

Effective Administrators

David A. Whetten

- ◇ 이 글은 高等教育專門誌 *Change* (1984년 11·12월호)에 계 ◇
- ◇ 재된 것으로, 筆者는 3년간의 연구와 백여 번에 걸친 大 ◇
- ◇ 學行政家와의 인터뷰를 통해, 效率的으로 대학을 경영할 ◇
- ◇ 수 있는 行政家の 3가지 특성을 제시하고 있다. 필자는 현 ◇
- ◇ 재 The University of Illinois in Champaign, Illinois 의 ◇
- ◇ 경영학 교수로 재직하고 있다. ……………〈編輯者 註〉 ◇

Warren Bennis, the widely recognized management author and former university president, once exclaimed, "Universities are among the worst managed institutions in the country. Hospitals and some state and city administrations may be as bad; no business or industry except Penn Central can possibly be."

Bennis articulated a nagging suspicion long harbored by many members of the academy. Peters and Waterman's masterful discourse on America's best-managed businesses, *In Pursuit of Excellence*, has made it especially tempting for academicians to envision organizational utopias and envy more fortunate colleagues in the business world. Given this infatuation, it is not uncommon today to hear trustees in board meetings argue, "This college should be run more like a business!"

The college-business parallel is, however, based on two questionable assumptions. The first argues that businesses are readily comparable to academic institutions; the second, that businesses know best what effective organization practice is. While indeed there are some similarities (e.g., the need to maintain strong fiscal control), the differences between "business" and academe in such areas as revenue streams, environmental conditions, modes of production, and lines of authority are substantial enough to caution against an uncritical assimilation of effective business practices into colleges and universities. While there are many basic management skills essential for effective administration in any setting, many business practices, such as the relentless emphasis on short-term, bottom-line results in American business enterprises would be counterproductive in the world of scholarship.

The proposition that colleges and universities should be run more like businesses is

grounded in a second mistaken assumption that businesses somehow have a corner on effective organizational practice. This overlooks the fact that many of the characteristics of excellence currently being touted in the business world have been hallmarks of the academy for generations. Peters and Waterman urge businesses to be value driven, to act within their institution's range of competency and traditions, to institutionalize authority structures with tightly and loosely coupled properties, to facilitate and reward outstanding individual performance, and to encourage entrepreneurship at the lowest levels of the organization.

My experience as a member of a business school faculty is that many business managers could learn a great deal about these organizational attributes from their counterparts in academe. This suggests that practitioners and scholars in higher education administration should place increased emphasis on chronicling effective organizational practice within academic institutions. While caution must be exercised in generalizing to the rest of the management world, it is nonetheless instructive to consider the unique and considerable contribution to management knowledge that can be made by close study of academic administration.*

Three years of research on the management of retrenchment in higher education including personal interviews and small group discussions with over one hundred faculty and administrators representing a wide variety of colleges and universities has led me to some observations about the characteristics of effective administrators. Truly exceptional educational administrators are, first of all, experts at managing coalitions. Second, they tend to utilize a leadership style often described as "aggressive opportunism." Finally, they pursue a balanced orientation between organizational process and outcome.

Effective Coalition Management

Effective administrators are masters at nurturing their political stakeholders. They are particularly able to sustain this support during times of substantial institutional stress. During periods of turmoil and crisis they don't let the day-to-day pressures of administrative responsibilities distract them from this critical activity.

A distinction between charismatic and catalytic leadership is useful here. Charismatic leaders use their powers of persuasion to convince others to follow a course of action articulated by the leader. In contrast, catalytic leaders work within a group to facilitate the emergence of a jointly supported set of objectives. The intent of the charismatic leader is to develop a loyal following; the intent of the catalytic leader is to foster group solidarity and commitment. It has been my experience that effective university administrators are viewed as either charismatic or catalytic (but seldom authoritarian) by their colleagues.

*Note that this research builds on other studies in this field. See especially *Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparison of Multiple Perspectives*, Kim S. Cameron and David A. Whetten (eds.), New York: Academic Press, 1983; and, *New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness*, Paul S. Goodman and Johannes M. Pennings (eds.), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Also, Kim Cameron, "Strategic Responses to Conditions of Decline: Higher Education and the Private Sector", *Journal of Higher Education*, 1983, 54: 359-380. James G. March and John P. Olsen. *Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations*. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget, 1976. Jeffrey Pfeffer, and Gerald R. Salancik, "Organizational Decision Making as a Political Process: The Case of a University Budget," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1974, 19:135-151.

The catalytic leadership style is consistent with an emerging view of organizations within the organizational behavior literature. In the past the effectiveness of an organization has been linked to its productivity, worker satisfaction and morale, goal fulfillment, or resource acquisition. Increasingly, authors are arguing that many of these criteria can be subsumed under a broader, meta-criterion called "strategic constituency support." This approach treats organizations as political arenas in which interest groups vie for control of organizational resources: workers are interested in better working conditions, external funding agencies emphasize productivity, the governing board focuses on accountability, and so forth. In this context the challenge for the central administration is to assemble a winning or dominant coalition that will support proposed actions—as one would in a parliamentary form of government. This is done through an ongoing process of negotiation and bargaining with the various interest groups.

The value of this view of organizations is that it keeps the role of central administration in proper perspective. Their purpose is to make things happen—to stimulate action, but in a facilitative manner. A common ingredient in academic institutions where disaffection is high is that key leaders are underplaying this catalytic role. They have become too distant from their internal and external constituencies, because they feel their support is not necessary ("I am powerful enough to push through important issues on my own"), they feel more comfortable handling the day-to-day administrative details of running an institution ("I won't waste my time getting embroiled in grubby politics"), or they don't see the facilitating process as part of their role ("The responsibility of the leader is to establish policy, and the responsibility of others is to support it"). In contrast, effective catalytic leaders view their institution as a fragile coalition that must constantly be tended and nurtured.

Effective coalition managers in educational institutions use several specific techniques. First, they foster mutual respect among all interest groups. Faculty and administration, humanities departments and professional schools, alumni and students, senior and junior faculty, all understand and respect one another. Such managers refuse to pit one group against another even when it would bolster their own personal power. As a result, administrative actions generate centripetal, rather than centrifugal, forces within the institution.

Second, effective catalytic administrators do not take the support of any interest group for granted. They are not seduced by the temptation to ignore the needs of groups that have been treated well in the past, and protect centers of excellence and use them as agents for improving the quality of other units. They build broad support for strategic changes in the organization's mission, by involving relevant interest groups in the decision making process, and wherever possible, incorporating the ideas of these groups in the final proposal. Indeed, effective administrators go a step further and involve interested parties in identifying the problems for joint consideration. In other words, instead of an administrator deciding what the problems are and then inviting others to participate in deciding what should be done (as a way of gaining their support for an outcome), these leaders seek input on the decision-making agenda itself. This constitutes a much greater degree of power sharing, since influence over the choice of what problems to discuss can be far more important than recommendations about solutions.

Third, effective coalition managers recognize the difference between responsive action and acting responsibly. Effective administrators recognize that catalytic management is not an excuse for abrogating personal responsibility for difficult decisions. They resist demands

to be 'responsive' that would push them in directions inappropriate for the institution. They understand the difference between building a dominant coalition around critical issues and letting domineering stakeholders dictate institutional policy. One of the keys to this is their ability to distinguish between legitimate claims and political posturing.

Responsible leadership exemplifies an important principle of supportive communication. When communicating with subordinates the tendency of many leaders is to take personal responsibility for good news by using the pronoun "I" in the conversation. But when they communicate bad news (e.g., a proposal has been turned down), they diffuse responsibility by using the pronoun "we" or (worse) "they." Usually, the specific actors to which these plural pronouns refer are not identified. The purpose of this strategy is to reduce the need to justify and be responsible for a tough decision, satisfying a need of the administrator, at the expense of the subordinate. Recognizing this, effective leaders are willing to assume full responsibility for the consequences of a final decision, especially when it is unfavorable.

Aggressive Opportunism

Using anthropological terms, it is possible to categorize administrators as either gatherers or hunters. Gatherers forage passively in an immediate area for enough food to satisfy daily needs. Hunters aggressively pursue a quarry as far as necessary and recognize that survival depends upon cunning and strategy. Some authors in the field of higher education argue that decades of assured growth have encouraged a "gatherer" mentality among academic administrators, particularly in state systems.

However, the aggressive leadership style of many academic administrators belies that stereotype. According to my research hunters abound, and usually possess three distinguishing characteristics.

First, assertive academic administrators preserve and highlight sources of opportunity within their institutions. A prevalent theme in the literature on organizational development theorizes that exceptional individuals are attracted to growing organization, primarily because of the possibilities within them for making more money and for rapid promotion. A corollary proposition is that it is difficult to keep extremely talented people in a retrenching organization. My research on educational institutions undergoing retrenchment suggests an important modification to this line of reasoning: truly exceptional individuals are attracted to centers of opportunity. These are generally, but not necessarily, associated with conditions of growth.

Effective educational administrators refuse to accept a presumed one-to-one relationship between conditions of general prosperity and an emphasis on creativity and innovation within their institution. Effective leaders of retrenching organizations somehow find the resources to sustain innovation and creativity. They do this in a variety of ways, such as aggressively pursuing outside grants, organizing fund-raising drives for new projects, or by taxing departmental budgets to create a central pool of money that funds a grant competition for new program ideas. Whatever the means, they find ways to create the necessary financial support for innovation, and are therefore able to buffer the innovation cycle from budget cycles.

But they do more than generate resources: they create a climate within the institution that encourages new ideas, that fosters risk taking. Systems dynamicists tell us there is a

difference between a "fail-safe" system and a "safe-fail" system. While the former system is risk averse, the latter is risk seeking or at least risk neutral. A fail-safe system abhors risk since it might lead to failure (in some organizations, such as a nuclear power plant, this approach is clearly warranted). In contrast, risk-seeking systems create a climate in which it's all right to fail in the process of trying to improve the system.

Effective academic administrators encourage a risk-seeking safe-fail organizational climate. They protect opportunities for innovation from budget fluctuations because they understand that in the minds of their most productive members there is a link between the attractiveness of staying in an institution and the emphasis its leaders place on innovation and creativity. Most high achievers have strong needs for personal discretion and challenge, and they recognize that these can be best fulfilled in innovative organizations. One disgruntled faculty member who had just accepted an attractive offer from another university expressed it this way:

"My reason for leaving is not primarily the difference in salary. It is because of the relative number of opportunities being created by the administration in these respective universities. This school seems to be dead in the water. The administration is too preoccupied with preserving tradition. They have essentially frozen the status quo. It is as though they commissioned a pilot to take a photograph of the campus and then ran this picture through a photocopying machine after pushing the 10 percent reduction button. The other school isn't much better off financially but they are using their assets in a much more creative manner."

A second component of assertive leadership is cultivating a distinctive institutional image. Every institution that was identified in my research as having exceptional leaders exuded distinctiveness, and had an image that set it apart from competitors. This concept has surfaced in the literature recently with the renewed interest in organizational culture. In actuality it has been around for a long time, at least since Burton Clark's early sociological research on the distinctive qualities of certain elite private colleges (e.g., "The Organizational Saga in Higher Education," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 17, 1972). However, it was striking to find how pervasive this characteristic is in all types of institutions of higher education, and how it is exemplified and used by effective leaders. Such an image is used not just as an external recruiting device but also as a powerful tool for shaping members' attitudes about the organization. Indeed, it was striking that, in my research, individuals' memories of their institution were indexed, and to a great extent colored, by their perceptions of the distinctive qualities of each presidential era. It was not uncommon for a faculty member to respond to a question about what was happening in 1975-78 by first reflecting "Let's see, who was president then?" After they had searched their memory using this indexing procedure they could respond to specific questions. What was even more interesting is that respondents used subdued tones and guarded terminology to describe a conservative, caretaker president, and a lively voice and animated gestures to describe the actions of a particularly dynamic leader.

Effective administrators recognize that key leaders personify an institution's image—both internally and externally. They try to exemplify an image consistent with core institutional values. An interesting example of this occurred during an interview with the president of a major university. In the middle of our discussion, he paused and said, "I can now see that when I go home and look at the evening news and see myself in action, or read quotes from my speeches in the newspaper, that I might as well be president of General Mills or Proctor and Gamble. I'm projecting an image of an efficient administrator who

is only incidentally interested in crucial educational concerns. I can see that the pressures of my day-to-day administrative activities have so totally dominated my attention that they have driven out any visible emphasis on educational values and priorities." This was a sobering observation for this individual; he had perceived himself as a prominent national leader in educational administration (Subsequently, he became much more involved in critical debates over educational issues).

The third component of assertive leadership touches on the role of charismatic leadership, especially in the strategic planning process. Effective administrators recognize that in charting a course for an institution, inspiring vision precedes, rather than is driven by, quantitative analysis. A major concern with most treatments of strategic planning is that they convey an impression that planning is an exact science that can be reduced to a series of mathematical formulas in which you essentially plug in your needs assessments, faculty and student preferences, etc., and the appropriate strategy for your institution is generated.

Ellen Chaffee has identified several planning strategies, including what she calls an interpretive process. It is important to highlight the interpretive component of strategic planning because planning is both a sense-making and a sense-giving process. The planning process entails sorting out and making sense of past actions, and establishing a range of possibilities for future actions (determining what is sensible). We define who we are by our statement of limitations and opportunities—which is in turn grounded in our interpretation of history. Anyone can find data to justify a proposed plan. That doesn't take great talent, nor is it a terribly vital part of the planning process. What distinguishes truly effective administrators is their ability to create the inspirational vision that can become the core of an insightful, commitment-generating strategic plan. While visionaries run the risk of losing touch with reality and proposing totally unrealistic plans, effective leaders avoid this pitfall by grounding their proposals in hard-nosed analysis. What is at issue here is not the presence or absence of analysis, but its role in the total strategy formulation process.

Balancing Organizational Processes and Outcomes

This leads to the final distinguishing quality of effective administrators. These individuals recognize that while the quality of their administrative decisions is obviously important, people's perceptions of the decision-making process are equally critical.

One of the negative aspects of the management by objectives movement is that it has encouraged administrators to overemphasize the importance of outcomes. We were told not to worry about how subordinates do a job and just hold them accountable for the final product. The effective administrators I observed recognize the need to restore a more balanced emphasis on process and outcomes. One way they do this is by treating administration as both noun and verb, denoting both a position with responsibilities and privileges, and a process for accomplishing productive work. This dualistic view of their role helps leaders remember that just because the right structure is in place doesn't mean that the appropriate processes will follow; while good structure is no replacement for good process, bad structure makes good process impossible. With this understanding, administrators avoid the trap of structural complacency, exemplified by the managerial statement, "We have created a position (or organized a task force) to deal with that problem." In short, effective leaders are as concerned with the how as they are with the what and the

why of administration.

This is especially important during times of retrenchment. Scarcity increases concerns about equity and fairness. The research on procedural justice in the field of social psychology points out that individuals, in a court of law, for example, are just as concerned about the fairness of the decision-making process as they are about the equitability of the outcome. Furthermore, as the importance of an issue to a group increases, or as the probability that the group will receive the outcome it prefers decreases, it tends to scrutinize the decision-making process more carefully. Consequently, administrators of retrenching organizations must manage the resource allocation process much more carefully than they would during periods of fiscal munificence. For example, they might appoint a special budget committee that is carefully constituted to contain representative of key interest groups, and use a more extensive peer review process for new program or research grant proposals, to allay heightened anxieties about procedural justice.

This leads to consideration of what is probably the most important organizational process—communication. It can be observed that effective administrators err in favor of over-communicating, especially during times of retrenchment. A basic truism in organizational theory is: change causes uncertainty. Information reduces uncertainty. Therefore, as change increases, so should the rate of communication.

All administrators understand that this is difficult to do. During a crisis, communication time competes with decision-making time. (“How do you expect me to communicate to others what I’m doing when I am already spending twelve hours a day doing it?”) However, effective administrators find ways of building communication time into busy schedules by creating self-imposed obligations that force them to hear from individuals outside their normal circle of intimate associates (who tend to reinforce each others’ point of view).

This can be done in a variety of ways. Successful administrators write to faculty members informing them of important upcoming issues and soliciting comments and suggestions. They establish a rumor hotline so that any member of the organization can verify the validity of a rumor, and give frequent reports to the faculty senate followed by lengthy question and answer periods. They commit themselves to an ongoing series of luncheons with critical internal and external stakeholders, or organize a series of discussions with a rotating group of faculty members. Ineffective administrators do just the opposite. As stress and uncertainty build, two-way communication falters and they cloister themselves in an inner sanctum with a few trusted advisors, while the rest of the institution awaits their next crisis-driven action.

A critical insight into effective administrators’ communication is that they don’t interpret faculty members’ disdain for committee assignments as a lack of interest in ongoing, two-way communication. This is an important distinction. Many faculty members don’t feel it is necessary to be around the table with the decision makers as votes are taken on various propositions, but they want to be informed about what is happening around that table. Most faculty members want to believe that if they get involved in a decision that will have an impact on them, they could exercise some influence. Since they understand that information is a critical determinant of influence, they desire access to the organization’s communication channels. As one faculty member said, “I would like to know what issues are being discussed and be invited to provide input into the discussion instead of having important decisions presented as a fait accompli in the weekly faculty newsletter.”

Creative Resolutions

I have been impressed during my research by the complexity of the problems facing leaders of financially troubled institutions and by the truly exceptional leadership talent at work in the education sector. I have found many individuals following the oriental admonition to treat crises as opportunities. These aggressive leaders are capitalizing on crises as mandates for improvement. They are seeking to build coalitions to support long-overdue housecleaning, and taking actions that would probably not be supported during a period of prosperity and tranquility.

Anachronistic programs and procedures are being discontinued, unproductive members weeded out or prodded to make a stronger contribution; organizational goals are being revitalized; and planning is assuming a more fundamentally important role. Along the way, these administrators have discovered ways to resolve one of the most vexing organizational paradoxes limiting innovation in most universities: during periods of abundance the resources to make major changes are present, but not the incentive; during periods of scarcity the incentive is present, but not the resources. Indeed, the ability to generate creative resolutions to the hoary dilemmas of academe may be the most apt characterization of the effective administrator.

In 1977, the Stanford Research Institute was commissioned by the federal government to identify the most pressing problems facing the United States. In addition to the predictable concerns for resource scarcity, falling industrial productivity, pollution, and lack of equal opportunity, high on the resulting list was the challenge of effectively administering large, complex systems. SRI listed twenty or thirty major problems observed in large complex organizations, such as reduced access of outsiders to key decision makers, declining legitimacy of leadership, increased system rigidity, plus reduced levels of innovation, morale, commitment, and loyalty.

One implication of the Stanford report is that the major challenge facing mature institutions in our society is how to avoid acting their age. It is heartening to see the number of administrators in higher education coming to grips with this challenge. *

高等教育 統計資料集 소개

- ◇ 本協議會는 高等教育에 關된 各種 資料를 收蓄·정리한 ◇
- ◇ 「高等教育 統計資料集」을 작년에 이어 두번째로 發刊하였 ◇
- ◇ 다. 이는 우리나라 高等教育의 實相과 發展 추세를 診斷하 ◇
- ◇ 고 未來社會의 理想的 大學像을 設計하는 데 必要하게 活 ◇
- ◇ 用될 것이다. 本誌는 많은 大學人들이 參考할 수 있도록 ◇
- ◇ 우선 目次만이라도 게재하여 發行消息과 아울러 그 內容을 ◇
- ◇ 소개한다. …………… 〈編輯者 註〉 ◇

I. 한국 고등교육 발전 지표 (총괄)	17
1. 고등교육의 발전 규모	19
1-1 학생수 증가 추이	20
1-2 학교수 증가 추이	22
1-3 교원수 증가 추이	24
1-4 사무직원수 증가 추이	26
2. 고등교육의 발전지표	29
2-1 인구 천명당 고등교육기관 학생수	31
2-2 지역별 고등교육 기관수	32
2-3 교수 1인당 학생수	34
2-4 사무직원 1인당 학생수	35
2-5 유형별 학교건물(실수)	36
2-6 고등교육기관 공교육비 현황	38
2-7 고등교육기관 도서관 현황	39
2-7-1 고등교육기관 학생 1인당 장서수	39
2-7-2 도서관당 수용가능 학생수	40
2-7-3 학생 1인당 도서예산액	41

2-8 유형별, 연도별, 학위별 교원수	42
2-9 전공 계열별 학생수	44
2-10 전공 학계별 교원수	46
2-11 고등교육기관 진학률	48
2-12 해외유학생수의 증가 추이	50
2-13 학술연구조성비 지급 현황	52
2-14 학위과정 이수자수	54
2-15 입학자수의 증가 추이	56
2-16 대학부설 연구소 현황	57
2-17 전공분야별 학회 현황	58
2-18 학부 학생수에 대한 대학원 학생비	59
II. 한국 고등교육기관의 유형별 통계지표	61
3. 학부교육	63
3-1 4년제 대학(교)와 학교수, 학과수 및 학생수	65
3-2 대학(교)의 법정정원에 대한 전임교원 확보율	66
3-3 대학(교)의 전임교원에 대한 석·박사학위 소지율의 추이(1982-'84)	66
3-4 4년제 대학(교) 전임교원의 학위별 분포	67
3-5 4년제 대학(교) 전임교원의 직급별 분포	67
3-6 4년제 대학(교) 외래강사 분포	68
3-7 4년제 대학(교) 외래강사의 학위별 분포	68
3-8 4년제 대학(교) 전임교원대 학생수의 비	69
3-9 대학(교)의 교수 1인당 재학생수의 비율 추이(1982-'84)	69
3-10 대학(교)의 기관수, 학생수 및 전임교원 증가율 추이(1982-'84)	70
3-11 전임교원 및 외래강사별 과목수, 학점수, 시간수, 수강생수	72
3-12 4년제 대학(교) 개설과목수, 학점수, 시간수, 수강생수	74
3-13 대학의 전임교원 및 외래강사별 전공과목의 주당 강의시간수	74
3-14 복수전공 이수자 현황	75
3-15 부전공 이수자 현황	76
3-16 4년제 대학(교)의 교내·교외별 연구비 수혜 현황	77
3-17 4년제 대학(교)의 교수 개인 및 연구소의 연구비 총액	77
3-18 교수진 및 연구소별 대학(교) 평균 연구비	78
3-19 연도별 해외연구 전임교원수(1981-'84)	79
3-20 4년제 대학(교)의 연구논문집수	79
3-21 4년제 대학(교)의 행정직원 현황	80

3-22	대학(교)당 평균 행정직원수	80
3-23	전체 행정직원 대 학생 비율	81
3-24	대학의 기준 교지 확보율별 학교수	81
3-25	4년제 대학(교)내 각종 위원회수	82
3-26	대학의 기준 체육장 확보율별 학교수	83
3-27	대학(교)의 기준 교사 확보율별 학교수	84
3-28	대학(교)의 기준 도서수 확보율별 학교수	85
3-29	대학(교)의 기준 도서관 좌석수 확보율별 학교수	86
4.	교양교육	87
4-1	대학 유형별 교양담당 전임교수의 지급별, 교육경력별, 학위별 분포 현황	88
4-2	대학 유형별 교양담당 시간강사의 지급별, 교육경력별, 학위별 분포 현황	90
4-3	국민윤리담당 전체교수 1인당 평균 학급수와 수강생수	92
4-4	국민윤리담당 전임교수의 학위 분포	93
4-5	국민윤리담당 외래강사의 학위 분포	94
4-6	교육대학의 국민윤리담당 전임교수 현황	95
4-7	대학 유형별 필수·선택의 학점수 분포 현황(인문, 사회, 자연)	96
4-8	대학 유형별 교양과정 배당학점수 분포	100
5.	대학 재정·경영	101
5-1	대학 수입 및 납입금 현황	103
5-2	대학 지출 항목별 분석	104
5-3	대학 지출 배분	106
5-4	교수 월급여액 및 급여격차	108
5-5	사립대학 법인자산 분석	109
6.	대학원 교육	111
6-1	대학원의 양적 현황	112
6-2	학문계열별 전문대학원 설치 현황	116
6-3	대학원의 전임교원 확보 현황	118
6-4	대학원의 외래강사 의존율 현황	120
6-5	대학원 외래강사의 소속별, 경력별, 학위별 통계	122
6-6	대학원 출강교수의 소속별 현황	124
6-7	대학원 출강교수의 직위별, 경력별, 학위별 통계	126
6-8	대학원의 교과과정 현황	128
6-9	대학원의 일반장학금 및 조교장학금 수혜자 비	130
6-10	대학원 석사학위과정 장학금 수혜액 비율분포	132

6-11 대학원의 졸업이수학점 현황	134
6-12 대학원의 교수 1인당 박사학위논문 지도원생수와 평균원생수별 분포	136
6-13 대학원의 교수 1인당 석사학위논문 지도원생수와 평균원생수별 분포	138
Ⅲ. 세계 주요국의 고등교육 지표	141
7. 고등교육 전반에 관한 국가간 비교	143
7-1 인구 10만명당 고등교육인구	145
7-2 25세 이상 인구 중 고등교육인구 비율	146
7-3 학교급별 교육재정 지출 비율	147
7-4 학문분야별 학생수	148
7-5 주요 국가의 학부 학생대 대학원 학생수의 비율	150
8. 미국의 고등교육 현황에 관한 지표	153
8-1 미국 고등교육기관 학생수의 추이	154
8-2 미국 고등교육기관 교원수의 추이	155
8-3 미국의 고등교육기관 현황(형태 및 설립유형, 등록학생 규모별)	156
8-4 미국 대학의 주요 전공분야별 학생수	158
8-5 미국 고등교육기관의 폐교 현황	160
8-6 미국 대학의 장학금 수혜액 및 수혜자 비율 추이	161
8-7 미국 대학원의 연구분야별(석·박사과정) 학생 현황	162
9. 영국의 고등교육 현황에 관한 지표	165
9-1 영국 대학의 교수 및 연구진 현황	167
9-2 영국 대학의 학생 현황	168
9-3 영국 대학생의 교과목(분야)별 수강 현황	170
9-4 영국의 개방대학 현황	172
10. 프랑스의 고등교육 현황에 관한 지표	175
10-1 프랑스 고등교육기관의 학생 현황	177
10-2 프랑스의 고등교육기관 취학률	177
11. 일본의 고등교육 현황에 관한 지표	179
11-1 일본 고등교육기관(대학)의 현황(총괄)	180
11-2 일본 고등교육기관(대학)의 학교수	182
11-3 일본 고등교육기관(대학)의 교원 현황	183
11-4 일본 고등교육기관(대학, 대학원)의 학생수 현황	184
11-5 전공분야별 학생 현황(대학)	186

11—6 전공분야별 학생 현황(대학원).....	188
11—7 전공분야별 학위수여 현황.....	192
11—8 일본 고등교육기관(대학)의 직원 현황	194
12. 서독의 고등교육 현황에 관한 지표	195
12—1 서독 고등교육기관의 연도별 재학생 현황.....	196
12—2 서독 고등교육기관의 연도별 신입생 현황.....	197
12—3 서독 고등교육기관의 대학별 학문계열별 신입생 현황	198
12—4 서독 고등교육기관의 대학별 학문계열별 재학생 현황	200
12—5 서독 고등교육기관의 학생수(외국인 학생 포함) 변화 주이.....	202
12—6 20개 전공분야의 등위와 학생수 현황.....	203
12—7 학위별 시험(자격) 통과자수 현황	204
13. 자유중국의 고등교육 현황에 관한 지표	205
13—1 자유중국의 고등교육기관 현황.....	206
13—2 자유중국 고등교육기관의 학생수 현황	207
13—3 자유중국 고등교육기관의 교·직원 현황	208