher.

CONCLUSIONS

Presidential Profile

The "average" presidential respondent in this study was a male over 45 years of age who had served his rural institution as chief executive officer for less than five years. His prior position to the presidency was a deanship outside of his present institution. He earned his doctorate with an academic concentration in Education. The four-year president has a Ph.D., while his two-year counterpart held the Ed.D. For the most part, the presidential profile that was recorded for this study reflected the literature review. Length of presidential tenure, under five years as compared to five-ten years, was the only demographic category that differed slightly.

Sources of Stress

Overall, the majority of respondents, 64.13 percent (N = 59), identified at least one excessive distress source of stress. One hundred percent (N = 92) of the chief executive officers cited a source of stress in the moderate or above category of distress. This study identified eight primary sources of job stress that can be associated with the presidency in similar institutions on a national level. They are as follows:

<i>Rank Order</i>	<i>Source of Stress</i>	<i>Z-Score</i>
1st	Budget	0.61
2nd	Complying with state/local fiscal policy	0.37
3rd	Career conflict with spouse	0.32
4th	Paperwork	0.15
* 5th	Union/collective bargaining	0.09
6th	Planning/maintenance of facilities and equipment	0.06
7th	Faculty	0.05
8th	Risk-taking	0.01

* Collective bargaining systems exist in only two states included in this survey: New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Only the respondents, N = 52, from these states were used to calculate the degree of distress for this source of stress. However, these presidents represented 56.52 percent of the total usable responses in this study.

Six open-ended questions were included at the end of the survey packet. The summary of the responses are as follows:

Excessive Sources of Stress

Although the budget process ranked first overall in this study as the source of stress that caused the respondents the highest degree of distress,

18.64 percent (N = 11) cited working with the state coordinating/governing board as their specific "excessive" source of stress. Presidents indicated little or no control involving input correlated with the state's budget appropriations process as the primary factor for their responses. Based on input from the comments column and responses to the first open-ended question, this researcher listed the following primary sources of stress as having a direct or indirect influence on the overall budget process.

<i>Rank Order (excessive distress)</i>	<i>Source of Stress</i>
1st	State coordinating/governing board
2nd	Budget
3rd	Local institutional governing board
4th	Union/collective bargaining
5th	Enrollment
6th	Insufficient facilities and equipment

Skills and Activities that Cause Distress

Public/formal speaking to groups was identified as the skill or activity that caused the respondents the most distress. Addressing groups during the budget process, formal faculty addresses and speaking to the local institutional governing board were cited as activities that involved formal presentations that provided distress for the presidents.

Immediate Reaction/Response to Distress

Respondents were asked what do you do most often when distress occurs? This question was included to identify initial reactions to distress.

The highest percentage of respondents, 21.05 (N = 16), indicated that they would immediately attack the situation and try to come up with a positive solution to the problem. The respondents submitted the following immediate reactions/responses.

<i>Rank Order</i>	<i>Reaction/Response</i>
1st	Attack/solve
2nd	Exercise
3rd	Relax, rest, meditate
4th	Get away
5th	Potential negative reaction (i.e., the use of alcohol, drugs or tobacco, become depressed, worry, and loss of temper)
6th	Talk to someone

Preferred Coping Strategies/Stress Management

Respondents were asked, what distress coping strategy or management skill do you prefer to use when distress occurs? This question was included to ascertain what the presidents do when they have time to think and plan after a distressful situation. The highest percentage, 28.79 (N = 19), of respondents, preferred to perform some sort of physical exertion as a coping strategy.

Examples included walking, jogging, playing tennis, swimming, lifting weights and golfing. The remaining chief executive officers listed the following as their preferred form of stress management:

<i>Rank Order</i>	<i>Coping Strategy</i>
1st	Exercise
2nd	Think, meditate, relax
3rd	Attack and solve problem
4th	Talk to someone
5th	Only one respondent preferred to "smoke"

Business Chief Executive Officer Comparison

The fifth open-ended question asked the respondents to compare the overall responsibility/accountability of their jobs with corporate executive officers. The results indicated that the two jobs are comparable in the areas of responsibility and accountability.

Fifty-eight and eleven hundredth's of a percent (N = 43) indicated the responsibility/accountability was the same.

Thirty-two and forty-three hundredth's of a percent (N = 24) presidents cited that they had more responsibility/ accountability than the business executive.

Eight and eleven hundredth's of a percent (N = 6) remarked they had no way of comparing the two.

Only one respondent felt that he had less responsibility/accountability than his corporate counterparts.

Most Distressful Time

Respondents were asked to identify the time of the year that their jobs became the most distressful.

The highest percentage of respondents, 60.26 (N = 47), indicated that the budget process, graduation, and closing out the academic year contributed to the spring semester as being the most distressful time of the year. There was no specific time of the year when their jobs became more distressful, indicated 30.77 percent (N = 24) of the respondents, while 8.9 percent (N = 7) labeled the fall semester as more distressful because they were concerned with new enrollment figures that would enable them to meet or exceed their budgetary projections.

Implications and Recommendations

Presidential stress in higher education has been identified and labeled a potential problem contributing to effectiveness and even burnout (Kauffman, 1980; Duea, 1981; Bucci, 1983; Melendez and de Guzman, 1983; Fisher, 1984; and Vaughan, 1986).

Executive stress and coping are topics that are not new to the literature. Workshops on stress and coping are available throughout the country. However, there are few attempts to deal with stress and coping involving the

administration and management of higher education. This researcher found many articles reporting research on faculty stress and stress associated with the teaching profession, however, only a few on administrative stress and even fewer on coping issues associated with higher education.

These issues become of increasing importance to higher education because excessive levels of distress usually correlate with jobs and people who are the most competent and committed. The college and university president has been labeled as a "superman - wonderwoman" (Vaughan, 1986, p. 132). Thus, it is not unusual for a college or university president to overtly deny that distress caused them any problem. Even those chief executive officers who admit that stress existed in the presidency admitted that stress was not an important factor and therefore the prospect of anything that would interrupt their enthusiasm for the position was unlikely.

Presidents need to be educated in the area of identifying signs and symptoms that may be correlated with stress. Major sources of stress associated with the presidency need to be identified. As Vaughan (1986) contended, "the important question is what are the stresses associated with the presidency and in what ways are presidents combating stress" (p. 130). Coping skills and stress management techniques need to be understood and practiced. Presidential workshops should contain a segment devoted to stress and the college and university chief executive officer. Organizations like the

Kellogg Foundation, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership, and the American Council on Education must include stress and coping segments in their workshops for new and existing presidents.

The president's spouse has been the subject of a great deal of attention recently. "Career conflict with spouse" was identified as a primary source of stress (ranking third) in this study. All but three of the respondents (100 percent, N = 92) in this study were males. Most institutions expect the president's wife to devote themselves to serving the college or university. This brings out the question of whether institutions are getting two for the price of one. There are several volumes that shed light on the role of the spouse of the college and university president and thereby add to the understanding of the complexities, frustrations and rewards associated with the presidency. Vaughan (1986) devoted a chapter in his book The Community College Presidency to this subject. Through a series of interviews and surveys he placed most presidential spouses into one of four categories: (a) those who have carved out a role for themselves, yet who are not satisfied with the role as it is perceived by others, especially the governing board, (b) those who accept the role and whose credo seems to be "that's the way it is, so why fight it?", (c) those with careers equal to or nearly equal to

that of the president's and view the spouse's role as just another part of a professional person's juggling act, and (d) those who feel that they have no role as the spouse of a president that goes beyond what one normally expects to find in a marriage and who show resentment and frustration over not having a more significant role (p. 168). He concluded that the highest degree of frustration or bitterness was among the fourth group, mainly because they would like to be more involved with the activities of the college or university. A disruptive, unhappy spouse may contribute to a competent president's effectiveness. Both partners need to communicate their roles. Research and workshops need to be directed toward the role of the spouse as a supportive one, not as a full partner in the enterprise.

The college and university president has a major responsibility for establishing proper rapport with the local institutional governing board. However, the board needs to be sensitive to the chief executive officer as well. The selection of a president for an institution of higher education is one of the most, if not the most, important duties of a board of trustees. The process by which the new president is chosen varies greatly. The manner in which the trustees carry out the responsibility depends on the mission of the institution, the role of the state coordinating/governing board, the governor and on the experience and wisdom of the board members. It is most important that the president obtain a clear understanding of the relationship

of his office to the board of trustees. It should be understood that he is the individual through whom the board exercises its authority and control. Prator (1963) concludes, "the college presidency is full of challenges. Certainly one of the most important, that which can also be one of the most rewarding to his college is the cultivation of the sympathetic support of his board of trustees" (p. 62).

Public institutions of higher education are dependent to a large measure upon legislative appropriations from the state coordinating/governing board for their financial resources. The role of the governor and legislators representing these agencies is extremely important. The president needs to be more involved with decisions directly affecting his institution. The state coordinating/governing agency was identified as the most excessive source of stress for the respondents in this study. Comments from presidents in this study about the state agency included, "State legislators are unwilling to pay the price for quality but they expect it", "I have a continuous battle over the budget with state legislators", "I have little or no control over our state funding formula", and "State rules and requirements seem to always change".

The results of this study indicate that college and university presidents have stressful jobs. Most chief executives understand that stress is a part of the job. However, most presidents do not identify the primary sources of

stress in their jobs, nor do they develop positive coping strategies when distress replaces the normal pressures associated with the position. Others having a direct impact upon a presidency including governors, state legislators, board of trustee members, community members, alumni, mid-level administrators, faculty and students also need to become more sensitive to the stress on an education chief executive officer. Only then can these individuals and groups assist the president in dealing with stressful situations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the findings and conclusions of this study previously detailed, the following recommendations are made:

1. Many diverse demands are placed on presidents. A follow-up study involving private institutional chief executive officers and their views on stress and coping is recommended in order to ascertain if the sources of stress correlate with their public counterparts.

2. In order to develop a better communication pattern between the president and the state coordinating/governing board, more research is needed on the comparison of state boards and their relationship to public institutions.

3. Current pressures may threaten the autonomy of the president (Austin and Gamson, 1983), especially in centralized state systems. It is recommended to conduct a study by surveying presidents and comparing their degree of power and autonomy in various state systems.

4. Expectations of the position are unclear, although the president is under constant scrutiny. Local institutional boards need to be informed of their role and responsibilities. Today's trustee must be informed on local state and national issues related to his institution and be prepared to work actively, with the president, on its behalf. It is recommended to conduct a

study comparing the perceptions of presidents and board members as to the institution's role or mission.

5. Do president's backgrounds, educational credentials or experiences differ from one, five, or ten years ago? (Green, 1988). Data gathered in future years will enable us to provide comparisons.

6. Is the chief executive officer's position in higher education more open to women and minorities? It is recommended to conduct a comparative study over a five- to ten-year period to determine if more minorities and women are entering the presidency.

7. This study identified the president's role in collective bargaining as a primary source of stress. It is recommended that research be conducted in states that have a union/collective bargaining system in order to identify specific areas of presidential distress associated with this process.

8. The geographic location of an institution presents a profile reflecting the tradition and culture of that particular sector. A study that would compare urban, rural and suburban institutions is recommended.

9. The respondents in this study ranked the alumni as the source of stress that presented the least degree of distress. Would this source of stress rank last for a major university president? It is recommended that a study be conducted to identify primary sources of stress for major university presidents.

In conclusion, this study provided useful information to college and university presidents, state legislators, board of trustee members, alumni, faculty, and students about the role of the chief executive officer in higher education and how they try to survive in the eye of a hurricane.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Austin, A. and Gamson, Z. F. Academic Workplace New Demands, Heightened Tensions. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report, 1983).
- Axline, L. "Identifying and Helping the Troubled Executive". Personnel. (V. 64). November, 1987, p. 40 (8).
- Beehr, T.A. and Bhagat, R.S. Human Stress and Cognition in Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1985.
- Bennis, W. The Unconscious Conspiracy. New York: AMACOM, 1976.
- Berdahl, R. O. Statewide Coordination of Higher Education. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.
- Bowen, H.R. Academic Compensation. New York: Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, 1978.
- Bucci, F.A. "Taking Stress in Stride: How Do College Administrator's Cope?", AAHE Bulletin. December, 1983.
- Buxton, T.H.; Pritchard, K.W.; and Buxton, B.M. "University Presidents: Academic Chameleons", Educational Record. Spring 1976, p. 79-86.
- Carbone, R.F. Presidential Passages. Washington D.C.: ACE, 1981.
- Chambers, M.M. Higher Education in the Fifty States. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1970.
- Chapman, E.N. Supervisor's Survival Kit. Chicago: SRA Inc., 1970.
- Chmielewski, J. Stress Management Guide. Bryan, Texas: Creative Living Unlimited, 1982.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "Median Salaries of Administrators 1987-88".
March 9, 1988, Vol. XXIV, No. 26, p. A-14.

Chusmir, L.H. and Durand, D.E. "Stress and the Working Woman",
Personnel. May 1987, V. 64.

"Classifications of Institutions of Higher Education," Chronicle of Higher Education, Carnegie Foundation, July 8, 1987.

Cohen, M.D. and March, J.G. Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Cooper, C.L. and Marshall, J. "An Audit of Managerial Stress", Journal of Enterprise Management. 1978, 1 (3).

Curtis, J.D. and Detert, R.A. How to Relax. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1981.

Dodds, H.W. The Academic President: Educator or Caretaker. New York: McGraw Hill, 1962.

Duea, J. "Presidents Rate Their Duties for Time, Importance and Stress",
Phi Delta Kappan. May, 1981.

Duea, J. and Bishop, W. Probe Examines the Presidency in Higher Education. Research Report 143. Cedar Falls: University of Northern Iowa, 1980.

Fisher, J.L. Power of the Presidency. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1984.

Friedman, M. and Rosenman, R. Behavior and Your Heart. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974.

Galton, L. Coping with Executive Stress. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983.

Green, M.F. The American College President: A Contemporary Profile. Ace, 1988.

Greenberg, J.S. Comprehensive Stress Management, 2nd. Ed. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1987.

- Hales, D.R. and Williams, B.K. An Invitation To Health, 3rd Ed. Menlo Park, California: Benjamin/Cummings, 1986.
- Insel, P.M. and Roth, W.T. Core Concepts in Health, 5th Ed. Mountain View, California: Mayfield Publishing, Co., 1988.
- Kaplowitz, R.A. The Impact of Sunshine/Open Meeting Laws on the Governing Boards of Public Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, July 1978.
- Kauffman, J.F. At the Pleasure of the Board: The Service of the College and University President. Washington, D.C.: ACE, 1980.
- Kerlinger, F.N. Foundations of Behavioral Research, 2nd. Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.
- Kerr, C. "Liberal Learning: A Record of Presidential Neglect", Change. September, 1984.
- Kerr, C. The Uses of the University, 3rd. Ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Kiev, A. and Kohn, V. Executive Stress. New York: Amacom, 1979.
- Krech, D.; Crutchfield, R.; and Ballachey, E. Individual in Society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Lazarus, R.S. Psychological Stress and The Coping Process. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Lazarus, R.S. and Folkman, S. Stress, Appraisal, and Coping. New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1984.
- Levy, M. R.; Dignan, M.; and Shirreffs, J.H. Essentials of Life and Health, 4th Ed. New York: Random House, 1984.
- Maslach, C.S. and Jackson, S.E. "Burnout in Organizational Settings", Applied Social Psychology Annual. 1984, p. 237.
- Melendez, W. A. and de Guzman, R. M. Burnout: The New Academic Disease. 1983. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report, No. 9).

- Montoye, H.J. and others. Living Fit. Menlo Park, California: Benjamin/Cummings, 1988.
- Mouly, G.J. Educational Research the Art and Science of Investigation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.
- Mullen, K.D. and others. Connections for Health. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1986.
- Nason, J.W. Presidential Search: A Guide to the Process of Selecting and Appointing College and University Presidents. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Board of Universities and Colleges, 1980.
- Pearlen, K.I. and Schooler, C. "The Structure of Coping", Journal of Health and Social Behavior. 1978, p. 19.
- Pelletier, K.R. Healthy People in Unhealthy Places. New York: Dell Publishing co., 1985.
- Perkins, J.A. College and University Presidents: Recommendations and Report of a Survey. Albany, New York: State Regents Advisory Committee on Educational Leadership, 1967.
- Perkins, R. The College President. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963.
- Prichard, K.W.; Buxton, T.H.; and Sintek, E. The Problems of College and University Presidents, School and Society. February, 1972.
- Quick, J.C. and Quick, J.D. Organizational Stress and Preventive Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.
- Riesman, D. "Beyond the 60's", Wilson Quarterly II. 1978.
- Rimer, S. "Exit the Rainmaker: The Disappearance of a Maryland College President", Washington Post. June 20, 1982.
- Schuler, R.S. "Stress Management for College Administrators", Educational Record. Summer, 1981.
- Selye, H. The Stress of Life. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

- Selye, H. Stress Without Distress. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1974.
- Solomon, L.C. and Tierney, M.L. "Determinants of Job Satisfaction Among College Administrators", Journal of Higher Education. July-August 1977, p. 412-431.
- Stephenson, W. The Study of Behavior. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Torregrosa, C.H. 1987 Higher Education Directory. Falls Church, Va.: Higher Education Publications, Inc., 1987.
- Ursin, H. Coping and Health. New York: Plenum, 1980.
- Van Dalen, D.B. Understanding Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.
- Vaughan, G.B. The Community College Presidency. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1986.
- Veninga, R.L. and Spradley, J.P. The Work Stress Connection. New York: Ballantine Books, 1981.
- Whitman, N.A. and others. Student Stress: Effects and Solutions. Washington, D.C.: ASHE-ERIC, 1984.
- Yates, J.E. Managing Stress. New York: Amacom, 1979.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
COVER LETTER

A letter that was sent to the chief executive officers representing 140 public two- and four-year institutions. It was intended to make them aware of the survey and to solicit their support.

May 27, 1987

Dear Dr.

I'm writing to request your assistance and opinion on presidential stress in higher education. As partial fulfillment of my doctoral degree requirements at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, I am conducting a presidential/executive officer stress inventory. This survey is being distributed to chief executive officers of public two- and four-year institutions in the mid-Atlantic states of Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia and West Virginia.

I ask that you complete the demographic information sheet and the opinion questionnaire according to the accompanying instructions. Your anonymity will be totally protected: The code number of the demographic sheet will be used for follow-up activities only. Should you desire a copy of the final results, please indicate this in the space provided.

If possible, I would appreciate you returning the completed survey by June 15, 1987. A self-addressed, stamped envelope has been provided for this purpose. If I have not received your reply by this date, I will call your secretary and arrange a telephone interview at your convenience. If you have any questions please call me at 301-822-5400 or after 6:00 p.m. at

Thank you in advance for taking time from your busy schedule to respond to this project. Your participation in this project is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Edward S. Baker

mas
enclosures

APPENDIX B
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION PAGE

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Code Number _____

1. Location of institution (urban, rural, etc.)

2. Position held prior to your present job _____
3. Were you promoted to your present job from within the institution?
__ yes __ no
4. How long have you been employed in your present job? _____ years
5. List the degrees you have earned and their primary area of concentration

6. Age (please circle)
under 30, 30 - 37, 38 - 45, 46 - 53, 54 - 60, over 60
7. Would you like a copy of the survey results?
__ yes __ no

APPENDIX C
STRESS/DISTRESS QUESTIONNAIRE

PRESIDENTIAL/EXECUTIVE OFFICER
SOURCES OF STRESS/COPING STRATEGIES INVENTORY

The purpose of this survey is to identify perceptions of selected two- and four-year higher education chief executive officers as to the sources of stress and the degree of distress associated with these sources, and what, if any, coping strategies they have developed.

For this survey, distress is defined as any unpleasant, undesirable or depressing source of stress. The following sources of stress have been identified as potential stressors that might negatively influence presidential/executive officer effectiveness. Please indicate two different responses: (a) Use the "comments" column to clarify or expand upon, if needed, the source of stress. (b) Circle the appropriate number to indicate the degree of distress associated with the corresponding source of stress.

SOURCES OF STRESS

Comments	No Distress	Slight Distress	Moderate Distress	Excessive Distress
Interactions with:				
1. Governing Board _____	0	1	2 3 4	5
2. Community _____	0	1	2 3 4	5
3. Alumni _____	0	1	2 3 4	5
4. Union (collective bargaining) _____	0	1	2 3 4	5
5. Cabinet/Administrative Council _____	0	1	2 3 4	5
6. Faculty _____	0	1	2 3 4	5
7. Students _____	0	1	2 3 4	5
Job Responsibilities				
1. Overseeing areas within the institution (administrative, instructional, student personnel, athletics, etc.) _____	0	1	2 3 4	5
2. Complying with Federal government policy _____	0	1	2 3 4	5
3. Complying with state/local fiscal policy _____	0	1	2 3 4	5

	Comments	No	Slight	Moderate			Excessive
		Distress	Distress	Distress	Distress	Distress	Distress
4.	Budget	0	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Fund raising	0	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Planning/maintenance of facilities and equipment	0	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Paperwork	0	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Meetings	0	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Traveling	0	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Social obligations	0	1	2	3	4	5
Self-imposed characteristics of the job:							
1.	Job security	0	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Loneliness of the job	0	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Living under constant scrutiny	0	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Receiving insufficient recognition	0	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Receiving inadequate salary	0	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Preparing for a career beyond the presidency	0	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Risk taking	0	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Being accountable (observation/evaluation)	0	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Competing with colleagues	0	1	2	3	4	5

	Comments	No Distress	Slight Distress	Moderate Distress	Excessive Distress
10.	Imposing high self-expectations	0	1	2 3 4	5

Miscellaneous:

1.	Present/future enrollment trends	0	1	2 3 4	5
2.	Office interruptions	0	1	2 3 4	5
3.	Personal interest interference	0	1	2 3 4	5
4.	Family interference	0	1	2 3 4	5
5.	Career conflict with spouse	0	1	2 3 4	5

Please add any additional sources of stress associated with your job that have not been included on this survey.

	Comments	No Distress	Slight Distress	Moderate Distress	Excessive Distress
1.		0	1	2 3 4	5
2.		0	1	2 3 4	5
3.		0	1	2 3 4	5

APPENDIX D
OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

1. Utilizing your "executive stress" responses, what sources of stress cause you the most problems and why?

2. List specific skills and activities that cause your distress.

3. What do you do most often when distress occurs?

4. What distress coping strategy or management skill do you prefer to use when distress occurs?

5. How would you compare the overall responsibility/accountability of your position with corporate executive officers?

6. Do you find specific times of the year when your job becomes more/less distressful? When and why?

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 2**