DIANA G. POUNDER
GARY M. CROW
AMY ALDOUS BERGERSON

Job Desirability of the University Professorate in the Field of Educational Leadership

ABSTRACT: This survey research study uses job choice theory to assess recent educational leadership doctoral graduates' perceptions of the desirability of the educational administration professorate. Results reveal attractive and unattractive aspects of professorial work as well as those job attributes that are most strongly related to candidates' assessment of overall job desirability and job intentions.

In the past several years there has been an increasing perception that fewer doctoral students in educational leadership are entering the professorate. A 1997 study (McCarthy & Kuh, 1997) found that the mean age for educational leadership professors in the United States has increased from 48 in 1972 to 52 in 1986 to 54 in 1994. The McCarthy and Kuh study also suggests that the turnover of faculty seems likely to continue during the next decade.

Little research has been conducted on what attracts individuals to enter the professorate. A useful theoretical framework to use in investigating these attractions is job choice theory (Behling, Labovitz, & Gainer, 1968; Young, Rinehart, & Place, 1989). This framework identifies theories of job choice, namely, objective theory, subjective theory, critical contact theory, and the work itself. Objective theory views candidates as "economic beings" who weigh objectively measurable factors in making job choices, for example, salary and benefit packages (Young et al., 1989). The subjective theory of job choice views candidates as "psychological beings," who consider how

Address correspondence to: Diana G. Pounder, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy, University of Utah, 1705 E. Campus Center Drive, Room 339, Salt Lake City, UT 84112. E-mail: pounder@ed.utah.edu

the job may meet their psychological needs, for example, social affiliation (Behling et al., 1968). Critical contact theory argues that candidates cannot determine the objective or subjective factors and thus make their job choices based on their initial contact with the organization (Behling et al., 1968). Finally, candidates may be influenced largely by an assessment of the work itself (Young et al., 1989).

This study seeks to contribute to policy discussions regarding ways that doctoral graduates are attracted or not attracted to the educational leadership professorate. The study should inform college administrators and professional associations regarding potential shortages in the professorate and the types of marketing and policy initiatives that can be used to attract a larger number of graduates to the professorate.

RESEARCH CONTEXT

In order to provide a research context for the current study, two bodies of literature are identified and briefly reviewed: characteristics of the educational leadership professorate and job choice theory.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROFESSORATE

The professorate in educational leadership is relatively new. The first doctorates in educational administration were awarded at Teachers College, Columbia University in 1905 (Callahan, 1962). By 1946, 125 universities and colleges provided educational administration programs, while in the mid-1980s, approximately 500 programs existed (McCarthy & Kuh, 1997; National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987). Currently, 145 doctoral programs exist in research and doctoral institutions (Lane, 2001).

Five major studies have been conducted to examine the characteristics of educational leadership faculty. McCarthy and Kuh (1997) identified four of these. Hills (1965), in the inaugural issue of *Educational Administration Quarterly*, focused on how the theory movement had impacted research conducted by educational leadership programs. In addition to finding that faculty were largely unfamiliar with the theoretical literature, he found that almost 90% of educational leadership professors had previous school teaching or administration experience.

The second study was the first in a series of longitudinal investigations of the educational leadership professorate. In 1972, Campbell and Newell

(1973) conducted a study, sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), to identify the characteristics of the professorate. In addition to other conclusions, these authors found that educational leadership professors were overwhelmingly male, Caucasian, Protestant, of rural origins, and were very satisfied with their career choice. They also found that research was not one of the priorities of most professors, although research was more valued by professors in 1972 than those in the earlier Hills (1965) study.

A third group of studies conducted by Newell and Morgan in 1980 surveyed professors of educational administration and higher education. Although the findings on the educational administration professors were never published, McCarthy and Kuh (1997), in their analysis of these data, found more commitment to theory and research than in previous studies. They also found that the average educational administration professor was older than those surveyed in the 1972 study and that the number of female faculty and faculty of color had significantly increased.

A fourth study also followed up on the previous two studies on the professorate. This study, conducted by McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, and Iacona (1988) found that the number of faculty had decreased since the earlier study. They also found that although the number of female professors had significantly increased, they were still underrepresented and undercompensated. The average age of faculty had risen to 52, leading the authors to predict a large turnover of faculty by 2000. Among the most interesting findings was that educational leadership programs were no longer confined primarily to research universities and barely over half of educational leadership faculty received their degrees in research universities. McCarthy and colleagues also found that professors were largely satisfied with their career choices. In regard to faculty work, the authors found that "faculty interest in and time devoted to committee work had declined since 1972, presenting a barrier to curriculum reform in educational administration" (p. 18).

The most recent study, which also contributed to a longitudinal perspective on the educational administration professorate, was conducted by McCarthy and Kuh (1997) in 1994. In terms of personal characteristics, professors in 1994 were more diverse racially and in gender composition. The authors compared this with the 1972 group:

> educational leadership faculty members in 1972 on average were 48 years old, and almost all were Caucasian men. By 1994, one fifth of the faculty members were women, more than one tenth were people of color, and their mean age was 54. (p. 92)

McCarthy and Kuh (1997) found that the typical educational administration professor in 1994, "taught two courses per term, chaired four doctoral

committees in the preceding three years, spent over two fifths of the work week teaching and advising graduate students and supervising doctoral work and 14% in research activities" (p. 141). They also found that educational administration professors received very little external funding and release time for research. Most of this was similar to professors in the 1972 study.

McCarthy and Kuh (1997) also examined the factors that influenced the decision to enter the professorate. They presented an interesting comparison among the 1972, 1988, and 1994 studies in regard to the importance of students and teaching on the one hand and the importance of ideas and extending knowledge on the other. In the previous two studies, an interest in students and teachers ranked higher than the importance of ideas and extension of knowledge. However, in 1994, these factors were weighted almost equally. The next two factors that were important for deciding to be a professor were other professors' influence and the desire to improve education—both of these fell significantly behind teaching and the extension of knowledge.

Professors in 1994, like their predecessors, were overwhelmingly satisfied with their career choice (87% saying they would be professors if given the chance again; McCarthy & Kuh, 1997). The most important factor that would influence their decision to change institutions was significant salary increase, followed well behind by family considerations, more stimulating colleagues, and more attractive geographic area. Except for family considerations this was comparable to 1972 and 1986; however, the importance of salary was much higher in 1986.

McCarthy and Kuh (1997) also investigated those aspects of the professorship that were most enjoyable and least enjoyable. As in 1986, the 1994 professors most enjoyed teaching and advising graduate students, with the distant second being research and writing. Field activities, not included in the previous study, were third in importance. The least enjoyable activity for the 1994 professors was overwhelmingly faculty governance/committee work, followed by university administration.

Although these studies included many more findings regarding the educational leadership professorate, the previous discussion provides a sense of the characteristics and satisfaction of the group and a comparison over time. These studies were intended to be largely descriptive and atheoretical. They were also focused on individuals already in the professorate.

These studies and the reform initiatives suggest the need for an investigation that is more targeted to the attractions of the professorate. Such a study would provide a deeper understanding of what motivates individuals to enter and continue in the professorate. In addition, a more theoretical

approach to an investigation of these attractions provides the opportunity to more adequately explain findings. Examining the attractions for those who have recently received their degrees in educational leadership provides the opportunity to determine why individuals enter or do not enter the professorate.

JOB CHOICE THEORY

The theory used in this study to understand job attractions of the educational leadership professorate is job choice theory (Behling et al., 1968; Young et al., 1989). In this section, we briefly introduce and discuss the theory and several important studies that helped to develop the theory and our use of it in this current study.

Job choice theory integrates different types of theories used to explain why people make the occupational choices they make. Behling et al. (1968) developed the larger job choice theory framework, which has been applied to education primarily in the work of Young et al. (1989) and most recently to educational leadership in the job attractions study of high school principals by Pounder and Merrill (2001). Career choices depend on job and organizational attributes and on characteristics of the applicant as a decision maker. The evaluation process used by the applicant depends on sources of information and the intensity of the information sought (Schwab, Rynes, & Aldag, 1987). The outcomes of this evaluation process include two categories. The first relates to the decision to apply for and, if offered, accept the job (job intentions). The second is concerned with "quality" of the obtained position and is related to such things as satisfaction with the choice, earning potential, and commitment to the organization measured in length of service, all of which ultimately influence the decision to remain with, or depart from the organization (Schwab et al., 1987, p. 133).

Behling and associates (1968) identified three theories of job choice: objective theory, subjective theory, and critical contact theory. We now turn to each of these.

Objective Theory

This theory of job choice assumes that job applicants are economic beings and that in evaluating job choice, applicants seek to maximize their economic status by joining the organization that is perceived to be the most economically competitive (Young et al., 1989). Individuals weigh the advantages and disadvantages of such measurable factors as salary, benefit packages, the chances of career promotion, and the quality of the

job location. "Each of these items is weighted in terms of its relative importance to the individual, and the results are combined into some overall index of desirability" (Behling et al., 1968, p. 15).

McCarthy and Kuh (1997) found that the average salary for educational leadership professors in 1994 was $52,500, which was above the salaries of other education professors but statistically significantly below faculty salaries in other disciplines. Salary also varied by gender (females lower), rank, and type of institution. Faculty members in research universities were paid on the average $8,000 more than faculty in comprehensive universities. The mean salary for new faculty (less than 5 years) entering as assistant professors was $39,500 in 1994. Obviously one of the factors that could contribute to an objective calculation of advantages and disadvantages of the educational leadership professorate for many candidates would be the comparison of faculty salaries with school administration salaries.

Subjective Theory

The second theory identified by Behling and associates (1968) is subjective theory, in which the evaluation of job choices is based on the individual as a psychological being. In this theory, the individual evaluates choices in terms of how well the job meets the psychological needs of the individual. The decision is based on the work environment and the "perceived ability of the firm to provide satisfaction for deep-seated and often unrecognized emotional needs of the candidate" (Behling et al., 1968, pp. 15–16).

Empirical support for the subjective theory can be found in the work of Tom (1971) who showed that similarities between candidate profiles and their most preferred organizations were significantly greater than similarities between candidate profiles and their least preferred organizations, thus linking the evaluation of the job with self-concept. Englander (1960) found that education majors were more likely than noneducation majors to consider teaching as a way to implement their self-concept. Pounder and Young (1996) also suggested that job choice can involve an evaluation based on psychological needs for certain types of organizational climates, such as school or district climates based on democratic rather than bureaucratic leadership.

Various elements of the educational leadership professorate lend themselves to evaluations by applicants that fit the subjective theory, for example, opportunities to influence the larger field of educational leadership practice. Recently, reform initiatives have argued for a greater focus on

school improvement, democratic community, and social justice (Murphy, 2002). If aspiring or new professors see these as fitting their self-concept, that is, their view of themselves as contributing to success for all children, they may view the professorate as an attractive career choice.

Critical Contact Theory

The third theory, identified by Behling and associates (1968), rejects the claim that individuals have sufficient information about competing organizations to make calculations based on objective or subjective factors. Instead, job choices are made on the basis of such things as "the appearance and behavior of the recruiter, the nature of the physical facilities and the efficacy of processing the paper work associated with his application" (p. 17). Comparable influences in attracting individuals to the professorate may include the influence of other educational leadership professors, especially during doctoral study, the influence of other education professionals, or the influence of friends or family members.

The Work Itself

Young and associates (1989) expanded Behling and associates' three job choice theory perspectives by adding a fourth job choice factor—the work itself. Young and colleagues suggested that individuals make rational choices based on information regarding the work itself—the job expectations and job requirements.

The work of the professorate is typically identified in terms of research, teaching, and service responsibilities. Various job expectations and requirements related to these areas could be examined in terms of their value for evaluating the career choice. Recent educational leadership program reforms, such as increased field partnerships, have changed some of the job expectations and balance of research, teaching, and service in ways that may be seen as advantages or disadvantages to aspiring or new educational leadership professors. McCarthy and Kuh (1997) noted that more attention was being given to field relationships.

Each of these theories of job choice has strengths and weaknesses. Behling and associates (1968) argued for integrating the theories, because all perspectives may influence the applicant in different ways. These authors maintained, "The average individual will be affected by elements of all these theories, but in varying degrees, in varying circumstances" (p. 18).

In the study described here, we use job choice theory, which integrates objective, subjective, critical contact, and work itself theories to investigate

the job attractions of the educational leadership professorate. Specifically, the use of these multiple perspectives allows us to test the relative weight of each in attracting candidates to the professorate. The use of this integrated theory provides the opportunity to apply a theoretical lens to the issue of job attractions for educational leadership doctoral graduates who may have recently made the choice of whether or not to become a professor.

METHODS

The study design is descriptive and correlational, specifically describing the characteristics of recent educational leadership doctoral graduates, their job choices, their job intentions, and their job perceptions regarding the educational leadership professorate. Additionally, the study explores the relationship between job attribute perceptions and overall job desirability and job intentions of recent educational leadership doctoral graduates.

SAMPLING AND DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Data for this study were collected by surveying recent graduates of doctoral programs in educational administration departments in Research I and II and Doctoral I and II universities.[1] All participants completed their doctoral programs between the fall of 1997 and the spring of 2000. Both research and doctoral universities were included to embrace all educational administration doctoral graduates in the United States during this time period.

To secure study respondents, a two-stage process was used that avoided having to ask educational administration departments to violate ethical and/or legal standards by revealing the names and mailing addresses of their recent graduates. First, using the 2001–2002 *Educational Administration Directory* (20th edition; Lane, 2001), department chairs or other key faculty in all 145 educational administration departments offering doctoral programs were contacted to enlist their help in recruiting graduates to participate in the study. Thirty-four departments agreed to participate by mailing a researcher-supplied postcard to their recent doctoral graduates. The cards sent to doctoral graduates provided a short description and rationale of the study and asked them to indicate their voluntary partici-

[1]Although we recognize that the Carnegie classification of universities has changed (Basinger, 2000), we felt that most respondents would be more familiar with the old classification (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1994).

pation in the study by returning the card with their names and addresses. A total of 265 graduates returned their cards to the researchers indicating willingness to participate in the study.

Because the total number of recent doctoral graduates across all educational administration doctoral programs is unknown, it is impossible to calculate a return rate for this sample. However, approximately two thirds of the respondents were graduates of Research I and Doctoral I institutions (i.e., "research extensive") and approximately one third of the respondents were graduates of Research II and Doctoral II institutions (i.e., "research intensive"). This proportion is very similar to the overall distribution of institution types of educational administration doctoral programs nationally.

To collect the study data, surveys were sent to all graduates who returned response cards stating that they were willing to complete the survey. A cover letter was enclosed with the survey, describing the purpose and rationale of the study, confidentiality assurances, and the process for addressing concerns. In total, 211 respondents returned a completed survey.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The survey completed by participants collected respondents' demographic and background characteristics, respondent perceptions of the attractiveness of professorial job attributes, the overall job desirability of the professorate, and graduates' job choices and job intentions. The survey instrument was adapted and developed from a recent study of the job desirability of the high school principalship using a job choice theory framework (Pounder & Merrill, 2001). (See the Appendix for a complete list of survey items. Specific scale items and scale reliabilities for all major study variables are reported in Table 4.)

The survey consisted of three parts. First, 17 items focused on respondents' demographic and background information, current employment data, and future career plans. In the second section, 57 job attributes related to the professorate were rated by respondents on a scale of -2 to $+2$. Negative responses indicated that a particular attribute had a negative influence on the respondent's attraction to the position of professor of educational leadership, whereas positive responses indicated a positive influence. The job choice items were adapted by the researchers from subjective, objective, critical contact, and work itself items from the Pounder and Merrill (2001) principal study to more nearly reflect professorial work-related considerations. To verify construct validity, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the items, yielding four objective factors (salary, benefits, and

working conditions—i.e., life/work balance and publication/work pressure), three subjective factors (colleagues, opportunity to influence the profession, and professional development/growth), three work itself factors (research, teaching, and service), and one critical contact factor (influence by other professionals on career decisions). Most of these variable scales had moderately strong reliabilities; Cronbach's alpha ranged from .47 to .85. Job attribute survey items that did not load on these job choice factors were omitted from subsequent analyses using job choice scales.

Finally, respondents were asked to rate the overall desirability or attractiveness of the professorate. Job desirability items were largely the same as those used in the recent Pounder and Merrill (2001) principal job choice study. Respondents who were working in nonprofessorial positions were asked about their professorate job intentions, specifically, the likelihood that they would seek, be offered, and accept an educational leadership faculty position in the foreseeable future. Respondents already serving in educational leadership faculty roles were asked about their intentions to remain in the same or similar role in the foreseeable future. Responses to the items in the last section were indicated on a 6-point Likert scale.

DATA ANALYSES AND RESULTS

DESCRIPTION OF RESPONDENTS

Based on the analysis of survey demographic and background characteristics questions, a brief descriptive profile of the total study respondent group is shown in Table 1. Similarly, the same descriptive information was analyzed for the subgroups who currently are higher education faculty members and those who are not (see Table 2).

Slightly more than half of the respondents were female (56%) and most were Caucasian (88%). The race and gender composition of the respondent group was very similar to that of most educational leadership graduate/doctoral program enrollees. The respondents were largely married (78%) with spouses who worked full-time outside the home. Slightly more than half of respondents earned an Ed.D. (56%) rather than a Ph.D., and most earned their doctoral degree from a Research I institution (39%), although an appreciable number earned their degrees from Doctoral I institutions (28%).

Most respondents reported their current position as K–12 administrator (34%), although responses were somewhat evenly distributed across several

Table 1. Description of Respondents

	All Respondents N = 211	*Nonprofessors Only N = 165*	*Professors Only N = 37*
Respondent variable	*Frequency (%)*	*Frequency (%)*	*Frequency (%)*
Sex			
Females	119 (56.4%)	89 (53.9%)	25 (67.6%)
Males	91 (43.1%)	76 (46.1%)	11 (29.7%)
Race			
Caucasian	185 (87.7%)	146 (88.5%)	31 (83.8%)
Minority race	26 (12.3%)	19 (11.5%)	6 (16.2%)
Marital status			
Married	165 (78.2%)	130 (78.8%)	26 (70.3%)
Single	43 (20.4%)	33 (20%)	10 (27%)
Spouse's employment status			
Full-time	125 (59.6%)	97 (58.8%)	19 (51.4%)
Part-time	18 (8.5%)	15 (9.1%)	3 (8.1%)
Other	11 (5.2%)	9 (5.4%)	2 (5.4%)
Missing values	57 (27.0%)	44 (26.7%)	13 (35.1%)
Current position			
K–12 admin	71 (33.6%)	N/A	N/A
Other	43 (20.4%)		
HEd admin	42 (19.9%)		
HEd faculty	37 (17.5%)		
K–12 teacher	9 (4.3%)		
Annual salary			
Mean (sd)	$65,120 ($19,411)	$67,200 ($19,334)	$53,730 ($16,338)
Min-Max	below $ 30,000–	below $ 30,000–	below $30,000–
Annual household	over $100,000	over $100,000	over $93,000
Income	$99,400 ($33,580)	$100,020 ($33,064)	$91,490 ($36,826)
Mean (sd)	below $30,000–	below $33,000–	below $30,000–
Min-Max	over $150,000	over $150,000	over $150,000
Highest degree			
EdD	119 (56.4%)	94 (57%)	18 (48.6%)
PhD	92 (43.6%)	71 (43%)	19 (51.4%)
Institution type where earned doctoral degree			
Research I	82 (38.9%)	63 (38.2%)	16 (43.2%)
Research II	23 (10.9%)	16 (9.7%)	7 (18.9%)
Doctoral I	60 (28.4%)	51 (30.9%)	7 (18.9%)
Doctoral II	38 (18%)	29 (17.6%)	6 (16.2%)

Table 1. Description of Respondents (continued)

	All Respondents N = 211	*Nonprofessors Only N = 165*	*Professors Only N = 37*
Respondent variable	*Frequency (%)*	*Frequency(%)*	*Frequency(%)*
Position history and experience	*N, Mean (sd) Min-Max*	*N, Mean (sd) Min-Max*	*N, Mean (sd) Min-Max*
K–12 teacher	151 10.44 (6.52) 1–31	122 10.73 (6.25) 1–31	21 8.95 (8.24) 1–30
K–12 admin	118 10.29 (6.18) 1–28	99 10.23 (6.10) 1–28	13 10.08 (6.63) 4–28
HEd Faculty	77 7.03 (7.21) 1–34	35 5.11 (4.70) 1–20	36 9.31 (8.92) 1–34
HEd Admin	55 9.95 (6.23) 1–24	45 10.09 (5.95) 1–24	8 8.88 (6.83) 1–18
Other	52 8.52 (7.99) 1–35	44 8.27 (8.23) 1–35	7 10 (7.48) 3–25
Total Yrs Exp	207 20.88 (8.63) 2–51	162 20.49 (8.44) 2–51	36 22.08 (9.70) 3–41
Career plans			
Remain in position	93 (44.1%)	67 (40.6%)	23 (62.2%)
Other pos	29 (14.2%)	21 (12.7%)	0
HEd faculty	28 (13.3%)	26 (15.8%)	1 (2.7%)
HEd admin	16 (7.6%)	10 (6.1%)	6 (16.2%)
Same pos, different org	14 (6.6%)	10 (6.1%)	3 (8.1%)
K–12 admin	13 (6.2%)	13 (7.9%)	0
Missing response	16 (7.6%)	17 (10.3%)	4 (10.8%)
Willing to move	Mean = 3.78 (s.d.=1.61) Min-Max = 1–6	Mean = 3.85 (s.d.=1.62) Min-Max = 1–6	Mean = 3.49 (s.d.=1.62) Min-Max = 1–6
Strongly agree	28 (13.3%)	26 (15.8%)	2 (5.4%)
Agree	56 (26.5%)	44 (26.7%)	9 (24.3%)
Slightly agree	46 (21.8%)	32 (19.4%)	11 (29.7%)
Slightly disagree	17 (8.1%)	15 (9.1%)	2 (5.4%)
Disagree	34 (16.1%)	27 (16.4%)	4 (10.8%)
Strongly disagree	24 (11.4%)	17 (10.3%)	7 (18.9%)

categories, including "other" (20.4%), higher education administration (19.9%), and higher education faculty (17.5%). "Other" positions (20.4%) included: state office of education, consultant, postdoctoral intern, educational research, noneducational, retired, or not employed. Respondents' average annual salary was over $65,000 with a range from below $30,000 to

over $100,000. Respondents' average household income was over $99,000 with a range from below $30,000 to over $150,000 (most were two-income families). Respondents reported an average of almost 21 years of professional experience, most having served as K–12 teachers and/or K–12 administrators. Specific career history information appears in Table 1.

When asked about their career plans for the next 5 years, most indicated they intended to remain in their current position (44.1%), and 13.3% indicated their intention to become a college/university faculty member. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement (on a 6-point Likert scale) with the statement, "I am willing to change geographic locations to accommodate my career." The response average was 3.78 ("slightly agree"), although there was considerable response variance (sd = 1.61). Specifically, almost 40% indicated "agree" or "strongly agree," whereas 27.5% indicated "disagree" or "strongly disagree."

Comparing the profiles of the total respondent group to the two subgroups—nonprofessors (n = 165) and current professors (n = 37)—revealed almost no differences in the profile of the total respondent group (column 1 of Table 1) and nonprofessors (column 2 of Table 1). However, there were some noticeable differences between the profiles of the professor group (column 3 of Table 1) and the nonprofessor group as well as the total respondent group (see columns 1 and 2 of Table 1). Specifically, those respondents who were currently serving in college/university faculty positions (see column 3) were relatively more likely to be female, single, earn a lower income, to have earned a Ph.D. (versus Ed.D.), and to have earned their doctoral degree from a Research I institution. Additionally, they have spent somewhat less time as K–12 teachers, although almost an identical amount of time as K–12 administrators. They were more likely to remain in the same position or seek a college/university administrator position, and expressed less interest in changing geographic locations to accommodate their career.

Several survey questions specifically asked college/university faculty (N = 37) for additional work-related information—such as questions about their faculty assignment, academic rank, and the institution type where they were employed. To better describe this particular subgroup, in addition to simple descriptive statistics for each variable, a cross-tabulation of these three variables was conducted (see Table 2). These two sets of related analyses revealed that 25 respondents work as tenure-track faculty, with almost half of these working in "Other" nondoctoral-granting institutions. Another 8 respondents indicated that they serve as auxiliary faculty (adjunct, clinical, visiting professor), with fairly similar numbers distributed across all of the types of institutions. Unfortunately, the researchers neglected to request information concerning whether these faculty appointments were

full-time or part-time, although presumably, a good portion of the auxiliary faculty may be part-time employees. Most of the faculty respondents held the rank of assistant professor (approximately 56%), although almost 25% held the rank of associate professor, most of whom worked in "Other" nondoctoral-granting institutions. For additional details on the professor respondent subgroup, see Table 2.

Table 2. Work-Related Information on Respondents Currently Working as College/University Faculty (N = 37)

Respondent Variable	*Frequency*	*Valid %*
Institution type where employed	4 Research I	13.3
N = 30	6 Research II	20
Missing = 7	7 Doc I	23.3
	1 Doc II	3.3
	12 Other Inst	40
Faculty assignment	25 tenure-track	75.8
N = 33	8 auxiliary (adjunct,	24.2
Missing = 4	clinical, visiting, etc.)	
Academic rank	2 professor	5.9
N = 34	8 associate prof	23.5
Missing = 3	19 assistant prof	55.9
	3 instructor	8.8
	2 other	5.9

Cross-Tabulations for Institution Type–Faculty Assignment–Academic Rank (N = 29, Missing = 8)

Institution Type	*Tenure-Track Faculty*	*Auxiliary (Adjunct, Clinical, Visiting, etc.)*	*TOTAL*
Research I	2	2	4
Assistant prof	2	2	
Research II	5	1	6
Assistant prof	4	1	
Associate prof	1		
Doctoral I	3	3	6
Assistant prof	3	1	
Instructor/Other		2	
Doctoral II	1		1
Associate prof	1		
Other Inst	10	2	12
Assistant prof	4		
Associate prof	5		
Instructor/Other	1	2	
Total	21	8	29

DESCRIPTION OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

As indicated earlier, respondents were asked to evaluate job attribute items, indicating on a 5-point Likert scale (+2 "strong positive influence" to -2 "strong negative influence") the degree to which each job attribute influenced their attraction to a professor position. Table 3 reveals those attribute items that were rated most favorably (one standard deviation or more above the mean of all 57 items) and those that were rated least favorably (one standard deviation or more below the mean of all 57 items).

The most favorably evaluated job attributes might be described as altruistically oriented or intrinsically motivating attributes, such as "desire to make a difference in the lives of students" or "opportunities to contribute to the preparation of educational leaders." Other more attractive job attributes included "opportunities to use leadership skills," "opportunities for professional growth and development," and "opportunities to pursue ideas." Only "flexible work schedule" could be characterized as a working condition item (objective domain), whereas most items fell in the "subjective" domain or the "work itself" domain of the job choice theoretical framework. A complete list of the more attractive job attributes appears in Table 3.

By contrast, those job attribute items that were viewed most negatively included largely salary and working conditions items (objective domain). For example, "pressure to publish" was evaluated least favorably of all 57 items, followed by "required extension of the work day to fulfill responsibilities," "political dynamics of working in higher education," and other financial and working condition items. See Table 3 for a complete list of the most negatively evaluated job attribute items.

Descriptive statistics of the job choice variable scales derived from the confirmatory factor analyses appear in Table 4 and variable scales are listed from the scale with the highest mean ("opportunity to influence profession") to the scale with the lowest mean ("publication/work pressure"). Again, variable scales assessing subjective domains are largely rated most favorably, whereas scales assessing objective domains are largely rated least favorably. Work itself scales appear to be divided with teaching rated most favorably, research rated relatively unfavorably, and service rated least favorably. "Critical contact," that is, influence by other professionals to become a professor, was the median rated independent variable scale, suggesting only moderate influence in attracting respondents to the professorate. See Table 4 for complete descriptive statistics and reliabilities of each scale.

Table 3. Professorate Job Attribute Item Ratings

Most Desirable Job Attribute Items	*Mean (sd) on 5-Point Scale = −2 to +2*
desire to make a difference in the lives of students	1.82 (.72)
opportunities to contribute to the preparation of ed leaders	1.67 (.60)
opportunities to use leadership skills	1.58 (.63)
flexible work schedule	1.54 (.62)
opportunities for professional growth and development	1.51 (.63)
opportunities to pursue ideas	1.48 (.63)
opportunity to apply theory and research skills to problems of ed practice	1.44 (.69)
advising and mentoring students	1.40 (.69)
opportunity to influence profession	1.39 (.69)
teaching courses	1.37 (.69)
Course and curriculum development	1.30 (.91)
autonomy in teaching	1.20 (.85)
opportunities to network with professional colleagues outside the institution	1.19 (.72)

Least Desirable Job Attribute Items	*Mean (sd) on 5-Point Scale = −2 to +2*
pressure to publish	−.66 (1.04)
required extension of the workday to fulfill responsibilities	−.25 (.84)
political dynamics of working in higher education	−.14 (1.28)
writing grants to support research and teaching	.06 (1.04)
being evaluated by peers in the RPT process	.10 (1.00)
stress level of the job	.13 (1.17)
employment opportunities for my partner	.16 (1.19)
starting salary	.22 (1.36)
attendance at meetings related to department or institutional service	.24 (.92)
adequate institutional funding to conduct research	.33 (1.08)
other pecuniary benefits	.43 (.94)
salary/compensation relative to the responsibilities of the position	.44 (1.20)

DESCRIPTION OF DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Graduates were asked to respond to several items that were used as dependent variable measures in the study (see Table 4 for descriptive statistics). Specifically, all respondents were asked to rate the "overall attractiveness" of an educational leadership professor position to them, using a 6-point Likert scale, where 6 = very attractive and 1 = very unattractive. On average, respondents rated the overall job attractiveness of an educational

Table 4. Independent and Dependent Variable Scales

Independent Variable Scales (Response Scale= −2 to +2)	*N*	*Reliability (Job Attribute Item Numbers From Survey)*	*Min-Max*	*Mean (sd)*
Opportunity to influence the profession (subjective)	207	.64 (Items 11, 12, 38)	−.33 to 2.00	1.50 (.50)
Teaching (work itself)	208	.47 (Items 28, 53)	−.50 to 2.00	1.39 (.57)
Professional development/ growth (subjective)	208	.67 (Items 46, 55, 57)	−1.00 to 2.00	1.00 (.64)
Colleagues (subjective)	207	.75 (Items 18, 25, 31, 32, 39, 44)	−1.67 to 2.00	.89 (.55)
Fiscal benefits/support (objective)	208	.77 (Items 23, 37, 43, 57, 48, 50, 54)	−1.29 to 2.00	.78 (.61)
Influence by other professionals (critical contact)	206	.59 (Items 8, 29, 36)	−2.00 to 2.00	.78 (.70)
Research (work itself)	208	.73 (Items 14, 15, 34, 42, 49)	−1.60 to 1.80	.56 (.68)
Life/work balance (objective)	208	.52 (Items 17, 19, 27, 41)	−2.00 to 2.00	.55 (.84)
Service (work itself)	206	.58 (Items 21, 52)	−2.00 to 2.00	.50 (.80)
Salary (objective)	208	.85 (Items 1, 9, 16)	−2.00 to 2.00	.39 (1.1)
Publication/work pressure (objective)	208	.51 (Items 20, 22)	−2.00 to 2.00	−.47 (.79)

Dependent Variable Scales (Response Scale = 1 to 6)		*Reliability (Job Desirability and Job Intentions Item Numbers from Survey)*	*Min-Max*	*Mean (sd)*
Overall job desirability	205	n/a (Item 1)	1 to 6	4.28 (1.37)
Job intentions (to become professor)	179	.84 (Items 3, 4, 5)	1 to 6	3.69 (1.21)
Job intentions (to remain a professor)	33	n/a (Item 2)	1 to 6	4.70 (1.49)

leadership faculty position as "somewhat" attractive/desirable (mean = 4.28, sd = 1.37). More specifically, 166 respondents (81%) rated the overall desirability of the professorate as "somewhat attractive" (n = 69, 33%), "attractive" (n = 59, 28%), or "very attractive" (n = 38, 18%), whereas collectively only 40 respondents (19%) rated the position as "somewhat unattractive," "unattractive," or "very unattractive." This measure was used as an overall job desirability rating in subsequent analyses.

Additionally, respondents who are *not* currently serving as educational leadership professors were asked to respond to 3 items, each measured on a 6-point scale—their "perceived probability of seeking an educational leadership faculty position," their "perceived probability of being offered an educational leadership faculty position," and their "perceived probability of accepting an educational leadership faculty position." Confirmatory factor analysis of these three items yielded a 1-factor solution, thus a 3-item dependent variable scale titled "Job Intentions of Nonprofessors" was created (Cronbach's alpha = .84). On average, nonprofessor respondents indicated they were only "somewhat likely" to seek, be offered, and accept an educational leadership professor position (mean = 3.69, sd = 1.21). Specifically, graduates' responses were largely evenly distributed across all response categories, with approximately half of respondents (52%) indicating they were "somewhat likely," "likely," or "very likely" to seek a professor position.

Last, respondents who are already serving as educational leadership professors were asked to indicate their job intentions—specifically, how likely they were to remain in their same or similar position for the next 5 years. On average, respondents indicated that they were "likely" to stay in the same or similar position (mean = 4.70, sd = 1.49). Specifically, 33 individuals responded to this item with collectively only 6 (18%) indicating that they were "somewhat unlikely," "unlikely," or "very unlikely" to stay in an educational leadership professor role. By contrast, 27 individuals (82%) gave more favorable responses with 14 (42%) indicating they were "very likely," 6 (18%) indicating they were "likely," and 7 (21%) indicating they were "somewhat likely" to remain in an educational leadership professor position in the next 5 years. This item was used as a measure of job intentions of professors in subsequent analyses (see Table 4).

BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS

Simple bivariate correlations were computed among the study dependent variables, independent variables, and selected respondent demographic and background variables. Most correlations were low to moderate in magnitude, although some were statistically significant due to the relatively large sample size. (In the interest of preserving space, only correlations between

dependent and independent variables and respondent demographic/background variables respectively are shown in Table 5.) There were no bivariate correlations among independent and/or demographic/background variables that were particularly large—certainly none so large as to create multicollinearity problems in the subsequent regression analyses. Specifically, bivariate correlations among pairs of independent and/or respondent demographic/background variables were, for the most part, less than .35 in magnitude. Only a few predictor variable pairs had bivariate correlations of moderate magnitude (approximately .40 to .60).[2]

Overall job attractiveness/desirability, as assessed by the total respondent group (n = 205), was significantly and positively related to the following job attribute scales: opportunity to influence profession (r = .228, p = .001), teaching (r = .208, p = .001), research (r = .138, p = .025), and service (r = .120, p = .045). The "work itself" factors seem to be most consistently related to respondents' assessment of the overall position attractiveness/desirability.

Job intentions, as assessed by the nonprofessor group (n = 174), were significantly and positively related to the following job attribute scales: opportunity to influence profession (r = .328, p = .000), teaching (r = .313, p = .000), benefits/fiscal support (r = .175, p = .010), critical contact (r = .161, p = .017), colleague group (r = .137, p = .035), and research (r = .130, p = .043).

Intention to remain in the professorate, as assessed by the professor group (n = 33), was significantly and positively related to the following job attribute scales: service (r = .437, p = .006), publication/work pressure (r = .435, p = .006), benefits/fiscal support (r = .376, p = .016), colleague group (r = .348, p = .024), critical contact (r = .340, p = .026), life/work balance (r = .325, p = .033), salary (r = .322, p = .034), professional growth/development opportunities (r = .307, p = .041), and opportunity to influence the profession (r = .300, p = .045).

Similarly, bivariate correlations between the study dependent variables and key respondent demographic/background variables were computed.

[2]Critical Contact–Colleagues = .403
Research–Opportunity to Influence Profession = .425
Research–Colleagues = .396
Benefits/Fiscal Support–Colleagues = .459
Benefits/Fiscal Support–Service = .388
Household Income–Married = .473
Household Income–Annual Salary = .615
K–12 Administrative Exp–Annual Salary = .525
College/University Admin Exp–K–12 Teacher Exp = 2.396
Total Experience–K–12 Teacher Experience = .476
Total Experience–K–12 Administrator Experience = .483

Table 5. Bivariate Correlation Matrix

	Overall Attractiveness of Professorate	*Job Intentions to Become a Professor (by Nonprofessors)*	*Job Intentions to Remain a Professor (by Professors)*
	Correlation *N*	*Correlation* *N*	*Correlation* *N*
Overall attractiveness of professorate	1 **205**	**.347 174	**.637 33
Work itself factors			
Research	*.138 203	*.130 176	.280 33
Teaching	***.208 203	***.313 176	.044 33
Service	*.120 202	.115 174	**.437 33
Critical contact factor	.084 202	*.161 174	*.340 33
Objective factors			
Salary	−.002 203	.033 176	*.322 33
Benefits	.024 **203**	**.175 176	*.376 33
Life/work balance	**.047** 203	.005 176	*.325 33
Publication/work pressure	.087 202	.019 174	**.435 33
Subjective factors			
Colleagues	.075 203	*.137 175	*.348 33
Opportunity to influence	***.228 203	***.328 175	*.300 33
Professional development/ growth	.076 203	.108 176	*.307 33
Background characteristics			
Male	−.052 204	−.121 178	−.059 33
Race	−.043 205	.007 179	.137 33
Married	*−.136 202	*−.139 177	.051 32
Spouse's employment status	.061 149	.104 132	.248 23
Annual salary	**−.182 203	.017 177	.031 33
Annual household income	−.115 201	−.031 176	.067 32

Table 5. Bivariate Correlation Matrix (continued)

	Overall Attractiveness of Professorate	*Job Intentions to Become a Professor (by Nonprofessors)*	*Job Intentions to Remain a Professor (by Professors)*
	Correlation / *N*	*Correlation* / *N*	*Correlation* / *N*
Highest degree earned	.009	.103	−.199
	205	179	33
Institution type—where earned degree	.076	.017	*.400
	197	172	32
Years as K–12 teacher	.011	.093	−.072
	205	179	33
Years as K–12 administrator	**−.193	*.132	−.099
	205	179	33
Years as college/ university faculty	.082	−.093	.062
	205	179	33
Years as college/ university administrator	.014	*−.161	.283
	205	179	33
Years as other	.020	−.094	−.062
	205	179	33
Total experience	−.090	−.041	.032
	201	175	33
Willing to change geographic location	.096	.069	*.319
	199	175	31

Note: 1-tailed test
*p − .05, **p − .01, ***p − .001

Results indicated that *overall job attractiveness/desirability, as assessed by the total respondent group* (n = 205) was significantly and inversely related to years experience as a K–12 administrator (r = −.193, p = .003), annual salary (r = −.182, p = .005), and marriage (−.136, p = .026). (That is, married persons were less attracted to an educational leadership professor role than were single persons.)

Job intentions to become a professor, as assessed by the nonprofessor group (n = 174), was significantly and positively related to years as a K–12 school administrator (r = .132, p = .039). However, nonprofessors' job intentions were significantly but inversely related to years experience as a college/university administrator (r = −.161, p = .016), and marriage (r = −.139, p = .033). (That is, married persons were less likely to pursue or accept an educational leadership professor position.)

Job intentions to remain in the professorate, as assessed by the professor group (n = 33), was significantly and positively related to the type of institution where the doctoral degree was earned (r = .400, p = .012),

and the respondent's willingness to change geographic locations to accommodate his/her career ($r = .319$, $p = .040$). Institution type was coded Research I (high), Research II, Doctoral I, to Doctoral II (low); thus, graduates of research institutions were more likely to remain in an educational leadership professor role than those graduating from doctoral institutions.

REGRESSION ANALYSES

To test the multivariate relationships between each of the dependent measures and the study independent and respondent demographic/background measures, three regression analyses were conducted—one for each dependent measure. In each analysis, only those independent variable and respondent demographic/background predictors that had significant bivariate correlations to the particular dependent measure were entered into the regression model. Thus, the three regression analyses did not contain exactly the same combination of predictors.

Regression Analysis 1: Predicting Overall Job Desirability/Attractiveness

Using those predictor variables that had significant bivariate correlations with overall job desirability, the regression model was statistically significant, although it explained slightly less than 15% of the variance in job desirability ($R = .386$, R-squared $= .149$). Those variables that explained the greatest portion of the model variance were: *the opportunity to influence the profession* ($\beta = .240$, $\beta = .003$), *annual salary* (inversely related; $\beta = -.158$, $p = .048$), and to a lesser degree, *teaching* ($\beta = .130$, $p = .063$). These three variables represent subjective, objective, and work itself factors respectively (see Table 6).

Regression 2: Predicting Job Intentions of Nonprofessors

Using those predictor variables that had significant bivariate correlations with job intentions, the regression model was statistically significant, although it explained only 22% of the variance in job intentions ($R = .469$, R-squared $= .220$). Those variables that explained the greatest portion of the model variance were the *opportunity to influence the profession* ($\beta = .243$, $p = .005$), *teaching* ($\beta = .242$, $p = .001$). To a lesser degree, *marriage* (inversely related; $\beta = -.133$, $p = .066$) contributed to variance in the professorial job intentions of nonprofessors. These variables represent the subjective and work itself factors of the job choice framework, in addition to a respondent background variable (see Table 7).

Table 6. Regression Analysis 1: Predicting Overall Job Desirability

Model Summary

Model Summary	R	R *Square*	*Adjusted* R *Square*	*Std. Error of the Estimate*
1	.386	.149	.118	1.290

ANOVA

Model	*Sum of Squares*	df	*Mean Square*	F	*Sig.*
Regression	56.502	7	8.072	4.848	.000
Residual	322.985	194	1.665		
Total	379.487	201			

Coefficients

Model	B	*Std. Error*	*Beta*	T	*Sig.*
(Constant)	4.251	.595		7.146	.000
Research	−.045	.156	−.022	−.288	.773
Teaching	.317	.170	.130	1.871	.063
Service	.073	.121	.042	.602	.548
Opp. to influence profession	.652	.216	.240	3.014	.003
Married	−.294	.230	−.087	−1.275	.204
Annual salary	−.011	.006	−.158	−1.994	.048
Yrs as K–12 admin.	−.025	.016	−.128	−1.573	.117

Regression 3: Predicting Job Intentions of Current Professors

Using those predictor variables that had significant bivariate correlations with job intentions of current professors, the regression model was statistically significant, explaining almost 77% of the variance in professors' job intentions (R = .877, R-squared = .769). Those variables that explained the greatest portion of the model variance were *willingness to change locations* (β = .412, p = .002), *type of institution where earned doctoral degree* (β = .390, p = .003), *publication/work pressure* (β = .374, p = .005), and to a lesser degree, *service* (β = .251, p = .062). These variables represent respondent background, objective, and work itself domains (see Table 8).

DISCUSSION

Several of the characteristics and attractions of recent educational leadership graduates require additional discussion. First, in the past several years,

Table 7. Regression Analysis 2: Predicting Job Intentions of Nonprofessors

Model Summary

Model Summary	R	R *Square*	*Adjusted* R *Square*	*Std. Error of the Estimate*
1	.469	.220	.177	1.09901

ANOVA

Model	*Sum of Squares*	df	*Mean Square*	F	*Sig.*
Regression	57.729	9	6.192	5.127	.000
Residual	198.083	164	1.208		
Total	253.812	173			

Coefficients

Model	B	*Std. Error*	*Beta*	T	*Sig.*
(Constant)	2.692	.508		5.298	.000
Critical Contact	.023	.135	.013	.171	.865
Research	−.083	.154	−.046	−.537	.592
Teaching	.519	.158	.242	3.287	.001
Benefits	.246	.160	.123	1.535	.127
Colleagues	−.056	.195	−.026	−.288	.774
Opp. to influence profession	.583	.203	.243	2.864	.005
Married	−.396	.214	−.133	−1.849	.066
Yrs as K–12 admin.	.013	.014	.076	.943	.347
Yrs as college/ university admin.	−.030	.017	−.134	−1.762	.080

educational leadership researchers and authors have argued for more racial diversity in the professorate. The latest figures reflect an increasing, but still underrepresented, group of professors of color. Our findings suggest that the pool from which professors come continues to be overwhelmingly homogeneous. In this national sample, almost 88% are Caucasian.

The average annual salary of this group of recent graduates ($65,000) creates a potential, but not new, problem for recruiting new professors. In order to accept a position as an educational leadership professor, most of these graduates would have to take an actual or potential pay cut. By comparing the average annual salary of current professors ($53,730) and nonprofessors ($67,200), we can estimate that becoming a professor potentially costs these recent graduates approximately $13,500 per year. (This salary differential may be attributable to the difference between a 9-month

Table 8. Regression Analysis 3: Predicting Job Intentions of Professors

Model Summary

Model Summary	R	R *Square*	*Adjusted* R *Square*	*Std. Error of the Estimate*
1	.877	.769	.636	.899

ANOVA

Model	*Sum of Squares*	df	*Mean Square*	F	*Sig.*
Regression	51.189	11	4.654	5.762	.000
Residual	15.345	19	.808		
Total	66.534	30			

Coefficients

Model	B	*Std. Error*	*Beta*	T	*Sig.*
(Constant)	.811	.781		1.039	.312
Critical Contact	.459	.273	.215	1.682	.109
Service	.466	.235	.251	1.981	.062
Annual Salary	.131	.173	.097	.761	.456
Benefits/fiscal support	.218	.353	.089	.618	.544
Life/work balance	.173	.214	.098	.805	.431
Publication/work pressure	.707	.223	.374	3.172	.005
Colleagues	7.122E-02	.389	.027	.183	.857
Opportunity to influence profession	.307	.367	.104	.837	.413
Professional development/ growth	−5.35E-03	.295	−.002	−.018	.986
Institution type	.494	.145	.390	3.413	.003
Willing to move	.381	.105	.412	3.643	.002

academic year of work and a 12-month calendar year of work, although all respondents were requested to report their "annual" salary.) For new professors, this salary gap could be even greater. These graduates already possess a vast amount of professional experience (Mean = 21 years), thus the cost of moving to the professorate is likely to be considered high by new educational leadership doctoral graduates.

Comparing the administrative experience of professors and nonprofessors reveals no difference. This is interesting in light of frequent complaints that educational leadership professors have little field experience. Our findings would suggest that this perception is inaccurate. At least the

most recent group of graduates who become professors bring with them considerable administrative experience (Mean = 10.08 years).

Recent graduates who have become professors are slightly more likely to obtain their doctoral degrees in Research I universities. Because these institutions are probably more likely to focus on knowledge and skills for the professorate, these graduates may have been socialized to the norms of the professorate. We will return to this discussion issue later in this section.

In spite of the potential salary costs of moving to the professorate that we previously described, these graduates of educational leadership programs find the professorate somewhat attractive. Although McCarthy and Kuh (1997) did not ask about the attractiveness of the profession, they did ask professors in 1994 about their satisfaction with their positions. In their sample, 84% of professors voiced satisfaction. This is comparable to the 82% of current professors in our study who say they are likely to remain in their current or similar position. Thus it appears that the commitment to the professorate remains high for those who enter the role.

Based on three regression analysis models that examined those factors that predict overall job desirability, job intentions of nonprofessors to become professors, and job intentions of current professors to remain professors, we found that job choice theory seems to most strongly predict job intentions for graduates who have already entered the educational leadership professorate. By contrast, exactly the opposite results occurred with a sample of potential and current high school principals (Pounder & Merrill, 2001). Specifically, the job choice framework had better predictive power explaining overall job desirability and job intentions among potential high school principals rather than job intentions among current high school principals. This difference in explanatory power may reflect differences in stage of career (i.e., novice professors versus experienced principals) or differences in career path/ascendancy patterns of professors versus principals.

Although the overall job desirability and the nonprofessor job intention regression models explained only modest variance, they do highlight the favorable influence of teaching and opportunity to influence the profession and the unfavorable influence of salary and marriage. These recent educational leadership doctoral graduates have already made a commitment to the education profession. Thus, teaching and opportunity to influence the profession are extensions of this commitment. However, because they are further along in their careers, they have made family and economic investments that make the professorate potentially less attractive.

In contrast, the regression model for current professors' job intentions to remain in the professorate explained almost 77% of the variance in job intentions by graduates who are currently professors; the model included background, objective, and work itself factors. Specifically the most potent predictors of intention to remain a professor included willingness to change location, likelihood of receiving the degree from a research institution, publishing/work pressure, and service.

A possible explanation for the first two of these attributes is the socialization occurring in Research I institutions, where these graduates are more likely to have received their doctoral degrees. Various types of universities probably socialize to different careers. The socialization that occurs in Research I institutions is more likely to focus on the professorate. In addition, one aspect of that socialization is a career orientation in which the individual is socialized more to the profession than the organization. In this case, willingness to move geographically would fit the socialization norms of Research I institutions and the professors coming out of these universities.

Interestingly, "publication/work pressure" was positively related to intention to remain a professor, suggesting that perhaps those respondents who have already chosen to be educational leadership professors do not experience publication/work pressure as necessarily disadvantageous to staying in the professorate. Several explanations of this finding are possible. First, these individuals have already made the investment to enter the professorate. In doing so, they have also accepted the value of scholarship and its outcome—publishing. Rejecting publishing norms of academia would reduce the value of the investment they have made to the profession. Second, pressure to publish may be a reflection of the institution's commitment and investment in the success of the professor. These graduates who have become professors may see this pressure as a recognition on the part of their universities of their capability and expertise. Third, these new graduates may see the stress of publication as a motivator to succeed in this valued component of the work of the professorate.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

RESEARCH

A limitation of this study is the undetermined response rate, due in part to the necessity of using an indirect way of contacting graduates (through departments). Developing a database of educational leadership graduates

from the 145 granting doctorates in educational leadership that includes contact information and perhaps some background information would be extremely helpful to researchers in directly contacting these individuals for follow-up studies. Professional organizations, such as UCEA, National Council for Professors of Educational Adminstration (NCPEA), or Division A of American Educational Research Association (AERA) might initiate this effort.

Although our study has the advantage of comparing those who chose the professorate with those who have not chosen it, studies that focus only on one group or the other may be worthwhile. Specifically, a qualitative examination would be useful to focus on, for example, the kinds of socialization mechanisms used in research versus doctoral institutions, how publishing and work pressures are perceived by graduates as attractions, and how recent reforms that focus on field relations and partnerships affect the attractiveness of the professorate.

Although job choice theory helps to identify objective, subjective, critical contact, and work factors that contribute to the perceived attractiveness of the professorate, we found that background factors (e.g., marital status and annual salary) also have a relationship to job intentions. The theory currently has no place for these background factors. A study using structural equation modeling might examine whether these background factors act as antecedents influencing attitudes about various job attributes that subsequently relate to job intentions. Such a study would expand and enrich the model for predicting those graduates who are likely to view the professorate as an attractive career choice.

PRACTICE

A major concern in the reform of educational leadership practice and preparation is the need to recruit persons of color. Certainly recruiting faculty of color is important in attracting diverse graduate students who can provide educational leadership in schools. However, this study demonstrates that the pool of potential candidates for the professorship is proportionately small and overwhelmingly not diverse. This suggests the need to place greater priority on recruiting graduate students of color and encouraging their entry into the professorate.

Because women are still underrepresented in many higher level K–12 administration positions (Shakeshaft, 1999) but are attracted to the professorate, they constitute a relatively fruitful labor pool for the educational leadership professorate. Our study found that among recent graduates who were professors, approximately 68% were female. These data, com-

pared with earlier studies (McCarthy & Kuh, 1997), reinforce the possibility (or probability) that the educational leadership professorate is becoming more gender balanced as proportionately more women than men are becoming educational leadership professors upon completion of doctoral study (Pounder, 1994).

A perennial problem for recruiting professors of educational leadership is the salary differential between administrative pay and academic pay. With the increasing desire to appoint professors with prior administrative experience, this problem is likely to become worse. Department chairs will need to be even more intentional about working with deans and university administrators to make the case for upgrading salaries for educational administration professors that compete with administrative salaries. One possible alternative is to adopt norms of other academic professional groups (e.g., law schools) by appointing candidates with significant prior professional experience at the associate professor rank to formally recognize the contribution of this prior experience and to pay a proportionately higher salary. (The analysis of current professors' rank by institution type in Table 2 suggests that this practice may be occurring in nondoctoral-granting institutions more than doctoral-granting institutions.)

Another strategy would involve recruiting people at an earlier stage of career when salary differences would not be as great. The respondents in this study have on average 21 years of professional experience. Although prior administrative experience will no doubt continue to be valued in recruiting and selecting professors, identifying individuals with less experience would provide the same grounding in practice but reduce the family and economic investments that individuals with longer experience have developed.

Because it is likely that the salary differential will continue for the foreseeable future, departments of educational leadership need to be more intentional about developing other attractions that could offset the financial costs. Respondents in this study identified several of these attractions. Objective factors, such as attractive employee benefit packages, should be developed to attract new faculty. Subjective factors, such as the colleague group or the opportunity to influence the profession and make a difference for students, need to be more visibly apparent to potential faculty. Work factors, such as teaching and research, need to be articulated in ways that demonstrate how they contribute to larger issues of student success and school reform.

The educational leadership professorate is, in some respects, at a crossroads. Recent initiatives by professional associations to take over more of administrator preparation create a cautious perception of the future. However, this can be a time to reinvigorate the professorate to make it more attractive to a diverse and exciting group of new professors.

APPENDIX: JOB ATTRIBUTE, JOB DESIRABILITY, AND JOB INTENTION ITEMS FROM SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Job Attribute Rating Scale

−2 Strong negative influence on my attraction to the position
−1 Somewhat negative influence on my attraction to the position
0 No influence on my attraction to the position
+1 Somewhat positive influence on my attraction to the position
+2 Strong positive influence on my attraction to the position
N/A Not applicable to the position as I understand it

	JOB ATTRIBUTES	RATING (Circle one number)					N/A
1	Starting salary	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
2	Other pecuniary benefits (e.g., dependent tuition reduction, housing assistance, access to child care)	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
3	Opportunity to influence change in my workplace	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
4	Opportunities to network with professional colleagues outside the institution	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
5	Support for female faculty and/or underrepresented groups	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
6	Autonomy in teaching	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
7	Supervision and evaluation of student work	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
8	Encouragement from professors to seek or remain in a professorial role	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
9	Career salary growth potential	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
10	Flexible work schedule	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
11	Opportunity to apply theory and research skills to problems of educational practice	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
12	Opportunities to contribute to the preparation of educational leaders	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
13	Accountability of higher education to the larger public	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
14	Evaluating the scholarly work of colleagues locally and nationally	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
15	Writing articles/books/chapters for publication	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
16	Salary compensation relative to the responsibilities of the position	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
17	Position workload	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
18	Frequent social interaction with faculty and staff colleagues	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
19	Balancing work and family demands	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
20	Pressure to publish	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
21	Participation in department or institutional decisions and issues	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
22	Required extension of the workday to fulfill responsibilities	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	
23	Adequate institutional funding to conduct research	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	

24	Employment opportunities for my partner	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
25	Support from colleagues for teaching and research	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
26	Access to cultural enrichment in the community	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
27	Balancing research, teaching, and service responsibilities	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
28	Teaching courses	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
29	Encouragement from family or friends to seek or remain in a professorial role	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
30	Financial support to attend professional conferences	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
31	Status of institution or department	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
32	Professional relationships with colleagues inside the institution	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
33	Diversity in the community and/or at this institution	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
34	Autonomy in selecting and pursuing a research agenda	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
35	Course and curriculum development	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
36	Encouragement from professional colleagues to seek or remain in a professorial role	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
37	Health insurance and other health-related benefits	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
38	Opportunity to influence the profession	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
39	Affiliation with renowned faculty	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
40	Being evaluated by peers in the retention, promotion, and tenure process	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
41	Stress level of the job	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
42	Designing and conducting research	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
43	Retirement benefits	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
44	Respect/prestige derived from position	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
45	Desire to make a difference in the lives of students	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
46	Opportunities for professional growth and development	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
47	Participation in local and national professional associations	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
48	Long-term job security	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
49	Writing grants to support research and teaching	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
50	Resource support for new faculty (e.g., reduced course load, faculty starter grants, graduate student support)	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
51	Quality of students	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
52	Attendance at meetings related to departmental or institutional service	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
53	Advising and mentoring students	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
54	Prospects for professional advancement	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
55	Opportunities to use leadership skills	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
56	Political dynamics of working in higher education	−2	−1	0	+1	+2
57	Opportunities to pursue ideas	−2	−1	0	+1	+2

REFERENCES

Basinger, J. (2000, August 11). A new way of classifying colleges elates some and perturbs others. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A31, A34–A42.

Behling, O., Labovitz, G., & Gainer, M. (1968). College recruiting: A theoretical base. *Personnel Journal, 47*, 13–19.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency: A study of the social forces that have shaped the administration of public schools.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, R. F., & Newell, L. J. (1973). *A study of professors of educational administration.* Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1994). *A classification of institutions of higher education.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Englander, M. E. (1960). A psychological analysis of vocational choice. *Teaching Journal of Counseling Psychology, 9*, 257–264.

Hills, J. (1965). Educational administration: A field in transition. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 1*(1), 58–66.

Lane, K. E. (Ed.). (2001). *Educational administration directory* (20th ed.). Highland, CA: Author.

McCarthy, M. M., & Kuh, G. D. (1997). *Continuity and change: The educational leadership professoriate.* Columbia, MO: University Council for Educational Administration.

McCarthy, M. M., Kuh, G. D., Newell, L. J., & Iacona, C. (1988). *Under scrutiny: The educational administration professoriate.* Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

Murphy, J. (2002). Reculturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 65–82). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1987). *Leaders for American schools: The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration.* Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

Newell, L. J., & Morgan, D. A. (1980). Study of professors of higher education and educational administration. Unpublished data.

Pounder, D. G. (1994). Educational and demographic trends: Implications for women's representation in school leadership. In N. Prestine & P. Thurston (Eds.), *Advances in educational administration: New directions in educational administration—Policy, preparation, and practice* (pp. 135–150). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Pounder, D. G., & Merrill, R. J. (2001). Job desirability of the high school principalship: A job choice theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*(1), 27–57.

Pounder, D. G., & Young, I. P. (1996). Recruitment and selection of educational administrators: Priorities for today's schools. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman,

D. Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 279–308). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Schwab, D. P., Rynes, S. L., & Aldag, R. J. (1987). Theories and research on job search and choice. In K. M. Rowland & G. R. Perris (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resource management* (Vol. 5, pp. 129–166). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Shakeshaft, C. (1999). The struggle to create a more gender-inclusive profession. In J. Murphy & K. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (2nd ed., pp. 99–118). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tom, V. R. (1971). The role of personality and organizational images in the recruiting process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6*, 573–592.

Young, I. P., Rinehart, J. S., & Place, W. (1989). Theories for teacher selection: Objective, subjective, and critical contact. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 5*, 329–336.

Diana G. Pounder is associate dean for professional studies and professor of educational leadership and policy in the University of Utah's College of Education. Her current and recent research includes work on the principal shortage debate, collaborative teacher work in schools, and administrator preparation and its impact. Her publications have appeared in *Educational Administration Quarterly, Journal of School Leadership, Australian Journal of Education*, and *AASA's School Executive Journal.*

Gary M. Crow is professor and chair in the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Utah. His research interests include principal socialization and leadership and he is currently conducting research in both the UK and the United States on the socialization of school leaders. His articles have appeared in *Educational Administration Quarterly, Journal of School Leadership*, and *Educational Management and Administration.*

Amy A. Bergerson, Ph.D., is a visiting assistant professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy at the University of Utah. Her research focuses on access, socialization, and retention in higher education; high school to college transition; and the impact of race, ethnicity, and social class on students' college experiences.