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This study was designed to investigate the perceptions of the chairs of presidential search committees and their response to the use of paid consultants. The opinions of search committee chairs were obtained from individuals who had served as chairs of the search committees at four year institutions. Data was obtained through the use of a research questionnaire organized around four major subproblems.

The questionnaire was distributed to all four year colleges and universities that had placed a notice of an available presidential position in the Chronicle of Higher Education during the calendar years of 1987 and 1988.
The treatment of the data included determination of confidence intervals and analysis of variance to determine the level of significance.

Selected Findings

It was discovered that 63.63 percent of the respondents had used a paid consultant in their most recent search.

It was also determined that public institutions of higher learning use paid consultants more often than private institutions. Also, smaller schools, (5,000 to 10,000 students) use a paid consultant more often. Those offering a Doctoral Degree as their highest degree, used a paid consultant more often than those that offered a Bachelor or Master Degree as their highest degree.

A further finding was that search committees do not want the paid consultant to serve in the final stages or have a voting privilege. This was true whether they used a paid consultant or not.

Selected Conclusions

The conclusion derived was that those chairs who had used the services of a paid consultant found them to be helpful during their presidential search. It was further determined that those committees that had not used a paid consultant were not as receptive to their use even though they had no experience working with one. Those committees
using a paid consultant felt that a paid consultant could enhance the search in the areas of ethics, efficiency, and confidentiality.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The college president influences the climate and direction of the institution he or she heads. The choice of this individual is a critical one, involving the future development of the school and the welfare of its population. It is imperative that those charged with selecting a college president exhibit a great deal of caution and concern for the future of their institution. Unfortunately, while selection committee members may be sincerely concerned about the outcome of their endeavor, they may not know how to perform their task well (Lorne, 1977). In addition, their efforts may be limited by constraints on their time. New approaches to accomplishing the task of selecting a president may be called for in today's complex college environment. An examination of the evolution of the selection process reveals why this is so.

Looking at the early history of American college presidents (Schmidt, 1970) it appears that 90% of those who held that position prior to the Civil War were ordained ministers. This was probably due to the fact that most colleges at that time had some religious affiliation. Later, laymen began to be appointed to the position of college president, but this transition took place slowly. As late as 1850, the ratio of laypersons
to ministers was still only one in ten. As laymen gained superior academic training and teaching experience in the colleges, they were naturally turned to more frequently as candidates for president. The selection, which was now more complex, was usually made by college trustees. It was not until the 1970's that internal search committees began to be assigned the task of recruiting and selecting a president. At most collegiate institutions today, the search for an executive involves the use of an internal search committee. These committees, which are chosen by the present administrators on campus, are usually made up of faculty, administrators, and students. The committee reviews resumes, and selects applicants who will be chosen for personal interviews. These interviews are either conducted by the search committee, or by another committee assigned to the task. This process results in the identification of one or more finalists who are recommended to the administration, trustees, or board for the final selection.

The job of the internal selection committee has been made more complex and difficult by new state and federal regulations, such as those relating to Affirmative Action, age and handicap discrimination, open meeting laws, etc. Budget constraints have also raised the issue of the cost effectiveness of this process. Further, there is usually a time constraint that is an
inherent part of the committee's "unwritten agenda."
With all of these considerations in mind, it is incumbent upon the individuals charged with the duty of replacing the executive officer to consider alternative means to speed the selection process, for the length of time an institution is without a leader should be as brief as possible.

**Theoretical Base for the Study**

Unlike colleges and universities, businesses often groom their younger staff members for top administrative posts. Bolman (1965) suggests that the failure to adopt this practice has contributed to the difficulties in matching the right person to the job.

Grusky and Miller (1981) note that career mobility in an organizational setting is essential for leadership development, but that it causes problems of organizational continuity when a leader is removed. Grusky (1960) notes that the higher the office where replacement is occurring, the greater will be the instability created by succession. Grusky and Miller are concerned that succession is more difficult when characteristics of the successor do not meet the institution's needs, and that it is better for the organization's subsequent performance when a new executive is brought in from the outside, which is just what
educational institutions tend to do. It would then behoove an educational institution to do its best in choosing the right person.

Executive Recruiters in Higher Education. Recently, a growing number of presidential searches at four-year institutions of higher education have involved the professional services of the executive recruiter. The executive recruiter not only provides a way to overcome the restrictions frequently placed on search committees by state and federal regulations, but also contributes the guidance, training and expanded resources needed for a more effective search.

Internal search committees today are hampered by the passage of laws providing for the privacy of individuals. The Buckley Amendment and the "Sunshine Laws" force searches for candidates to be open to public scrutiny. This not only makes the selection committee's job more difficult by opening the names of potential candidates to public knowledge prematurely, but it undermines the security of their candidates' present positions. The executive recruiter, through the use of private search procedures and personal contact with potential candidates, may narrow the selection to the final candidates before their names are made public, thus circumventing the sunshine laws.
Other reasons justifying the use of executive recruiters are pointed out by Mottram (1983) who says, "Recruiters will save considerable time and money over internal search committees." He adds, "Even hospitals, which bear a close resemblance to educational institutions in organization, method of operation, and internal politics, are making effective use of search firms as their 'old boy' network proves less and less reliable."

Heller (1987) further indicates that presidential searches take time, and involve large campus wide committees that often don't think aggressively. Consultants working closely with these committees are "turning passive selections panels into aggressive academic raiders" in order to obtain the most qualified candidates for the position.

On the other hand, the high cost of hiring an executive recruiter, as well as the propensity of institutions to use the traditional selection process, has limited the acceptance of executive recruiters in higher education. Heller states that the University of Wisconsin rejected executive recruiters "out of hand," while searching for a new chancellor. Crawford Young, chairman of that search panel stated, "To turn over a portion of this work to an outside agency would be to abdicate our responsibility." Young continued, "We could express in abstract what our criteria were,
but we could never communicate the subtle subliminal needs and criteria." He was really saying, "We know what we are looking for, but we really can't express it." That would be a difficult job for a diverse selection committee to fulfill.

In a rapidly changing competitive environment, academic institutions face the challenge of obtaining the best candidates for leadership positions, while adhering to the most cost effective constraints. A study of the perceptions and opinions of those institutions which have used executive recruiters as compared to those that have not, may serve as a guide to other institutions facing the selection process.

Statement of the Problem.

The purpose of this study was to compare the perceptions of chairs of search committees that used paid consultants with those that did not regarding criteria, costs and attitudes toward the use of executive recruiters.

Subproblems Four major subproblems central to the study were identified:

1. To determine the extent to which executive recruiters were used by collegiate institutions.

2. To determine the opinions of search committee chairs as to the ideal criteria to be used in the presidential search process.

3. To determine the relative cost for each search mode.

4. To determine the attitudes of the search chairs toward the use of executive recruiters.
Significance of the Study. Crucial to the future of a school of higher education is the selection of the institutional leader. The impact of the president's governance is felt at all levels of the institution. It is therefore incumbent upon the selection committee to choose wisely and well. This study was designed to provide insight into the perception of individuals who have served recently on search committees. In addition, it investigated the impact of the use of executive recruiters on presidential searches. Further, the study also compared the cost of the selection process at those institutions that used only a search committee, with those that used both a committee and an executive recruiter.

Delimitations

The study included only four-year institutions of higher education that performed a search for a president during the 1987 and 1988 calendar years, and that advertised in the Chronicle of Higher Education. This provided a population of about 233 institutions. To use earlier years would have taxed the memory of search chairmen and increased the chance of having to survey persons who were no longer available.

The institutions surveyed were representative of all four-year institutions and reflected the varying size and philosophies of all such institutions.
The questionnaire elicited information that allowed description and comparison of the methods used by internal search committees. The information obtained was perceived as sufficient to describe the effectiveness of search committees acting alone versus those using the services of executive recruiters. Employment agencies and other types of employment organizations were not examined because they are rarely involved in executive searches at the collegiate level.

Only the chairman of each selection committee was being surveyed, thereby excluding external points of view of other committee members.

Assumptions

The assumptions underlying this study were:

1. As the source of study and research, the opinions of internal search committee chairmen would provide the most reliable source of information concerning the effectiveness of executive recruiters.

2. The perceptions of the search committee chairmen would be objective data, sufficient to measure the effectiveness of executive recruiters and internal search committees.

3. Information resulting from this study would be helpful to other institutions seeking leaders.
Procedures

A review of the literature indicated that a comparative analysis methodology was appropriate for this study. The procedure involved a comparative analysis of the opinions and perceptions of selected individuals who had actually served on recent presidential search committees at four year colleges and universities.

The Chronicle of Higher Education was used for selecting the survey population because it is accepted as the most widely used source for professional listings by institutions of higher education.

Chairmen of internal search committees who had participated in a search within the last two-years were selected as the best source of data as to their committees' effectiveness. To secure this data, questionnaires were mailed directly to the chairman of each internal search committee.

Population Sample

The research sample comes from the Chronicle of Higher Education's employment listing for presidential searches at four year colleges and universities over the two-year period of 1987 and 1988. The total population, 233 searches, was included.

Research Instrument

A questionnaire was constructed after consultation with several executive recruiters and search committee
members. The available literature helped to identify areas of importance to be included. It was necessary to develop this questionnaire because no studies were found that had already developed an instrument to survey individuals on the use of executive recruiters by internal search committees.

The survey instrument was reviewed by Drs. McLaughlin and Reisman, Harvard researchers. Upon their advice, important changes were made.

The research instrument was constructed in three parts. The first part considers the opinions of chairmen of the committee on the use of executive recruiters. The second measures the perceived importance of various candidate attributes. Part three deals with general questions about the search process.

The questionnaire was sent along with a stamped, self-addressed envelope for the return of the completed instrument. A second letter and duplicate questionnaire was sent by registered mail to those who did not respond by a specified date, and a phone call was made to those who still did not respond.

**Treatment of Data** The data was analyzed by means of a series of comparisons by standard deviations, means, confidence intervals, and an analysis of variance. They tested for differences in responses be-
between search committee chairmen who have and have not used a paid consultant over a number of items and dimensions.

The survey instrument was tested for reliability via Dr. Anthony Saville’s "Rules for Constructing Questionnaires," unpublished, by means of a test-retest reliability test. The instrument was found to be both reliable and stable at the .913 level.

Specifically, this study compared the opinions and perceptions of those search committee chairmen who had used executive recruiters with those who had not.

Definition of Terms.
1. CANDIDATE - A person who survives extensive screening, reference checking and interviewing and is to be presented for consideration for the position to be filled.

2. CHARACTERISTICS - Pertains to distinctive character quality or disposition that the most qualified presidential candidate should have to function efficiently if hired.

3. CRITERIA - Those procedures and characteristics perceived by paid consultants and internal search committees, to be of importance in selecting the most qualified candidate.
4. EXECUTIVE RECRUITING - The service, performed for a fee by an individual or group of consultants organized as a firm or similar entity, to help managers of client organizations identify and appraise executives to fill specific management positions.

5. HEADHUNTER - A censorial term for executive recruiter. May refer to an individual or agency that seeks candidates for a client.

6. NON-APPLICANTS - Individuals who are presently employed at an institution and are not actively seeking a similar position at any other institution.

7. INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION - Institutions which identify teaching, service and/or research as primary missions and which offer four-year planned programs of study.

8. PARTICIPANTS - Those individuals who are appointed to serve on the internal search committee.

9. PIRACY - Attracting an individual who is presently employed as president of another college or university, to an institution seeking to fill that position itself.
10. POPULATION - Refers to the four-year colleges and universities seeking applicants for the position of president at their institutions.

11. PRIVACY - An infrequently used synonym for confidential search. It is also used to refer to various privacy acts and legislation protecting the individual.

12. SCREEN - The process of selecting the most qualified candidates from a pool of applicants, for the purpose of interviewing for an executive position.

13. SEARCH - The task of identifying and appraising qualified executives in an orderly manner. Consists of several steps which represent the broad phases of a typical search assignment and identify major areas of activity involved in the job to be filled.

14. SEARCH PROCESS - The procedures, personnel and activities involved during the recruitment of candidates for the position of president.

15. SUNSHINE LAWS - Laws developed by individual states to require searches be made open and available to public scrutiny.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Over the years, the selection process for a college president has been transformed from an internal choice made unilaterally by trustees of an institution to a decision falling more and more under the influence of an external recruiter. As the responsibilities of the college president have become greater and the selection process has involved meeting diverse interests, the need for professional assistance has become evident.

Often search committees are ill prepared for their task. As federal and state laws increasingly hamper the selection process, institutions are slowly beginning to turn to executive recruiters to assist in the recruiting and selection of college presidents. This study investigated the perceptions of search committees and their attitudes toward the use of executive recruiters.

Historical Perspective The Rev. Henry Dunster was chosen president in 1640 of the first chartered college in the United States, Harvard College (Ferrari, 1970). The second colonial college, William and Mary, designated the Bishop of London as its president. All of the
early United States colleges were established under religious auspices (Dexter, 1916), and as a rule had ministers as their presidents.

Schmidt (1970) concluded that prior to the Civil War, 90% of college presidents were ordained ministers. By the middle of the 19th century, however, trustees began more and more to select senior teachers as Presidents. The decision was usually a simple one. Trustees sought no outside help, and no outsider was considered. Consistent with the totalitarian nature of most schools at that time, the early relationship of the presidents to their faculty was usually that of employer to employee with autocratic powers accorded the president (Prator, 1963).

By the late 1800's, the principles of democracy began to enter the university setting. Kauffman (1980) observed that as the role of president changed so did the role of governing boards, as constituent groups pressed for participation in the process of choosing a new leader.

This transition to a more collegial governing approach was in the interest of harmony and maintenance of morale at the university. In fact, by 1871, the president could pass no rule nor appoint an officer without full consultation and exchange of views between the boards of control and instruction (Hofsteader, 1955). Rudolph (1965) notes that finally presidents
began to recognize themselves as belonging to a society of professionals. They realized they were managers doing for higher education what the leaders of industry were doing in other areas of American society.

This close working relationship between the president and faculty brought about a significant change in the role of the president. As the role of the president became more democratic, so did the process of selecting this officer. No longer a unilateral appointment within the institution, it became a committee process, seeking promising candidates from outside.

Today it would be unheard of for a trustee to appoint the senior teacher to the post of college president at his or her own discretion. The process has now been delegated to search committees and as Hyde (1969, p. 186) states, "The rites of presidential selection are like an Easter egg hunt; many people want to participate, and thousands want to watch."

Reisman and McLaughlin (1985) note that the search process for a college or university president today has become a highly complicated affair. The logistics and politics are considered a source of headaches and anxieties for search committees. Some search committee members have suggested that some presidents were kept in office longer than was optimal because everyone recalled from previous experience, just how wearying a search could be.
According to Seldon (1960), the average length of service for board members is the same as that for college or university presidents (8.1 years.) Thus it is likely that board members will be involved in at least one presidential appointment sometime in their term. Clearly, anything that would facilitate the task would be most welcome.

Factors Influencing the Choice of College President

Whatever system is employed for finding and selecting a college president, those who make the decision must have a clear idea of what qualities they desire in a successful candidate. Two sets of criteria will influence the development of this candidate profile. First, the unique style and requirements of the school must be considered. These may be called Institutional Objectives. Second, the personality traits inherent in the candidates themselves will be an important factor. These may be called Candidate Characteristics. Institutional Objectives and Candidate Characteristics, whether conscious or not to the decision-making body, determine the direction the search process will take.
Institutional Objectives

Bisesi (1985) believes that the presidential search must begin with an evaluation of the relevant institutional issues that will be facing the new administrator as well as an outline of the campus's strengths and weaknesses.

Reisman and McLaughlin (1985) take this even further. They believe a full brochure should be prepared to provide candidates with detailed information about the institution and the specific credentials and capacities sought in a new president. It is their contention that a successful search involves a committee that has a clear sense of the type of person it is looking for given the special make-up of the school. These qualities should, in turn, be communicated to those being considered for the position of president. Institutional goals are the best guidelines to present a candidate, in order to match the best candidate to the institution.

Arhn (1984, p. 56) concurs, suggesting that prior to initiating a dean selection process, a search team should address a series of questions relative to unit strength, weakness, mission, resource allocation and desired leadership characteristics. He notes that the same series of questions can be applied to a presidential search.
It must be remembered that many different opinions may be brought to this process and it may not be possible to reconcile them all. Bisesi (1985) cautions that no individual can please everyone, so the emphasis should therefore be on preferred qualifications. Committee members should keep in mind that they are looking for an individual who can fulfill institutional needs, can be judged on administrative performance and organization, and can lead a diverse group of professionals. This calls for an open-ended approach that does not lock a committee member to direct standards. The candidate, Bisesi says, should promote high faculty scholarship, encourage excellent leadership and be able to acquire and allocate resources effectively.

Characteristics of the Candidate

A number of authors have attempted the challenging task of describing the personal characteristics the successful college president should exhibit (Bolman, 1965; Kauffman, 1974, 1980; Kronovet and Hawley, 1977; Lorne, 1977).

Matheny (1986, p. 38) tells us that "people have been wrestling with the problem of how to hire the right people for the right jobs for many decades." He points out that the results have not always been successful. During the seventies and eighties, more than
two dozen large corporations controlling billions of dollars hired new presidents, only to fire them within a year or two.

The criteria that Matheny (p. 3) has identified as necessary for top flight executives are dedication, energy, high skills, discipline and ethics. Good leaders are "team players - teachers and mentors - who lead, develop and motivate their people." Skill at selecting competent and dedicated managers is, according to Matheny, highly evolved. It develops through actual experience, and is not an innate ability. Hiring is judgmental and can therefore never be reduced to a pure science. Whenever we deal with human nature, it seems obvious it is impossible to predict behavior, yet we continually try, often in vain. These same considerations would be applicable to the hiring of college presidents. Matheny tells us that, "it is a fact, that many managers are employed from outside the company and enter into their jobs without a clear understanding of: 1. What they will be expected to do in the job, or 2. The operating philosophy, attitudes and values of their new employer." He also describes nine critical qualities, or success factors, which must be considered in evaluating a management candidate, in order to make an accurate prediction of how successful he/she will be in the job. These are:
1. energy level
2. goal
3. orientation
4. income expectations
5. non-monetary work expectations
6. general ability
7. arithmetic and logical ability and intelligence
8. people skills, adaptability and flexibility
9. strength of self image and management style

These critical qualities are important guides, but he points out one must allow for situational conditions.

Mactavish (1984, p. 12) points out that search committees often turn to easily measurable characteristics including degrees, experience, personal and professional references, achievements, honors, and awards. He suggests that while these are characteristics that should be used in the sorting process, in order to narrow the field of candidates, he would not use them to finally select a leader. Like many others, he states that the describable qualities of a leader are actually "nonquantifiable," and are very hard to define. Mactavish puts forward the following qualities: ego, strength, and inner confidence, ability to create and disseminate a vision, to set forth the seeds of ideas, and to cultivate their growth in others; ability to function as a change agent; ability
to create consensus; and knowledge of how groups function and an understanding of the communication process. Mactavish allows for flexibility as a desired approach in a search.

An additional factor that is rarely appreciated, but which may have a significant effect, is the candidate's spouse. If the spouse is not convinced of the desirability of a job, the candidate may refuse the position offered. Byrne (1986), believes that 75% of the failures in recruiting are due to wives refusing to go along with placement. Characteristics of the spouse, in turn, may affect the desirability of the candidate, since the spouse will be called upon time and time again to perform, much as a vice president of public relations would be. The importance of the spouse in the choice of a candidate has been documented in many articles. (Bolman, 1965; Corbally, 1977; Kaufman, 1974, 1980)

Summary

Clearly, some consensus on the part of decision-makers with regard to institutional objectives and desirable candidate characteristics will be necessary before a concerted effort can be made in the search for a new president. Assuming that such a consensus has been reached, how does the search process proceed? We will now go on to examine the search process as it is typically carried out in schools today.
The Search Process Today

Kauffman (1974) points out that every year from 200 to 300 colleges and universities face the necessity of choosing a new president. He views that task as becoming increasingly complex, controversial and difficult, and notes that boards of trustees and regents often seek to learn from the experience of others. Requests for specific guides are often sought by the inexperienced.

Given the critical nature of the choice of a college president, there should be a measured and organized approach to finding qualified applicants (Thorndike, 1986). Unfortunately, as Frederic W. Ness, President of the Association of American Colleges, commented (1974, p. 24), "The process which is generally followed in recruiting and selecting the college president, as described in several recent exposes, is itself often so haphazard as to be ludicrous." He adds, "Of all capricious, disorganized, unprofessional operations in human society, this one would certainly appear to qualify for some kind of negative award" (p. 24). Ness is only one of many to comment on the failures of the most common mechanism in use today for selecting a college president, the internal search committee. Many of the failures are blamed on untrained individuals who participate in a search in a disorganized manner.
Fortunato and Waddell (1981) call search committees a recent development in higher education. They look to their growth as a product of state and federal legislation affecting faculty and staff members. They observe that in the past boards of trustees used search committees in an advisory capacity only when selecting administrative officers. Other authors have made similar observations (Kronovet and Hawley, 1977; Lorne, 1977; Priest, 1965). However, "the good old boy" systems that were prominent in the past are fading quickly as a method of picking presidents, according to Marchese (1984). By the 1970's search committees, which before served only in an advisory capacity to boards of trustees, were assigned the full responsibility for the search, selection and recommendation of candidates.

How do such committees operate today? Common approaches to presidential searches involve a single search and selection committee which is usually chaired by a member of the governing board, but occasionally by a faculty member. According to Reisman and McLaughlin (1985), the establishment of procedures for the search becomes the first important issue. How the search committee will be composed is the next issue. Reisman and McLaughlin suggest that proceeding without consulting the faculty is unwise, and excluding faculty members should never occur.
How large should such a committee be? Evans (1976) states that, "A search committee should be small in the interest of efficiency." He believes total representation of the institution is important, but at least one member should be experienced in personnel selection. An understanding should be drawn up with the trustees that the committee will select finalists and then the trustees will interview them for their final selection. Lorne (1977, p. 14) states, "The general consensus seems to be that it should have no more than 6 - 9 members." Other authors (Bolman, 1965; Kronovet and Hawley, 1977; Reinert, 1974) agree that 10 or fewer members is an optimum size. Reisman and McLaughlin (1985) insist that search committees numbering 20 to 30 members are too large to work efficiently.

Limiting committee size to an appropriate number is sometimes difficult. The problem seems to be that "participatory democracy," during the search, has actually come to mean that every interest feels it has the right to be represented on the search committee. Often faculty push for additional committee members when they believe they are underrepresented. This often leads to the problem of unqualified individuals looking for the "right person" when they do not fully realize or agree on what qualities the right person should have.
The problem with search committees

As pointed out earlier, the use of the search committee, although a widespread phenomenon, is actually a very recent one. Bromert (1984) notes that academic and administrative openings in higher education were generally not advertised nationally until March 30, 1970, when the Chronicle of Higher Education began to publish the first ads. At that time, only 19 positions were listed, and only 2 named a search committee as the designated contact.

Since that time search committees have influenced a majority of the selections made (McLaughlin, 1985), but the quality of their choices has been questioned.

The high turnover rate of college presidents is pointed out in a study of 3250 colleges and universities performed by the Higher Education Publication. This study indicates that a combined two-year turnover of 39.3% is the result of poor choices by internal search committees, many of which are made up of individuals who are not properly trained in search procedures and/or are confused or intimidated by the restrictions of state and federal regulations.

These regulations include privacy laws (Buckley Amendment) affirmative action, and handicap and age legislation. Further rules and regulations involving collective bargaining and other labor laws, plus the widespread involvement of faculty, staff, ad-
ministrators, boards, and students in the governance process, have had a significant effect on the way in which colleges and universities have approached the entire search process at the presidential level (Kronovet and Hawley, 1977, p. 2). The use of search committees as a valid method of choosing presidents has been questioned by Reinhart (1974), who believes that many search committees are used to circumvent these affirmative action mandates or to validate predetermined decisions.

The search committee, whose use had at first seemed the answer to the problems of an executive search, has proved to have a questionable track record. Pressures from within involve meeting the often conflicting demands of special interest groups within the school. Pressures from without involve meeting federal guidelines insuring equal opportunity. Compounding the complexities that face the institutional search committee are the federal and state regulations governing the protection of rights of the candidates. One of the greatest issues here is the question of confidentiality of the search process.

Confidentiality

Ashworth (1982, p. 20) informs us that several states have moved to require public disclosure of the names of candidates for college presidents. The author asks, "How can the public's right to know be balanced
against the needs of a public university?" On the other hand, confidentiality is often of utmost importance to candidates. Maintaining a workable balance between the need of the public to know, and the need of public agencies to keep certain information confidential, has become increasingly difficult. Until recently, this balancing act has not been required in the area of higher education. However, recent court decisions concerning state laws on open records, have made mandatory the immediate release to the press of the names of all applicants and nominees, even those who may be unaware that they are under consideration. Minnesota law also requires complete disclosure of all candidates names (Schaffer, etc., 379 50.2d 633 Fla. 1980; Harte-Hankes Taxes Newspapers v. Hirbert, et. al, District Court of Travis County). Florida law requires that interviews with candidates be open to the public. According to Ashworth (1982, p. 20), "Anyone familiar with search and selection procedures in higher education can see the difficulties such legal requirements can cause."

At most institutions, search committees are composed of faculty members, students, and, sometimes, board members. The committee reviews credentials, then assesses the candidates. It avoids the public by meeting in private closed sessions, in order to develop a list of the best candidates to recommend to the board for final interviews and selection. Reisman and
McLaughlin (1985, p. 346) say that "Perhaps the most difficult, and certainly one of the most important decisions of the search committee, is the extent to which confidentiality will be maintained in the search and selection process." Almost all those concerned with the search agree that the most desirable candidates can be brought forward only under a guarantee of confidentiality.

Reisman and McLaughlin describe the range of confidentiality from completely open in the Sunshine Law states, to those searches where confidentiality is maintained throughout. They observe that in the majority of searches where a balance of confidentiality and openness was maintained, this was accomplished by keeping the process secret up to the selection of finalists. Disclosure finally occurred when the finalists were actually brought to the campuses for open interviews.

However, several search committees told Reisman and McLaughlin that finalists withdrew when told they would have to appear in an open forum. It was also the case that search committee members were sometimes themselves the source of leaks of confidentiality, and this often polarized the campus. The authors suggest that telling search committee members of the need for secrecy will not assure confidentiality. The authors
decry this fact, for they feel that the result of an open search is to lower markedly the quality of applicants.

In considering the public's need to know, researchers have identified two major concerns: the right of privacy of those candidates who are under consideration, and the legality and integrity of the selection process. The problems of public disclosure can be appreciated when one realizes that most major universities will not consider a candidate from within the institution when a presidential vacancy occurs (Birnbaum, 1971; Bisesi, 1985; Reinert, 1974; Thorndike, 1986). They will look to someone outside the institution who has a proven track record. Search committees are rarely interested in the unemployed. Therefore, recruiting a new president usually means stealing one from another school. Piracy has become standard. Public disclosure creates problems for search committees because most viable candidates do not want to risk their current positions by release of their names.

William Friday, Theodore Chesburgh, Charles Odegard, Hellerman Wells, and other former and present college presidents all said they would not be willing to enter searches where confidentiality of their candidacy could not be guaranteed (Turning, 1982). They felt that an open search would eliminate their par-
ticipation in a great many searches today. Their feel-
ings are not uncommon as documented by a number of
researchers who have stressed the importance of con-
fidentiality in presidential searches (Bolman, 1965;

The courts are finding it difficult to deal with
state laws that require the release of all candidates' names, even though almost everyone involved acknow-
ledges that the release of names is a bad idea. In
certain circumstances where state laws do provide ex-
ceptions, the courts are trying to determine whether presidential searches may be excluded from the open
records provisions. Currently state courts are am-
biguous in their decisions concerning the confiden-
tiality of names of presidential candidates.

Things are not likely to change soon, for changing
existing open record laws is difficult. Few legis-
lators want to face their constituents or the press in
order to close public access to any of the public
records, including lists of candidates for college
president positions.

How Businesses Choose Executives and What Higher Educa-
tion Learns from Them

The choice of a chief executive is not unique to
educational institutions. Business and industry have
successfully dealt with the problem for centuries. At
this point it might be interesting to examine how
businesses choose their leaders for the purpose of comparison. Specifically, we will examine two issues: the common business practice of choosing leaders by succession; and the growing importance of the use of an executive recruiter to find a talented executive from outside the organization.

**Conceptual Base** Frederic deWolf Bolman (1965) describes how business and industrial organizations, unlike colleges and universities, groom their younger staff members for top administrative posts. The failure of higher education to adopt this practice, he believes, has contributed to the difficulties involved in matching the right person to the job. Many private businesses believe in bringing their people up through the "ranks" by training them to become leaders within their organizations.

Birnbaum (1971) notes that for the organization selecting a president, the succession process may be a mechanism that operates to limit organizational conflict and maximize organizational stability. He further indicates that most educational institutions seeking a president have been more concerned with the background variables associated with those selected than the relationship between the selection process and organizational functions. This problem is addressed in this study.
Thompson (1956) believes that the conflict involved in the presidential succession process may be a productive dimension of organizational health. In fact, Hefferlin (1969) indicates that evidence shows that colleges which have recently selected a new president are often those most receptive to curricular innovation and change. A further indication that the new person chosen to head the college is of vital importance to the institution.

Grusky and Miller (1981, p. 439) define succession as the "process associated with the movement of members out of the organization and their replacement by new members." They note that career mobility in an organizational setting is essential for leadership development but that it causes problems of organizational continuity when a leader is removed. Grusky (1960) notes that the higher the office where replacement is occurring, the greater will be the instability created by the succession. Grusky and Miller are concerned that succession is more difficult when characteristics of the successor do not meet the institution's needs, and that it is better for the organization's subsequent performance when a new executive is brought in from the outside.

Whether it is better to choose an "insider" by the process of succession, or to look elsewhere to bring in an "outsider", is an interesting question. Reinert
(1974) and Bisesi (1985) indicate that an overwhelming percentage of presidential searches, as high as 80%, led to the hiring of the outside applicant. Gouldner (1954) notes that even the hint of an imminent succession and the perception by a subordinate of the upward mobility of his superior may change supervisor-subordinate relations and alter personal attitudes and other interpersonal relationships through "anticipatory succession." This indicates a difficulty for the insider and the importance of the executive recruiter in developing a highly qualified candidate pool that internal search committees could not find for themselves. The literature indicates that the executive recruiter excels at finding the most talented outsider. Carlson (1962) believes that the performance of an "insider" versus an "outsider" is predictable. He describes insiders as "place-bound" and outsiders as "career-bound." Insiders noted as having higher commitment to a specific community and a lower commitment to their career, while just the opposite holds for the outsider. Thus, the choice of an outsider might seem beneficial at first, but the chances that the newly-hired executive might soon seek employment elsewhere are high. This fact may explain why so many college presidents find new positions so soon after taking office. As the majority of the presidential candidates are selected from outside the institution, colleges hiring outsiders
will have to realize that these individuals are career oriented and therefore subject to a higher turnover rate.

To summarize, succession of leadership within the ranks may assure executive loyalty, but it prevents the revitalization of a business or institution through the introduction of new talent. Bringing in someone from outside may bring exciting changes, but it also brings the risk that the search for a new executive will again be necessary before long. Is there any way to improve the search process to insure a better fit of person and institution? This is where the Executive Recruiter comes in.

The Executive Recruiter

Bryne (1986) writes that Thorndike Deland was one of the first headhunters, (or executive recruiters). Deland toyed with and experimented with new ways for evaluating people. He tried handwriting analysis and even sizing the executive's frontal lobes as a measure of intellectual capacity. Unfortunately, these methods did not lead to any great revelations in finding the perfect executive. The search continues for the most effective evaluation technique.

At the outset of World War II Deland lent partner Edward Raisback to the U.S. War Department to help identify executives for the Armed Services. Raisbeck, who remains active in their firm today at age 81, be-
came assistant to the Pentagon's director of personnel. Then "headhunting" began to be discovered as a new profession.

Top executives were hard to find in the war-thinned ranks of many corporations in the 1940's. Along with the havoc of the war, many new products were developed, including synthetic fibers and computers. Companies that wanted to take advantage of the new products often lacked the managerial expertise and talent to do so. At the same time, executives viewed "institution jumping mobility" as their career strategy and necessary for climbing to higher positions. Before World War II, Bryne (1986, p. 21) tells us, "Largely home grown executives had a near familial loyalty to their corporations." The phenomenal growth of the demand for executives coincided with the ever growing belief that managers were interchangeable from one institution to another.

In the early days of executive recruiting recruiters created a shroud of mystery around themselves and this new profession. But with time, Williams (1978, p. 39) says,"The general level of competence and professionalism has improved so vastly that most unethical operators have been forced out." This still remains a matter of importance to those using executive recruiters.
Recruiters develop a comprehensive game plan after spending a great deal of time with a client company executive reviewing the specific position to be filled. They then develop a list of target companies or industries, seeking the most qualified candidates, the great majority of whom are not actively looking for a new position.

Williams (1978, p. 35) tells us, "The recruiter is employed by the client to fulfill a specialized role in the staffing of executive positions with outside personnel." The duties of an executive recruiter are to assist those clients seeking employees in solving specific management problems. The position of executive recruiter today plays an essential role in many business selections. According to Williams, more than 85% of the Fortune 500 companies have used executive recruiters in some way in recent years, and many smaller companies routinely employ executive recruiters. Universities, major hospitals, and other institutions now use recruiters to locate senior faculty professionals and administrative talent. Even The White House has engaged recruiters to aid in the selection of cabinet level candidates.

Advantages of Using an Executive Recruiter

There are several reasons why businesses turn to executive recruiters. Telecommunication, space exploration, automation, and new technology have led to
the need for more sophisticated management techniques in government, the military, universities, and industry. Williams (1978) believes management, in order to remain competitive, has turned to consulting firms for the technical advice and personnel expertise lacking in their own organizations. There aren't enough executives to fill key positions; therefore clients ask consultants to recruit additional qualified executives from other companies.

Another factor is the issue of confidentiality. The complexity of a flood of government regulations in the seventies (Bryne 1985; Matheney 1986; Reisman and McLaughlin, 1985) protecting an individual's right to privacy caused more companies to turn to executive recruiters, much as they would turn to other experts such as accountants, lawyers, and management consultants. According to Bryne (1985), "Headhunters" are hired partly to find out what many corporations cannot legally discover themselves. They ask questions in a discreet manner about divorce or alcohol abuse, and obtain references colleagues would normally refrain from giving.

Additional reasons for using an executive recruiter are professional assistance, timing, third person objectivity and maximum exposure when searching for and selecting candidates. Responsibilities of the executive recruiter include contacting candidates and
evaluating them, presenting candidates to clients and arranging meetings between them, checking references, and participating in negotiations.

The use of executive recruiters has long been the practice in private business. Only recently have they been used in higher education, but their use is on the increase. They seem to be very important to the search process for inexperienced search committee members (Heller, 1985).

The Executive Recruiter in Higher Education

Frederic Ness, (1981) director of the President Search Consultation Service, stresses that each institution must accept the fundamental responsibility of choosing its new president. He indicates that a growing number of institutions use his company's services extensively to help them accomplish their task.

Ness (1970) believes this is a positive trend and states, "If time and funds are available, I would recommend the retention of outside consultants to work with students, faculty, and trustees...in fact, with the total constituency...in a realistic appraisal of where the institution is at the moment and where it should be going."

There are many, like Ness, who feel strongly that executive recruiters make an enormous contribution to the schools they serve. Let us begin by examining some of these advantages.
Special Contributions the Executive Recruiter can Make to Higher Education

Executive recruiters can greatly facilitate the task of the search committee in a number of important areas, as follows.

Reducing pressure on search committee members:
Ruth Weintraub, senior vice president of the Academy of Educational Development, was asked what her agency could do for a college that it could not do itself (Marchese, 1984). Weintraub said that, in addition to enlarging the pool of qualified candidates and accelerating the search process, paid consultants do what committee members are not properly prepared to do. She believes that a proper search is a full time process and when committee members try to do it alone, along with their regular work, they tend not to do an adequate job and may miss some highly qualified individuals. As a result, they are often put under stress unnecessarily. Reisman and McLaughlin observe that pressures have led to the use of professional consultants by search committees in order to reduce the anxieties of search chairmen and members.

Politics within a school often put pressure on committee members. An outside recruiter can help here. Kaufman (1980) has observed that often when a president is dismissed or hastily resigns, there is distrust between the administration and faculty. An outsider can
often raise questions and issues with a governing board or faculty that no one inside the institution would be able to raise.

Heller (1977) has found that headhunters help disperse animosity when the warring factors on a campus are involved in a search. Finally, as Kauffman points out, if the institution's image is damaged, an outside consultant can help to interpret the new situation even better than the governing board chairman.

In all these ways outside recruiters help ease the psychological burden felt by search committee members, and reduce negative feelings within the group.

Confidentiality:

The issue of confidentiality has been raised earlier and will only be briefly summarized here.

Reisman and McLaughlin (1985) believe that pressure from federal regulations regarding privacy has led many institutions to seek the help of professional consultants. As Mottram (1985) believes, the best reason to use a search firm is that it provides access to candidates whose names could not otherwise be obtained. He notes that the executive recruiter acts as a private agency and is not restricted by State and Federal Laws requiring open interviews at public institutions.
Recruiting an outsider:

In today's search process, it is evident that there is an outsider's advantage. Reinert (1974) has indicated that an overwhelming percentage of presidential searches lead to the hiring of outsiders. Other scholars have set the percentage at 80% (Bisesi, 1985) and 70.8% (Birnbaum, 1971). These figures show the importance of properly trained search committees and the assistance of consultants in finding highly qualified candidates. The executive recruiter excels at finding and attracting talented people from outside.

Reisman (1985, p. 16), who has written extensively in praise of consultants, states, "Their use reflects an appreciation of the need to court people rather than wait." Heller (1987, p. 1) tells us that "Most executive recruiters are not inhibited by whether a person is, or is not, looking for a job. They, in fact, look for those individuals that are happy where they are." The author describes studies by Heidrick and Struggles, who have coordinated 60 presidential searches at private and public institutions around the country. Bowen (p. 1), a partner in the company, states that "any person is a prospect." He says, "It's up to us to turn him or her into a candidate." Mottram (1985), concurs. He has observed that search firms rarely attempt to contact people who are pursuing jobs. They are "hunters" whose prey are the executives who are
reasonably happy with their present positions. Mottram feels that those individuals do not regularly read want ads, nor do they have resumes on file with employment agencies, because they are too busy and happy doing a good job for their current employers.

Clearly the active approach taken by executive recruiters enables them to find candidates who would have been out of reach of the ordinary search committee.

How the Executive Recruiter Operates

Heller (1985) observes that the participation of paid consultants shapes the search process, often serving to promote candidates with traditional credentials and national recognition.

Fisher (1987), president of Leadership Developments Associates, Inc., says that an outside expert validates the institutional search process by helping the search committee clarify and identify what the institution's real needs are. He also notes that schools benefit when they tap the expertise of those who have access to information networks and are experienced in national searches. These are tools that internal search committees often don't have.

Kauffman, as a consultant to presidential searches, describes his role as interpreter or manager of the selection process. He believes that some
faculty will resent the influence of an outsider, and that the search should not be turned over entirely to the consultant.

Kauffman (1984) explains that outside consultants are helpful in cases where search committees lack experience and confidence. Other ways consultants help are by defining institution needs, outlining the characteristics of the kind of person that the institution should be seeking, providing a staff person for the committee, suggesting techniques for obtaining desirable nominations, suggesting names of possible candidates, conducting background investigations on selected candidates and aiding in the public relations of the actual appointment. Additional uses are: speeding up the search process, identifying and obtaining information on candidates, and selling a desirable candidate on the possibilities of an institution.

Mottram (1985), describes the typical course of action the consultant takes. He suggests that a search firm must first seek to discuss with its client, in great depth, the job specifications and personal chemistry of the candidate. He says that the consultant begins with the process of "sourcing." This involves the development of a list of institutions and key people who might be helpful in identifying potential candidates. In the next step, he calls the
sources, and without revealing the name of the searching institution, describes the position and a profile of the ideal candidate. This is the way a list of potential candidates is compiled.

According to Mottram the consultant then actually visits the institution to conduct a preliminary review. Next, the consultant conducts an in-depth, face to face interview with the candidate, and prepares a report that includes a comprehensive picture of the candidate's work history, education, family situation, personality and a final recommendation concerning the individual's suitability for the job. The consultant then sends written evaluations of candidates to the committee which he reviews with them. Sometimes the consultant will then personally check the references of those candidates the institution wants to meet. In some search firms, the reference check may wait until the institution has actually decided to offer the position. In either case, the consultant checks primary references, as well as secondary references that have been provided by the candidate. He asks about the candidate's strengths, and weaknesses and verifies his or her intuitive responses to the client. Last of all, the consultant coordinates arrangements so that the interviews with the institution go smoothly.
What will all these special services cost? This is an important question to address for this can be a major concern at some institutions. Weintraub (1984) notes that her firm recruits at the presidential and vice presidential levels for a fee of approximately $17,000 - $18,000. The fees cover "out of pocket" expenses. Most searches run on the average of $25,000, with a high of $1,000,000 at one private college (Kronovet and Hawley, 1977; Unglaube, 1983).

This may seem a high price to pay, but some may consider that the long-term benefits of making the proper match of individual to institution, far outweigh any considerations of cost.

**Stages of Use**

Using an executive recruiter can prove to be a costly proposition. Thus, while many authors favor their use (Reisman and McLaughlin, 1984; Kapolitz, 1974; Ness, 1974; Karol, 1980; Kiersh, 1979 and Prator, 1963), most authors do not recommend the use of consultants throughout the entire search.

Reisman (1985) advises that search firms are most effective at the beginning and end of the search. McLaughlin (1985) also sees the beginning of the search as a crucial time for the executive recruiter. McLaughlin describes consultants as "Skilled reference checkers," as they elicit more information than an internal search committee can (p. 27). She has observed
that many consultants will conduct all initial screening of the candidates. Because they operate off campus, confidential information is kept out of reach of those not involved in the search. She also sees consultants as important because they can conduct background investigations without disclosing their position.

There are some authors who feel that it is worthwhile to use the services of a recruiter throughout the search process. Kronovet and Hawley (1977) recommend that a board find a consultant before selecting a search committee. They also recommend that a consultant should have a key role during each phase of the search including the planning stage, prescreening, screening, interviewing, and final evaluation phase. Additional consultant roles should include: the coordination of the overall search process, presiding over the search with the executive secretary, and functioning as a surrogate board. Kronovet and Hawley recommend that the consultant should also chair the search committee in order to remove any biases, hidden agendas and subtle pressures that may occur with individuals from within the campus.

Summary

Ness (1985, p. 5) probably sums it up best for those who favor the use of paid consultants by internal search committees when he states that such consultants
"set their feet on the right path." They are the guides through a most complicated affair involving a most complicated group of individuals who may be untrained for the rigors of a presidential search.

The literature indicates that search committees, due to their lack of expertise and the abundance of legal restrictions which seem to retard their effectiveness, would do well to seek the services of an executive recruiter.

The historical transition from autocratic to democratic control of academic institutions, combined with the growing body of legislation at the federal and state level, has placed an almost impossible burden on search committees of colleges and universities attempting to select a new president. Dependence upon the professional executive recruiter may prove to save both time and money, and lead to the identification of more qualified candidates.

Candidates themselves praise the activities of executive recruiters. Bennis (1985) wrote of his personal experience as a candidate for president at Northwestern University. He describes his role as candidate and his experience with an executive recruiting firm. He says that many searches he was involved in were controlled by politics within the organization, a situation that should not have been allowed to develop. He described the Northwestern recruiter as straightfor-
ward and honest, a Harvard Business School graduate who
gave him an "exhaustive survey of the present status
and future of Northwestern" (p. 41).

Thus, the executive recruiter seems to offer many
advantages. On the other hand, some experts caution
that the use of the recruiter should complement, not
replace the traditional search committee.

Mottram (1983), vice president of Fleming As­
associates (a search firm) and a retired college dean,
understands the difficulties confronting internal
search committees at institutions of higher education.
He believes that search firms can save educational in­
stitutions considerable time and money. Yet, he also
believes that search committees are an integral part of
higher education. He states, "To suggest that search
committees do not serve a useful purpose would be a
mistake. To suggest that they should be replaced en­
tirely by something else would be foolish."

Even with this proviso in mind, it is clear that
the executive recruiter has an important contribution
to make to the academic world. As professional search
firms are called upon more and more by schools and
universities, their influence will grow even greater.
It would be worthwhile at this point to compare the
outcomes of presidential searches at those institutions
which have employed the services of an executive
recruiter, with the outcomes at institutions that have not. In this way a stronger case may be made for or against their use.
CHAPTER 3
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This study sought to clarify the opinions and perceptions of chairmen of internal presidential search committees at four year institutions of higher education, both public and private, toward procedures, committee composition, use of paid consultants and identification of preferred character attributes of the candidates. Specifically, this study sought to compare the opinions and perceptions of those chairmen of committees that used paid consultants at some time during their most recent search, to those that did not.

A review of the literature revealed that little data exists on the opinions and perceptions of actual search committee members as to the use of paid consultants during the search process. In addition it was apparent that there was limited information available as to committee members' opinions and perceptions concerning search cost, procedures, committee structure, time required and relevant candidate attributes.

An important goal of this study was to gain knowledge of the structure of the internal search committee and determine the contribution of the paid consultant. Research indicates that many search committee
members perceive the duties of the paid consultant differently from the way the actual paid consultant perceives them himself. The stage at which the services of the paid consultant would be most effective was also perceived differently by the two groups (Kaufman, 1985).

It was decided that a questionnaire covering the points in question would provide data that would clarify these issues.

**Development of the Test Instrument**

The first step in developing the questionnaire entailed contacting several individuals who had served on internal search committees as well as a few executive recruiters in order to elicit their support and ascertain what data they perceived to be crucial to the study. Individuals from both groups proved to be cooperative and helpful. The information that the two groups could offer was limited due to a lack of earlier studies, but the requested opinions and assistance were promptly and courteously provided.

Based on the opinions provided by the group, and issues that had emerged from a review of the available literature, a three part questionnaire was constructed. The first part consisted of 23 questions written in a Likert Scale format that addressed the opinions and perceptions of Search Committee chairmen as to the use of a paid consultant. The second part, also in a
Likert scale format, measured the perceived importance of various possible attributes of the candidates. Part three was comprised of seven general questions concerning the search process in relation to such areas as cost, committee make-up and size, and the amount of time invested in the search.

Specifically, this study was undertaken in an attempt to answer the following research questions:

1. What was the extent to which paid consultants were used by collegiate institutions?

2. What was the opinion of search committee chairs as to the ideal candidate criteria to be used in the presidential search process?

3. What was the relative cost for each search mode?

4. What were the attitudes of the search chairs toward the use of executive recruiters?

The research questions were answered by tabulating the responses to the three part questionnaire just described. Part one was designed to answer research questions one and four. Part two answered the research question number two. Part three was designed to answer research question number three.

Validity of the Instrument

In order to validate the questionnaire, an early version was administered to seven presidential search committee members who had served on recent presidential
searches in the state of Nevada. Each was asked to complete the instrument and to make comments or suggestions about specific items that might be improved or enhanced. In response to suggestions provided by this pretest, the instrument was revised. Helpful suggestions were made about specific items to include or delete, and the number of items was significantly reduced.

Further help in validating the questionnaire was provided by two Harvard faculty members, Ford Emeritus recipient Dr. David Reisman and researcher Dr. Judith McLaughlin, both of whom have had several articles published concerning the use of paid consultants during presidential searches. A soon-to-be released book co-authored by these prominent researchers addresses the subject in depth. Drs. Reisman and McLaughlin viewed the test instrument, recommending several changes in the questions, and the overall instrument. A letter of support stressing the importance of the study was also provided by them, which was later used to elicit subject cooperation.

Finally, the search committee members who had seen the questionnaire initially reviewed the revised version and approved its use for the study. It was felt that the final questionnaire (which appears in appendix B), actually did measure what it had been designed to.
Reliability of the Instrument

In order to verify instrument reliability, a number of tests were performed. First, a test-retest reliability test was administered in accordance with Dr. Anthony Saville's "Rules for Constructing Questionnaires," (unpublished manuscript.) The questionnaire was first administered to the search committee chairs at colleges and the results recorded. After six weeks, those same college chairs were contacted and they agreed to a retest with the same instrument.

The results of the two tests were submitted to a statistical correlation test and it was determined that there was a correlation at a mean level of .913. According to Dr. Saville's publication, the instrument is stable and reliable if the correlation proves to be .80 or above. Next, in order to further explore the reliability of the questionnaire, internal consistency was tested, using sets of questions that should show near identical responses. Responses to questionnaire items 11 through 18 infer that a paid consultant should be used throughout the entire search process, when compared to responses for question 19 which directly requested a preference for using a paid consultant from start to finish. A t test at the five percent level of significance verified the null hypothesis that there was no difference in the responses, Table 17, Appendix
D. An additional t test comparing preferences for using a paid consultant in only the final selection process was compared to preferences for using a paid consultant in the entire search process. Answers were significant, both for those subjects that had and those that had not used a paid consultant in their most recent presidential search.

A final test involved grouping questions 3 through 10 together resulting in a mean agreement score of 67 percent. This was compared to the mean agreement score of 60 percent for question 23. This comparison was designed to measure and compare agreement levels by chairs to the use of a paid consultant.

To summarize, the questionnaire tested reliable as to stability, response bias, and internal consistency.

Selection of the Subject Pool

The subjects for this study were chairmen of internal search committees selected from the Chronicle of Higher Education's employment listing for presidential searches at four year colleges and universities during the two year period of 1987 and 1988. This source was chosen because it is the noted and accepted source of Presidential Searches by both candidates and internal search committees. The study was limited to a two year period because any attempt to expand the time would
limit access to relevant individuals due to death, retirement, relocation or limited recollection of events.

**Administration of Questionnaires**

The questionnaire, along with a cover letter and a self-addressed stamped envelope, was sent to each of the 233 presidential search committee chairmen identified in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* covering over the period of 1987 to 1988.

After a period of three weeks, a second letter, duplicate questionnaire and self-addressed stamped envelope were sent to those individuals who had not responded to the first mailing.

**Treatment of the Data**

The data was tabulated and analyzed by means of a comparison of standard deviations, confidence intervals, and means. In two cases, analyses of variance were performed.

Confidence intervals are described as an alternative test to statistical significance. They provide the same information, only in a way that is more meaningful. Some journals may require that instead of significance tests, confidence intervals be used (Fitz Gibbon, Morris, 1987). If repeated samples were taken, it could be expected that in the congress the true difference would be captured in about 95% of these confidence intervals. It is fairly likely that in compar-
ing the results from those search committees using paid consultants with those that did not as measured by the Likert scale, which ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree.) In those cases where an analysis of variance was used, that method was chosen because it is a technique for examining differences among independence means. For example, if we want to ask if three or more means are significantly different, we use ANOVA, analysis of variance, thereby asking if the three kinds of treatment were equally effective (Fitz Gibbon, Morris, 1987).

A review of the literature and consultation with the Department of Education Administration and Higher Education faculty, indicated that a comparison of the confidence intervals, means and standard deviations for those chairmen who used a paid consultant during their recent search versus those who did not would be the appropriate way to analyze the data. Responses to the first two parts of the questionnaire which fell on a Likert scale, were analyzed by comparing areas of agreement and disagreement between those chairmen who had used a paid consultant sometime during the search, and those who had not.

Part three of the questionnaire involved open-ended questions requesting demographic type information. These results were displayed in table form as were the
previous two parts involving questions based on the Likert scale. The responses were provided in the actual way that they were given in a summary manner.

For each questionnaire item, a specific scale was included in a table for indicating the results of the analysis of data indicating the opinions and perceptions of the chairmen of the internal search committees.

The data was analyzed using the mini-tab statistical package 8.1.1 at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Summary

This chapter presented a description of the research design and methodology. A review of the literature, selection of the study population and design and distribution of a survey questionnaire were part of the initial stage of the study. Descriptive information was tabulated and reported after subjecting the data to a critical analysis and statistical treatment. Further details of the data collection and analysis is provided in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The questionnaire data was examined in order to determine terms of examining the opinions and perceptions of selected individuals who had served as chairs of presidential search committees at four year educational institutions of higher education with regard to search committee structure, cost, time required, procedures and relevant attributes of presidential candidates.

Specifically, this search was undertaken in an attempt to answer the four research questions concerning: the extent to which paid consultants were used, ideal criteria, relative cost and attitudes of search chairs toward the use of executive recruiters.

The questionnaire was sent to 233 individuals identified as chairs of search committees at their collegiate institutions and drawn from the 1987 and 1988 Chronicle of Higher Education presidential search section. Of those questionnaires sent, 143 were returned for a response rate of 61.4 percent. Of the 143 returned, 91 had used a paid consultant during their most recent search, representing a rate of 63.63 percent. Therefore 52, or 36.37 percent, had not used a paid consultant during their most recent search. (Figure 1).
USE OF PAID CONSULTANTS
HIGHER EDUCATION PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH

Figure 1
Paid Consultant used 63.64
Not used 36.36
The survey results are presented in three major segments. Part one of the questionnaire deals with the opinions and perceptions of search committee chairmen as to the use of paid consultants and was designed to answer research questions one and four. Part two solicited from the chairs the perceived importance of predetermined attributes of candidates. That data was used to answer research question number two. Part three was designed to answer research question number three and is comprised of seven general questions concerning the search process in relation to such areas as cost, committee make up, size and the amount of time involved during the search.

Percentages presented here represent data obtained from the Likert scale used in parts one and two of the questionnaire. The percent of agreement to each question was determined by adding the number of responses in category one (agree strongly) and category two (agree). The percent of disagreement to each question was determined by adding together the number of responses in category four (disagree) and category five (strongly disagree). Responses in category three were considered neutral, (neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the question asked).

Analyses of variance were performed in two areas where it seemed appropriate. The first case involved the comparison of search costs for those committees
using a paid consultant vs. those that did not (question 47). The second case involved a comparison of those committees that used a paid consultant with those that did not in regard to the question of whether or not paid consultants should be voting members (question 20 and 22).

General Demographic Information

Demographic data from participating schools includes the type of institution (public or private), the size of the student body and the highest degree offered by the institution. The type of institution responding to the survey instrument is illustrated in Table 1.

Private institutions represented the largest segment of the research population with a total of 78, or 54.55 percent. Public institutions represented the remaining 65 respondents for 45.45 percent. Figure 2 gives a graphic display of the data.
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TABLE 1

Frequency Distribution by Type of Institution Responding to Survey Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 indicates the size of the student body of participating institutions. Institutions with a student body size of 0 - 5,000 composed the largest segment of respondents for a total of 90 or 62.94 percent. The second largest segment responding was 5,000 - 20,000 students for a total of 40 or 27.97 percent. The smallest segment included those institutions with a student body size of over 20,000 students which represents 13 or 9.09 percent of the total. These figures may reflect the number and percent of higher educational institutions by size in the United States in general. The majority of U.S. colleges have a student population of under 5,000. The largest institutions represent the smallest percent of the total num-
ber of collegiate institutions. Figure 3 presents a graphic display of characteristics of participating schools.

**TABLE 2**

**Frequency Distribution of Responding Institutions by Size of Student Body**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5,000</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 20,000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 indicates the highest degree offered by the responding institutions.

Those institutions that offered a Masters Degree as their highest degree represent the largest segment of respondents totaling 67, or 46.85 percent. Those responding institutions offering a Bachelors degree only and Doctoral Degree were identical at 38 each, or 25.58 percent. Figure 4 displays the data in a graphic form.
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Figure 4

Respondent Demographics

Highest Degree Offered

Bachelor: 26%
Doctor: 27%
Master: 47%
TABLE 3

Frequency Distribution of Highest Degree Offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree Offered</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic comparison of institutions using and not using a paid consultant.

Next, demographics will be compared for those responding institutions that used a paid consultant during their most recent search to those that had not. The data is presented in Table 4.

Private schools tended to use a paid consultant in their presidential searches more than public schools. Private schools employed paid consultants in 60.44 percent of the cases, while public schools employed them in 39.56 percent of the cases. This difference is significant at the .05 level. Figure 5 presents the data in graphic form.
Figure 5
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The percentage of schools using a paid consultant is 63.64 percent, as noted previously. We will now break down the data according to private vs. public schools.

**TABLE 4**

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Type of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Paid Consultant Used</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Paid Consultant Not Used</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that the small and midsized institutions, (0 - 5,000 and 5,000 - 20,000), use paid consultants more often in their presidential searches than do the larger size institutions, (over 20,000). Figure 6 offers a graphic illustration of the data provided.
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TABLE 5
Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Size of Institution
Using vs. Not Using a Paid Consultant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Institution</th>
<th>Using Paid Consultant</th>
<th>Not Using Paid Consultant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5,000</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63.74</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-20,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those institutions that offer a Master or Doctor Degree as their highest degree prefer overwhelmingly to use a paid consultant during their search for president, (71, 77.96 percent). Both Masters Degree and Doctoral Degree granting institutions used a paid consultant more often during their search than did those offering a Bachelor Degree as their highest degree (figure 7).
Use of Consultant vs Degrees Offered

RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS
TABLE 6

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Highest Degree Offered Using vs. Not Using a Paid Consultant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Paid Consultant Used</th>
<th>Paid Consultant Not Used</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.98</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>48.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.87</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Questions

Part III of the questionnaire contains general questions whose answers might further assist in the understanding of the presidential search process.

When looking at the question of search committee organization, the question was asked, "How many members were on your committee," and, "in your opinion, what is the optimum number?" (questions #41 and #42). The results of actual use were much the same for both those search committees that did use and did not use a paid consultant (9-11 and 9 respectively.) When asked for the optimum number, those that had used a
those who had not used a paid consultant in their most recent search stated 10. Again both groups are quite consistent in their opinions and perceptions as to the optimum number of committee members that should be on the search committee.

The next question (#42) surveyed the committee organization. The respondents were asked to indicate on the questionnaire how many administrators, faculty members and others were on the committee. The aggregate scores were: Administrators 0, faculty 2, and others 7. When a comparison was made of those committees that did and did not use paid consultants, some differences emerged. When a paid consultant was used, the scores were: Administrators 0, faculty 3 and others 5. That compares to scores for those committees that did not use a paid consultant as follows: Administrators 2, faculty 2 and others 4.

It seems that when a paid consultant was used, the search committee did not use resources of any administrators, (0).

By contrast, the committee that did not use a paid consultant seemed to prefer to use more administrators and fewer faculty, (2 and 2 respectively). Perhaps those committees that did use a paid consultant used that individual in a coordinator role, whereas administrators performed that role in those committees not using a paid consultant.
The general question that asked how long it took to complete the search was answered uniformly. Both those committees that did and did not utilize a paid consultant averaged 6 - 7 months. These findings indicate no time was saved by using a paid consultant.

The results of the final general question, "How many committees took part in the search?", indicate that overall 62 percent used one committee while 15 percent used two committees and 6 percent used three committees. When those committees that used a paid consultant during their presidential search were compared to those that did not, again, some differences were noted. Those committees that used a paid consultant formed one committee in 66 percent of the cases, while 11 percent used two committees. When we look at those committees that did not use a paid consultant, we find that 56 percent used one committee, while 23 percent used two committees, and 8 percent used three committees. It seems that those search committees not using the services of a paid consultant found it necessary to form more committees. This may have an effect on the cost of the search that perhaps the chairs of the search committees are not aware of.
TABLE 7
Frequency Distribution of Number of Members Serving on Search Committee Using vs. Not Using a Paid Consultant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Committee</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used Paid Consultant</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Use Paid Consultant</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Data

Now that the demographics and size of the presidential search committees has been discussed, it is appropriate to address the findings that apply to each of the research questions.

Research question number one: What was the extent to which paid consultants were used by collegiate institutions? Part one of the questionnaire addresses this question.

As noted previously, 63.63 percent of those who responded to the questionnaire had used a paid consultant in their most recent search. This data was obtained from question number one of the questionnaire. Question number two asks: Have you ever served on any search committee that involved a paid consultant? Of those that responded, 58.74 percent indicated that they had served on a search committee that had
used the services of a paid consultant. It seems then that the use of a paid consultant has become a tool for the majority of higher educations presidential searches in recent years. In order to better understand the extent to which search committees did utilize the services of a paid consultant, the questions asked on the questionnaire obtained information on the point of the search at which the consultant was brought in.

Stages of the Search

The stages at which a consultant could be brought in were broken down into the following: 1. Initial stage  2. Search stage,  3. Final stage  4. All stages, and  5. All stages, but with no vote for the paid consultant.

The data was also obtained by grouping together several questions that applied to a particular stage of the search.

The initial stage is formed by combining four questions from the survey form which ask if a paid consultant should:

Number 12 - develop a candidate pool?

Number 15 - develop an institutional brochure?

Number 16 - do initial screening of all applicants to eliminate the unqualified?

The search stage combines two questions and asks the chair if a paid consultant should:
Number 17 - check the references and review the candidate files along with the search committee after the candidate pool is selected?

Number 18 - screen all applicants and present a list of semifinalists to the search committee for their consideration?

The final stage asks whether a paid consultant should assist in the search as follows:

Number 13 - Should the paid consultant be involved in the final negotiations with the president elect?

Number 14 - Should the paid consultant be involved in interviewing the final candidates?

To determine whether or not respondents prefer the use of a paid consultant throughout all stages, the following questions were used:

Number 19 - Should the paid consultant have complete involvement with the search committee from its formation through a recommendation?

Number 20 - The paid consultant need not be a voting member sitting at all stages with the search committee, but be available for consulting at various stages?

Of those respondents who used a paid consultant, 60 percent felt that a paid consultant should be used throughout the entire search. However, when specific questions were asked and placed into order, figures
indicate that only 52 percent actually preferred the use of a paid consultant during the entire search. This is still close in range, but may have tested their resolve to use a paid consultant at every stage. The data also indicates that of those who used a paid consultant on their search committee, 52 percent preferred to use them at the initial stage, 61 percent preferred to use the paid consultant at the search stage, and only 18 percent preferred to use them at the final stage (figure 8). The data further indicates that those committees that used a paid consultant during their search prefer to use them during the initial and search stage but prefer that the paid consultant not be involved in the final stage. This again indicates that those on search committees do not want the outsider "to participate" in the final negotiations with a candidate, but prefer to do so themselves.

The last indicator of chair attitudes toward the use of a paid consultant can be noted when we look at the various stages of their use. Again we look at the five different predetermined stages: the initial stage, the search stage, the final stage, all stages and all stages but not vote.

The data indicates that both those who used and did not use a paid consultant prefer their use at the initial and search stage but not at the final stage,
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and when we look at the all stage period of use we note that those committee chairs that used a paid consultant prefer their use at all stages, (2.2 on the Likert scale). Those committee chairs that did not use a paid consultant during their search are neutral concerning the use of a paid consultant at all stages, (3.1 on the Likert Scale).

Figure 18 in the confidence intervals, based upon the sample data, is used to predict overall opinions and perceptions of search committee chairmen for the use of a paid consultant during each individual stage. For instance, the 95 percent confidence intervals portrayed in figure 18, apx. E, show that paid consultants would be widely accepted by the search committees in the initial stage of a presidential search. There would be a probability of .95 that the Likert score would range between 2.40 and 2.29, and 2.10 to 2.61 for usage of a paid consultant in the initial stage by those who had used and those who had not used respectively.

As noted previously in Chapter One, confidence intervals are used because they are an alternative to statistical significance and may be even more meaningful. It could be expected that in the long run, about 95 percent of these confidence intervals would
"capture" the true difference or in other words, there is a 95 percent chance that the value would be within these confidence intervals.

When the entire study population was asked whether or not they would use a paid consultant if one were given no vote, there was strong agreement that a paid consultant could be used in this situation (94 percent). Again, this attitude was corroborated when they were asked whether paid consultants would be used if they were denied voting privileges (figure 9). Their responses were reflected in questions number 20 and 22. Question number 20 states that a paid consultant need not be a voting member sitting at all stages with the search committee, but should be available for consulting at various stages; 94 percent agreed. The respondents clearly prefer that paid consultants consult only, and not vote. Question number 22 asks if a paid consultant should be a voting member on the search committee, 99 percent said no. Respondents seem to feel strongly, regardless of whether their search committee had used a paid consultant or not, that the use of such consultants be limited to assisting the search committee. They should not be actively involved throughout the search, nor should they have voting privileges.
In order to more fully analyze the data, it seemed appropriate in this case to perform an analysis of variance. As the table in appendix D indicates, the difference was significant at the .05 level. The two questions, number 20 and 22, were the opposite of one another in order to test for internal reliability. Those committees using a paid consultant scored a mean score at 1.41 on question number 20, indicating agreement that they should not be a voting member but consult only. Those not using a paid consultant agreed at the 1.86 level. For question number 22, asking if the consultant should not vote, both agreed again with those using a paid consultant scoring a mean of 4.94 and those not at the 4.82 level.

We have reviewed the data that addresses research question number one concerning the extent to which paid consultants were used. We will now look at the second research question, that of search chair opinions as to the ideal candidate criteria to be used in the search.

Research question number two: What were the opinions of search committee chairs as to the ideal candidate criteria to be used in the presidential search process?

The data is obtained in part II of the questionnaire and is labeled as, Candidates Attributes Scale. The respondents were asked to rank sixteen listed can-
didate attributes by their importance on a 1 to 5 scale. They were also asked to write in any additional attributes that were not listed but that they felt were important.

When the results were tabulated, the sixteen attributes were divided into two groups and labeled as most important and least important.

Ten attributes were listed as most important and six attributes were listed as least important.

The ten attributes and the percentages of response that were most important, listed in order, were:

1. Developing community links - 98%
2. Leadership experience in academia - 96%
3. Fiscal and budgeting ability - 92%
4. Outgoing personality - 92%
5. Seen as innovative - 90%
6. Power of persuasion - 89%
7. Earned Doctorate - 88%
8. Experience working with elected trustees or board - 79%
9. Record of vertical promotion - 78%
10. Salary in line with anticipated salary - 61%

Those six attributes that were categorized as least important by percentage of response and listed in order are:
1. Professional degree in administration - 16%
2. Experience with collective bargaining in an academic standing - 30%
3. Leadership in non academic organization - 37%
4. Published author - 48%
5. Interview with spouse - 54%
6. Past teaching experience - 60%

When we compare responses of those search committee chairs who used paid consultants with those who did not, we note the greatest differences in perception of importance of attributes in the six least important attributes. The attribute that shows the greatest difference is teaching experience. Those committee chairs that did not use a paid consultant view teaching experience as more important than those who did, (71 percent and 54 percent respectively). Overall those who did not use a paid consultant and those that did tend to agree on the ranking of candidate attributes. It is interesting to note that the attributes ranked as most important tend to be business-oriented and not academic-oriented, e.g. developing communication links, 98 percent, and fiscal and budgeting ability, 92 percent, compared to past teaching, 60 percent, and published author, 48 percent.
After reviewing the data for the 16 listed attributes respondents were asked to write in other attributes they viewed as important but which were not listed. The attribute most often listed was "fund raising development activities," which was listed 15 times. Next was "understanding the mission and commitment to it," noted 10 times. The "ability to communicate" and "integrity" were third, listed 5 times each. Additional attribute write in's, listed in order of frequency, are presented in Table 8.

In summary, those attributes that seemed most important dealt with running the institution on a daily basis, almost as a business. The president might be seen as the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the educational institution, much like the CEO of a business organization. Their duties may in fact overlap considerably given today's economic situation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund raising/development activities</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand mission and commitment to it</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication ability</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative action minded</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to listen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to perform under stress</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable to faculty, administration and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong family relationships</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research question number three: What was the relative cost for each search mode?

Question number 46 was, "Considering the salaries of the staff, faculty and others on the search committee, as well as the length of time the search was in progress, what is your estimate of the total cost to the institution?"
The mean cost of the presidential search was determined to be $37,803. The mean cost of a presidential search for those committees who did use a paid consultant was $46,759. For those committees that did not use a paid consultant the cost was determined to be a mean of $22,154 (figure 10). Using a 95 percent confidence interval, it was discovered that costs for searches that used a paid consultant in their most recent search ranged from $38,000 to $56,000. Searches that did not use a paid consultant ranged between $15,000 and $33,000.

An analysis of variance was performed of the data for search costs. It was found that there was a significant difference in cost at the 5 percent level between those search committees that used a paid consultant and those that did not (Table 9 below). It seems that using a paid consultant does add to the cost of a search. The question that remains to be answered, however, is the value received for the additional cost. This is a question worthy of future study.
TOTAL COST OF PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH
TABLE 9
Relative Cost of Each Search Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.001E+10</td>
<td>2.001E+10</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2.603E+11</td>
<td>1.846E+09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.803E+11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEVEL | N | MEAN | STDEV |
------|---|------|-------|
1     | 91| 46745| 47460 |
2     | 52| 22154| 33607 |

POOLED STDEV = 42968

Research question number four: What were the attitudes of the search chairs toward the use of executive recruiters?

As discussed in research question number one, the chairs of search committees prefer not to allow the paid consultant to have a vote in choosing candidates. The respondents indicate that they would not allow a paid consultant to vote, (99 percent). On the other hand, if the paid consultant were to consult only, but not vote, 94 percent would agree to their use by the search committee.
Ethics is an important consideration when looking at attitudes of the search chair. When we look at the ability of the paid consultant to maintain ethical standards during the search process, we find that those who used a paid consultant in the most recent search tend to agree that the paid consultant does tend to maintain ethical standards. Data concerning the ethics issue was gathered from question 21. Those who did not use a paid consultant tend to disagree that the paid consultant tends to maintain ethical standards, as noted below in Table 10. They ranked in the range of 3.07 to 3.7 which leans toward disagreeing (4) on the Likert scale. By contrast, those committee chairs who had used a paid consultant tend to agree that such consultants do help maintain ethical standards during the search process, scoring 2.62 on the Likert scale with a 95 percent confidence interval of 2.37 to 2.86.


TABLE 10

Frequency Distribution of Respondents Concerning Ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Used Paid Consultant</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>95% Confidence Intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vs. Not Used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.37 to 2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Used</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.07 to 3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the question of confidentiality is asked, (number 10 on the questionnaire, "a paid consultant could help maintain greater confidentiality," ) 39 percent of the respondents agreed.

Of those who had used a paid consultant, 76 percent agreed that confidentiality could be maintained by a paid consultant. But only 27 percent of those who had not used a paid consultant during their search agreed that their use would help maintain confidentiality.

The results are presented below in Table 11. As noted, the mean Likert score for those committees using a paid consultant is 2.54 with a 95 percent confidence interval of 2.29 to 2.79. While those not
using a paid consultant showed a 3.75 mean score on the Likert scale with a confidence interval of 3.42 to 4.08. definitely leaning toward disagreement.

**TABLE 11**

Likert Scale Frequency Distribution of Respondents Concerning Confidentiality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Used Paid Consultant</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>95% Confidence Intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vs. Not Used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.29 to 2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Used</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.42 to 4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several questions address attitudes of committees toward efficiency and contribution to efficiency provided by a paid consultant. When the following questions are combined, that resulting data reflects the attitude toward efficiency:

Number 4. The use of a paid consultant would help to prevent conflict within the search committee;

Number 7. The use of a paid consultant would be a cost effective procedure in your search;

Number 8. A paid consultant would effectively reduce the amount of time required to select the acceptable candidate;
Number 10. A paid consultant could help maintain greater confidentiality during the search process; and

Number 23. The use of a paid consultant would effectively enhance the overall procedure.

When responses to these questions are combined and the mean obtained, we find that 45 percent of the respondents agree that a paid consultant would increase the efficiency of the committee. When we examine responses of those who had used a paid consultant, we find 63 percent agree. Those search committees who did not use a paid consultant did not feel they would increase the efficiency of the committee, (18 percent agreement). It seems then that those committees that have used a paid consultant have learned by experience that the efficiency of the committee is increased overall, while those who have not used a paid consultant and had not had the experience, do not agree.

Summary

This chapter presented the data that was obtained from a survey of presidential search committee chairmen from four year higher education institutions. All had led a presidential search during the calendar years of 1987 and 1988 and listed the available position in the Chronicle of Higher Education. A comparison was made of responses of chairmen of presidential searches that had used a paid consultant versus
those that had not. The data was analyzed to answer four research questions. Those four questions concerned: search committee chair attitudes toward the use of paid consultants; search costs; ideal candidate criteria to be used for the search; and finally, the extent to which the paid consultant was or should be used. The opinions and perceptions of the search committee chairs toward each of these questions was obtained through responses to the questionnaire.

The results of the data analysis indicate that there are differences in attitudes and perceptions between those search committees that have used a paid consultant and those that have not. The data indicates that those search committees that had not used a paid consultant in their most recent search are not as receptive toward the use of a paid consultant. However, it should be noted that this attitude is not based upon actual experience. Those search committees that have had experience with a paid consultant are more positive about the use of a paid consultant during their searches.

Both groups agreed that the paid consultant should not have a vote privilege (99 percent). Both groups preferred that the paid consultant not have total involvement during the final stage of the search.
Finally the data gathered from the questionnaire indicates that the use of a paid consultant in higher education is prominent, (63.64 percent).
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of college search committees toward the use of paid consultants in the presidential search. The data from a questionnaire designed for this study was collected, tabulated, and analyzed. This chapter will provide a summary and conclusions, and will present recommendations for further study.

To obtain data for this study chairmen of the presidential searches at four year institutions of higher education during the calendar years of 1987 and 1988 were identified in the Chronicle of Higher Education's presidential search announcements. A questionnaire developed for this purpose was sent to these chairmen so that a comparison could be made between those recent searches that involved the use of a paid consultant, and those that did not. Questionnaires were sent to a total of 233 presidential search chairs. Of those, 143 were returned, for a response rate of 61.63 percent.
The study focused on the following four research questions which formed the purpose of the study involving the use of paid consultants by presidential search committees:

1. To determine the extent to which executive recruiters were used by collegiate institutions.

2. To determine the opinions of search committee chairs as to the ideal candidate criteria to be used in the presidential search process.

3. To determine the relative cost for each search mode.

4. To determine the attitudes of the search chairs toward the use of executive recruiters.

For each question, a comparison was made of those search committees that used a paid consultant to those that did not.

Additional information was sought by adding general information questions to the survey that could be of help to search committees in future presidential searches.

Nearly two thirds of committee chairs that responded to the questionnaire lead searches that had used the services of a paid consultant.

Extent used, ideal criteria, costs of the search, and attitudes of search chairs, were analyzed by the use of confidence intervals, an analysis of variance,
means and standard deviations. The findings for each of the four research questions will be discussed in turn in the section to follow.

1. Extent Used

Paid consultants were used in 64.64 percent of the searches included in the study. The data indicated that paid consultants were believed to be accepted as useful to the search by the majority of those committees that used a paid consultant in their most recent search for a college president. Those committees that had not used a paid consultant in their most recent search, tended not to be receptive to a paid consultant's services, unless their duties were limited to consulting only, and no voting privileges were extended to them. Those search committee chairs that did use a paid consultant, preferred the use of a paid consultant. Evidently experience with a paid consultant actually formed an overall positive attitude in those who had used one. The most serious limitations exposed by those chairs was that they preferred that a paid consultant not be used in the final stages of the search and that they not have a voting privilege. There was general consensus on the part of both those search chairs who had used a paid consultant and those who had not that voting privileges are definitely not to be given to paid consultants.
It is interesting to note that both those committees that had and had not used paid consultants during their search preferred that their services be utilized at the initial and search stages. Here again we note that even those committees that had not used paid consultants during their search would be receptive to their use in the early stages of the search. Therefore it might again be construed that higher education does not prefer outside assistance in their final selection decisions.

Demographic data is an important consideration when observing the extent that paid consultants were used. The demographic data consisted of size of the student body, type of institution - public or private, and the highest degree offered by the responding institutions.

Those institutions that used paid consultants utilized their services most often in the 0 to 5000 student body size category. Therefore it seems that the smaller sized schools felt the need for consultant services perhaps because they had fewer contacts or less institutional identity from which to draw qualified candidates.

Next, it was noted that when type of institution was considered, private institutions used a paid consultant more often. It could possibly be construed that perhaps private institutions were less restricted
by state and federal laws controlling presidential searches. It could also be possible that private institutions had more available funds and less outside resistance for the hiring of a paid consultant. The private institutions may also have been more receptive toward the use of paid consultants.

The last of the demographic data used in the survey was that of the highest degree offered by responding institutions. Those institutions that used paid consultants and offered advanced degrees overwhelmingly preferred the services of paid consultants. Those institutions might have felt it important, because of their status, to obtain the most qualified candidates.

2. **Ideal Criteria** Predetermined candidate attributes were tested for importance by chairs of the search committees. The data indicated that those attributes that were most readily seen as important were more on the business side than the education side. There seems to be a preference toward business ability in running an education institution, rather than academic ability. The ability to raise funds, fiscal and budget ability, being personable, and the ability to deal with all constituents including trustees, faculty, administration and students are all ranked as important by search chairs. Many of those qualities
are seen as important for Chief Executive Officers of major corporations. The need for a scholarly president is not perceived as important as in the past.

Leadership qualities and positive personality characteristics were also noted as desirable attributes for a presidential candidate to possess. This indicates that committees felt that a president should be able to influence, persuade and be innovative.

3. Costs The search costs were significantly different for those search committees that used a paid consultant and those that did not. The level of significance was at the .05 level. The mean cost of a search for those chairs who had used a paid consultant was $46,749, compared to a mean of $22,154 for those who did not use a paid consultant. The cost of using a paid consultant for the presidential search was definitely determined to be more costly. It was not determined whether the additional cost led to selection of an applicant who was significantly more beneficial to the institution.

4. Chair Attitudes Toward Paid Consultants This was the most extensive and important question of this study, the purpose of which was to survey the opinions and perceptions of college search committees concerning the use of paid consultants in the presidential search. Those search committee chairs
that had used a paid consultant in their most recent search preferred their use. The respondents were surveyed for their opinions of paid consultants and their performance in ethics, efficiency, and confidentiality.

On the issue of ethics, those committees who used paid consultants agree that they will maintain ethical standards, (a mean score of 2.62 on the Likert scale). Those who did not use a paid consultant tended to disagree that they would, (3.38 mean score on the Likert scale). Percentage figures for agreement are 45 percent for those using a paid consultant, and 23 percent for those not using a paid consultant.

Confidentiality was a major concern to many search committee chairs. Those committees using paid consultants tend to agree that they can assist in maintaining confidentiality, (2.54 mean Likert score). Those not using the paid consultant scored a mean Likert score of 3.75, tending to disagree. Again, the corresponding percentage of agreement is 51 percent for those who have used a paid consultant, and 19 percent for those who have not.

Efficiency was rated by comparing several questions in order to determine whether there was agreement or disagreement as to the use of a paid consultant. Once again we note those committees that had used a paid consultant had a mean Likert score of
2.16, representing a strong level of agreement that a paid consultant had made the process more efficient. Those not using a paid consultant registered a mean Likert scale of 3.55 indicating they did not think a paid consultant would make the process more efficient. The representative percentages are 67 percent agreement for those using a paid consultant, and 15 percent agreement level for those not using a paid consultant.

For all three questions which determine whether a paid consultant can improve the search in regard to ethics, efficiency and confidentiality, those committees who had used a paid consultant tended to agree, while those who had not used a paid consultant did not. Those not using a paid consultant seem not to be supportive of their use even though they have not had any experience with them. A good example is the chair response to question number 3, which asks, "Can a paid consultant be accepted by the majority of search committee members?" Those who used a paid consultant in their most recent search strongly agreed at 89 percent. Those who had not used a paid consultant agreed at only 29 percent.

Additional information was gathered as to committee composition, and the search process. The mean committee size for those using paid consultants was 10-11, while for those who did not use a paid consultant, it was 9 committee members. The optimum size was
seen as 9 by those committees who had not used a paid consultant, and 9 - 10 by those who had. The committee size was seen as about equal for both groups and close to the perceived optimum size. The average length of a search was about equal at 8 months. Therefore the use of a paid consultant did not seem to expand or lessen the length of the search. The number of committees used was nearly equal at one, except that those that did not use a paid consultant used a second committee in 29 percent of the cases. Therefore, it might be construed that by not using a paid consultant, more committees were needed to do that work which a paid consultant could do. The committee make-up of faculty, administrators and others differed somewhat. Those committees that did not use a paid consultant tended to use administrators on their committees, while those that did use paid consultants tended not to use administrators. It might be construed that those committees not using paid consultants may find that administrators on the committee assisted in the search organization and procedures.

Overall, those chairmen who had worked with paid consultants, viewed their contribution favorably, while those who had not had experience working with paid consultants tended to downplay their usefulness.
It might be concluded that paid consultants do play an important role, which becomes more obvious to those who have actually used their services.

When observing those respondents who indicated a neutral attitude in their responses, it may be noted that those individuals comprise a significant number throughout the study. A neutral attitude could also be viewed as being receptive to the use of a paid consultant once they have had experience with a consultant or have been made aware of the benefits of a paid consultant, therefore possibly increasing significantly the number supporting the use of the services of paid consultants.

Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. The findings reported in this study could be useful to search committees when college presidential vacancies occur. Specifically, information that could enhance the operation of presidential search committees involves candidate attributes, costs and length of previous searches, committee size and composition, and most importantly, attitude toward the use of a paid consultant.
2. Because search committee chairs and other committee members may lack knowledge of interview skills and/or activities and training, a paid consultant could aid in the search.

3. Assuming that the use of a paid consultant is in fact an ability method of hiring the most qualified individual as president, information should be used to approach those negative or neutral to using a paid consultant and educate them to the advantages of using one.

4. A model should be established concerning the most effective time during the search to use the services of a paid consultant as well as cost guides for those services.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

The following recommendations are based on a review of the literature and an analysis of the data.

1. It is recommended that a follow-up study be performed of the same research population in order to determine how successful the search experience was, in terms of the success of the chosen candidate. This should be related to whether or not a paid consultant participated in the search and comparing the results. The chosen individual should also be interviewed for his/her opinions as to the use of the paid consultant during the search. A comparison could be made of the
opinions and perceptions of the chairs after two or three years had elapsed since the hiring of the chosen candidate.

2. Further studies should involve the demographics noted in the study. Why do certain types of institutions prefer the use of paid consultants?

3. Further research is needed to distinguish and describe those stages of the search that are seen as beneficial by those search committees that have used a paid consultant.

4. A study should be made concerning total search costs by comparing those committees that used a paid consultant and those that did not in order to determine whether or not the use of a paid consultant is a cost saving method.

5. In looking at cause and effect, a study should be made to determine whether those committee chairs that used a paid consultant and were happy with their services, were predisposed to prefer them, or did their "experiences" induce them to their use.
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LETTER SUPPORTING NEED FOR STUDY

DAVID REISMAN
JUDITH MCLAUGHLIN
May 31, 1989

Mr. Jim Goldsmith
Student Financial Services
University of Nevada/Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154

Dear Mr. Goldsmith:

Forgive my delay in writing this letter. I have been busy grading student papers, reviewing thesis proposals, and writing letters of recommendation for graduating students, and only just now have cleared my desk sufficiently to find my notes on our last telephone conversation about your research.

By now, your questionnaire has undoubtedly been mailed, and you are eagerly awaiting the responses. For your sake, as well as my own, I hope that your return rate is high. You have asked many questions about which both I and my colleague David Riesman, Henry Ford II Professor of Social Sciences Emeritus, have a very great interest. As I mentioned to you when we spoke, your topic of inquiry, the use of executive recruiters in the search process, is one that we view as extraordinarily important for higher education today. In 1984, David Riesman and I published a paper in Change magazine on the use of consultants in presidential searches. That paper attracted wide interest, in part because many institutions were just beginning to consider using a consultant in this capacity and were curious about the experience of other institutions, and in part because nothing else had been written on this subject. Since 1984, the use of consultants in searches has increased dramatically. In recent years institutions as different as Brown University, Bradford College, Hampshire College, Hartford College for Women, Michigan State University, and the Pennsylvania College of Art have utilized the services of consulting firms in their presidential searches. Whereas a few years ago it was somewhat unusual when a college or university chose to use a executive search consultant, now it is news when an institution decides not to do so. At a workshop on search consultants held during the annual meeting of the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities this spring, someone asked about the percentage of searches for college and university presidents that used consultants, and the five consultants present--representing several search firms, both not-for-profit and corporate--put forward estimates ranging from 75% to 50%. My guess is that the lower figure is more accurate, but there is no data on this of which I am aware.
Surprisingly, however, given this significant change in the manner of searching for college and university presidents, virtually nothing has been written about this phenomenon, other than by the search firms themselves who can hardly be considered objective observers or commentators. In our forthcoming book, Choosing a College President: Opportunities, Constraints, Triumphs, and Catastrophes (to be published by Princeton University Press, under the auspices of the Carnegie Foundation), we have devoted two chapters to the use of consultants. One is a discussion chapter; the other is a case study of Winthrop College, a state college in South Carolina, which used the services of the Academy for Educational Development in their search for a president. Although the book has twelve chapters (including five case studies), we fully expect that the two chapters on consultants will be the most widely read.

All this is by way of saying that David Riesman and I think that you have chosen an important topic for your research and we look forward to reading your dissertation.

With best wishes for a successful conclusion to your work.

Sincerely,

Judith Block McLaughlin
Lecturer on Education
April 20, 1989

Dear :

It is my understanding that you recently served as chairman of the above presidential search committee. I am conducting a study of four year college and university presidential search committees, and I need your help to complete my dissertation. My study will examine the opinions and perceptions of the chairperson of these committees including such matters as the use of paid consultants, search costs and the desired characteristics of a college/university president.

As the chairperson of a presidential search committee, you had the opportunity to observe the operation of the committee. The enclosed questionnaire elicits your response to questions about the search as you observed it. The questionnaire contains items that can be easily answered based on your recollections and can be completed in a short time.

All responses will be strictly confidential. No individual, institution or search committee will be identified. Your answers are of great importance to the success of this doctoral study.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it by May 5, 1989 in the enclosed self addressed stamped envelope. If you have any questions, or need further information, contact me at 702/739-3695 (University) or 702/877-0759 (Home.)

Thank you for your kind cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Jim Goldsmith

P.S. If you are interested in a summary of the findings of this research, detach the inside address of this letter and return it with the questionnaire or in a separate envelope.
May 15, 1989

Dear:

Recently I sent you a questionnaire, asking you to share your experiences as the chair of a recent Presidential Search Committee. As yet, I have had no response to the questionnaire which should have reached you approximately two weeks ago.

Perhaps you never received the questionnaire, or lacked the time to complete it. Although the overall response to the questionnaire has been excellent, it is necessary to have a larger sample from those who actually served on a presidential search committee. I am therefore enclosing another copy and would very much appreciate your taking a few minutes from your busy schedule to complete and return it to me.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very sincerely yours,

James Goldsmith
PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH
QUESTIONNAIRE

POSITION/TITLE: ________________________

I am currently collecting data on the recruitment and selection process your institution used in its search for a new president. I would appreciate it a great deal if you would take a few moments of your time to complete and return this questionnaire. Your opinion is very important to me in order that I can evaluate the opinion of many search committees from many institutions to determine the perceptions about the selection process.

Your response will assist me in making recommendations to other collegiate institutions facing this most important selection process. Your response will be completely anonymous. Please return the completed questionnaire in the self addressed-self stamped envelope by May 5, 1989. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. Did you use a paid consultant at any time during your most recent search for a president? YES _____NO

2. Have you ever served on any search committee that involved a paid consultant? YES _____NO

INSTRUCTIONS: For Items 3 thru 23, please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements. Circle the number that most closely corresponds to your degree of agreement or disagreement.

1 = STRONGLY AGREE  2 = AGREE  3 = NEUTRAL
4 = DISAGREE  5 = STRONGLY DISAGREE

3. A paid consultant/team can be accepted by the majority of search committee members.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE

4. The use of a paid consultant/team would help to prevent conflict within the search committee.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE

5. The paid consultant/team would be able to obtain data that you as a committee could not, due to legal state and/or federal restrictions.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE

6. The use of a paid consultant/team can increase the applicant pool.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE

7. The use of a paid consultant/team would be a cost effective procedure in your search.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE
8. A paid consultant/team would effectively reduce the amount of time required to select the acceptable candidate.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE

9. A paid consultant/team would provide more qualified applicants than your committee could obtain through normal channels.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE

10. A paid consultant/team could help maintain greater confidentiality during the search process.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE

11. If used, a paid consultant/team should visit the candidates campuses to inquire about performance.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE

12. The paid consultant/team, if used, should develop a candidate pool for presentation to the search committee.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE

13. A paid consultant/team, if used, should be involved in the negotiations with the president elect.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE

14. If used, a paid consultant/team should be involved in interviewing the final candidates.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE

15. If used, a paid consultant/team should be involved in the development of an institutional brochure and opening advertisement.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE

16. A paid consultant/team, if used, should do initial screening of all applications to eliminate the unqualified.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE

17. After the candidate pool is selected, the paid consultant/team should check the references and review the candidate files along with the search committee.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE

18. A paid consultant/team, if used, should screen all applicants and present a list of semifinalists to the search committee for their consideration.

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE
19. A paid consultant/team should have complete involvement with the search committee from its formation through a recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

20. A paid consultant/team need not be a voting member sitting at all stages with the search committee but should be available for consultation at various stages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. The use of a paid consultant/team would help maintain ethical standards during the search process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. A paid consultant/team should be a voting member on the search committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. The use of a paid consultant/team would effectively enhance the overall selection process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Candidates Attributes Scale**

For each of the attributes listed, check its degree of importance for the evaluation of presidential candidates using the following scale:

1 = Very Important  
2 = Important  
3 = Average Importance  
4 = Little Importance  
5 = No Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past teaching experience</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published author</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of vertical promotion</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen as innovative</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership experience in non academic organization</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned doctorate</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree in administration</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience working with elected college trustees or boards</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing personality</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with collective bargaining in an academic setting</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34. Fiscal and budgeting ability 1 2 3 4 5

35. Leadership experience in an academic organization 1 2 3 4 5

36. Skilled in developing links with the community 1 2 3 4 5

37. Applicants salary expectation in line with anticipated salary 1 2 3 4 5

38. Power of persuasion 1 2 3 4 5

39. Interview with spouse 1 2 3 4 5

40. Please list any other attributes you can suggest.

GENERAL QUESTIONS

41. How many members were on your search committee? 

42. What is the optimum committee size? members

43. How long did the complete search process take? 

44. How many committees took part in the search? 

45. How many were on the committee?
   Administrators  Faculty  Others

46. Considering the salaries of the staff, faculty and others on the search committee, as well as the length of time the search was in progress, what is your estimate of the total cost to the institution? $ 

47. Any additional comments or suggestions you may wish to make.

INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Please complete the blanks below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size (Student Body):</th>
<th>Type of Institution:</th>
<th>Highest Degree Offered:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 500</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-1,000</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

COMPUTER PROGRAMS FOR DATA ANALYSIS
Mini-tab was a general purpose statistical data analysis system developed at Penn State University for researchers and students with no previous computer experience. It was designed primarily for moderate size data sets which could be stored in main memory.

There were three versions of Mini-tab for microcomputers. The Fundamental version provided commonly used statistical and data manipulation routines that were particularly useful for instruction and preliminary analysis.

Features included: plots, histograms, descriptive statistics, simple and multiple regression, analysis of variance, nonparametrics, cross-tabulation, random data generation and macro and looping capabilities.

The Standard version expanded on those capabilities to include time series analysis, step wise regression, exploratory data analysis, and matrix operations.
APPENDIX D

TABLES
TABLE 12

PART I

For questions 1 through 23, responses to the questions were arranged by use of the Likert Scale.

1 - Strongly Agree  2 - Agree  3 - Neutral  4 - Disagree  5 - Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>PAID CONSULTANT USED</th>
<th>NOT USED</th>
<th>PAID CONSULTANT AGGREGATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did you use a paid consultant at any time during your most recent search for a president?</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have you ever served on any search committee that involved a paid consultant?</td>
<td>yes 76% yes 29% yes 59%</td>
<td>no 28% no 71% no 41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A paid consultant/team can be accepted by the majority of search committee members.</td>
<td>Agree 89% 29% 67%</td>
<td>Disagree 2% 37% 27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The use of a paid consultant/team would help to prevent conflict within the search committee.</td>
<td>Agree 52% 8% 36%</td>
<td>Disagree 19% 63% 35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The paid consultant/team would be able to obtain data that you as a committee could not, due to legal, state and/or federal regulations.</td>
<td>Agree 49% 15% 37%</td>
<td>Disagree 27% 63% 41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The use of a paid consultant/team can increase the applicant pool.</td>
<td>Agree 88% 40% 71%</td>
<td>Disagree 8% 37% 18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The use of a paid consultant/team would be a cost effective procedure in your search.</td>
<td>Agree 64% 10% 44%</td>
<td>Disagree 16% 75% 38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A paid consultant/team would effectively reduce the amount of time required to select the acceptable candidate.</td>
<td>Agree 65% 35% 54%</td>
<td>Disagree 23% 46% 31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
<td>AGREED</td>
<td>DISAGREED</td>
<td>AGG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A paid consultant/team would provide more qualified applicants than your committee could obtain through normal channels.</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A paid consultant/team could help maintain greater confidentiality during the search process.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If used, a paid consultant/team should visit the candidates campuses to inquire about performance.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The paid consultant/team, if used, should develop a candidate pool for presentation to the search committee.</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A paid consultant/team, if used, should be involved in the negotiations with the president elect.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. If used, a paid consultant/team should be involved in interviewing the final candidates.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If used, a paid consultant/team should be involved in the development of an institutional brochure and opening advertisement.</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A paid consultant/team, if used, should do initial screening of all applications to eliminate the unqualified.</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
<td>PAID CONSULTANT USED</td>
<td>PAID CONSULTANT NOT USED</td>
<td>AGG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. After the candidate pool is selected, the paid consultant/team should check the references and review the candidate files along with the search committee.</td>
<td>Agree 86%</td>
<td>Disagree 9%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. A paid consultant/team, if used, should screen all applicants and present a list of semi-finalists to the search committee for their consideration.</td>
<td>Agree 35%</td>
<td>Disagree 55%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. A paid consultant/team should have complete involvement with the search committee from its formation through a recommendation.</td>
<td>Agree 32%</td>
<td>Disagree 33%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. A paid consultant/team need not be a voting member sitting at all stages with the search committee but should be available for consulting at various stages.</td>
<td>Agree 98%</td>
<td>Disagree 2%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The use of a paid consultant/team would help maintain ethical standards during the search process.</td>
<td>Agree 1%</td>
<td>Disagree 17%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. A paid consultant/team should be a voting member on the search committee.</td>
<td>Agree 0%</td>
<td>Disagree 99%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The use of a paid consultant/team would effectively enhance the overall selection process.</td>
<td>Agree 85%</td>
<td>Disagree 7%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 13

#### PART II

**CANDIDATES ATTRIBUTES SCALES**

Questions 24 through 39 were answered on a scale of 1 - 5.

1 = Very Important  
2 = Important  
3 = Average Importance  
4 = Little Importance  
5 = No Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>PAID CONSULTANT USED</th>
<th>PAID CONSULTANT NOT USED</th>
<th>AGGREGATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Past teaching experience</td>
<td>Agree 54%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Published author</td>
<td>Agree 48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Record of vertical promotion</td>
<td>Agree 75%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Seen as innovative</td>
<td>Agree 89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Leadership experience in non-academic organization</td>
<td>Agree 36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Earned doctorate</td>
<td>Agree 84%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Professional degree in administration</td>
<td>Agree 13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 46%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Experience working with college trustees and boards</td>
<td>Agree 80%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Outgoing personality</td>
<td>Agree 92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Experience with collective bargaining in an academic setting</td>
<td>Agree 33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Fiscal and budgeting ability</td>
<td>Agree 93%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Leadership experience in an academic organization</td>
<td>Agree 96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
<td>PAID CONSULTANT USED</td>
<td>PAID CONSULTANT NOT USED</td>
<td>AGG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Skilled in developing links with community</td>
<td>Agree 98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Salary expectation in line</td>
<td>Agree 65%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Power of persuasion</td>
<td>Agree 84%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Interview with spouse</td>
<td>Agree 60%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PART III

**GENERAL QUESTIONS AND DEMOGRAPHICS**

### 41. How many members were on your search committee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Paid Consultant Used</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Paid Consultant Not Used</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 42. What is the optimum committee size?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Paid Consultant Used</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Paid Consultant Not Used</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
43. How long did the search process take?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paid Consultant Used</th>
<th>Paid Consultant Not Used</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Number Of Months</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. How many committees took part in the search?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paid Consultant Used</th>
<th>Paid Consultant Not Used</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Percent</td>
<td>Number Percent</td>
<td>Number Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.93</td>
<td>55.77</td>
<td>62.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Total 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>8.1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>9.0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>12.1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>20.0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>150.0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 91</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
45. How many were on the committee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAID CONSULTANT</td>
<td>USED</td>
<td>PAID CONSULTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number/Percent</td>
<td>Number/Percent</td>
<td>Number/Percent</td>
<td>Number/Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>0 41.76</td>
<td>0 25.0</td>
<td>0 35.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.18</td>
<td>1 23.08</td>
<td>1 23.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.78</td>
<td>2 26.92</td>
<td>2 22.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3 13.46</td>
<td>3 7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4 7.69</td>
<td>4 5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>5 1.92</td>
<td>5 2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>6 1.92</td>
<td>6 2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>TOTAL 52</td>
<td>8 .70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Faculty | 0 7.69 | 0 11.54 | 0 9.09 |
| 1 | 4.40 | 1 3.85 | 1 4.20 |
| 2 | 26.37 | 2 23.08 | 2 25.17 |
| 3 | 26.37 | 3 19.23 | 3 23.78 |
| 4 | 13.19 | 4 15.38 | 4 13.99 |
| 5 | 10.99 | 5 7.69 | 5 9.79 |
| 6 | 4.40 | 6 15.38 | 6 8.39 |
| 7 | 3.30 | 11 1.92 | 7 2.10 |
| 8 | 2.20 | 14 1.92 | 8 1.40 |
| 9 | 1.10 | TOTAL 52 | 9 .70 |
| TOTAL | 91 | 11 .70 |

| Other | 0 12.09 | 0 11.54 | 0 11.89 |
| 1 | 2.20 | 1 5.77 | 1 3.50 |
| 2 | 4.40 | 2 3.85 | 2 4.20 |
| 3 | 6.59 | 3 5.77 | 3 6.29 |
| 4 | 7.69 | 4 15.38 | 4 10.49 |
| 5 | 14.29 | 5 3.85 | 5 10.49 |
| 6 | 9.89 | 6 5.77 | 6 8.39 |
| 7 | 13.19 | 7 13.46 | 7 13.29 |
| 8 | 12.09 | 8 13.46 | 8 12.59 |
| 9 | 4.40 | 9 13.46 | 9 7.69 |
| 10 | 2.20 | 10 3.85 | 10 2.80 |
| 11 | 5.49 | 12 1.92 | 11 3.50 |
| 12 | 1.10 | 16 1.92 | 12 1.40 |
| 13 | 2.20 | TOTAL 52 | 13 1.40 |
| 16 | 1.10 | 16 1.40 |
| 18 | 1.10 | 19 .70 |
| TOTAL | 143 | 143 |
46. Considering the salaries of the staff, faculty and others on the search committee, as well as the length of time the search was in progress, what is your estimate of the total cost to the institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paid Consultant</th>
<th>Paid Consultant</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used</td>
<td>Not Used</td>
<td>Mean Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Cost</td>
<td>Mean Cost</td>
<td>Mean Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$46,745.00</td>
<td>$22,154.00</td>
<td>$37,803.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. What is the size of the student body?
   a. 0 - 5,000
   b. 5,000 - 20,000
   c. Over 20,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paid Consultant</th>
<th>Paid Consultant</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used</td>
<td>Not Used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 63.74%</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>62.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 30.77%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>27.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 5.49%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49. What is the type of institution - Public or Private?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paid Consultant</th>
<th>Paid Consultant</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used</td>
<td>Not Used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC 39.56%</td>
<td>55.77%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE 60.44%</td>
<td>44.23%</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. What is the highest degree offered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paid Consultant</th>
<th>Paid Consultant</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used</td>
<td>Not Used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors 21.98</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>26.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters 46.15</td>
<td>48.08</td>
<td>46.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor 31.87</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>26.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stages of Use of Paid Consultant</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
<td>Dis-Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Stage</td>
<td></td>
<td>58 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Stage</td>
<td></td>
<td>41 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Stage</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Stages</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Stages But No Vote</td>
<td></td>
<td>94 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Voting Privilege</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Consultant Would Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>47 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MTB > oneway c20 c1

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON C20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.636</td>
<td>6.636</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>114.190</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>120.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVEL** | **N** | **MEAN** | **STDEV** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.4176</td>
<td>0.7159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.8654</td>
<td>1.1552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POOLED STDEV = 0.8999**

MTB > oneway c22 c1

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON C22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>16.168</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>16.629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVEL** | **N** | **MEAN** | **STDEV** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.9451</td>
<td>0.2734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.8269</td>
<td>0.4303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POOLED STDEV = 0.3386**
### TABLE 17

MTB > TWOSAMPLE C19 C61

**TWOSAMPLE T FOR C19 VS C61**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STDEV</th>
<th>SE MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C61</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2.892</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95 PCT CI FOR MU C19 - MU C61: (-0.48, 9.969)

TTEST MU C19 = MU C61 (VS NE): T = -1.48 P=0.14 DF = 227

MTB > RMEAN C13-C14 C61

MTB > TWOSAMPLE C19 C61#F VS G USED PC

**TWOSAMPLE T FOR C19 VS C61**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STDEV</th>
<th>SE MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C61</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95 PCT CI FOR MU C19 - MU C61: (-1.69, -0.94)

TTEST MU C19 = MU C61 (VS NE): T = -6.94 P=0.00 DF = 179

MTB > TWOSAMPLE C19 C61#F VS G USED PC

**TWOSAMPLE T FOR C19 VS C61**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STDEV</th>
<th>SE MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.048</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95 PCT CI FOR MU C19 - MU C61: (1.30, -0.30)

TTEST MU C19 = MU C61 (VS NE): T = 3.19 P=0.002 DF=85
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This study was designed to investigate the perceptions of the chairs of presidential search committees and their response to the use of paid consultants. The opinions of search committee chairs were obtained from individuals who had served as chairs of the search committees at four year institutions. Data was obtained through the use of a research questionnaire organized around four major subproblems.

The questionnaire was distributed to all four year colleges and universities that had placed a notice of an available presidential position in the Chronicle of Higher Education during the calendar years of 1987 and 1988.
The treatment of the data included determination of confidence intervals and analysis of variance to determine the level of significance.

**Selected Findings**

It was discovered that 63.63 percent of the respondents had used a paid consultant in their most recent search.

It was also determined that public institutions of higher learning use paid consultants more often than private institutions. Also, smaller schools, (5,000 to 10,000 students) use a paid consultant more often. Those offering a Doctoral Degree as their highest degree, used a paid consultant more often than those that offered a Bachelor or Master Degree as their highest degree.

A further finding was that search committees do not want the paid consultant to serve in the final stages or have a voting privilege. This was true whether they used a paid consultant or not.

**Selected Conclusions**

The conclusion derived was that those chairs who had used the services of a paid consultant found them to be helpful during their presidential search. It was further determined that those committees that had not used a paid consultant were not as receptive to their use even though they had no experience working with one. Those committees
using a paid consultant felt that a paid consultant could enhance the search in the areas of ethics, efficiency, and confidentiality.