DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 534 HE 009 834

AUTHOR Wolfle, Lee M.
TITLE Prestige in an American University.
INSTITUTION Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State Univ., Blacksburg.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Association (Toronto, Canada, March 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); *College Faculty; *Higher Education; National Surveys; Occupational Clusters; *Professional Recognition; Rewards; Self Esteem; *Social Stratification; Socioeconomic Influences; Statistical Data; *Status; Teaching

ABSTRACT

Prestige hierarchies operate in all known organizations; universities are no exception. Davis and Moore (1945) have called such stratification in any social system a universal necessity. The present study focused on positions in a university setting. Using procedures developed to measure prestige of occupations in national surveys, the attribution of prestige attached to university positions was determined. One hundred and eight positions were scaled and the scale's validity and underlying scaling criteria evaluated. It appears that university prestige is a microcosm of national prestige, and seems to have a similar socioeconomic base. (Author)

PRESTIGE IN AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

Lee M. Wolfle

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Blacksburg, Virginia

Prepared for the meetings of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada, March, 1978. Support for this research was provided by a grant from the College of Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The author wishes to express his appreciation for the extremely helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper by Robert W. Hodge, Dael Wolfle, and Marvin G. Cline. Printed in U.S.A.

Session 9.03

PRESTIGE IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

ABSTRACT

Prestige hierarchies operate in all known organizations; universities are no exception. Davis and Moore (1945) have called such stratification in any social system a universal necessity. The present study focused on positions in a university setting; using procedures developed to measure prestige of occupations in national surveys, the attribution of prestige attached to university positions was determined. One hundred and eight positions were scaled and the scale's validity and underlying scaling criteria evaluated. It appears that university prestige is a microcosm of national prestige, and seems to have a similar socioeconomic base.

Prestige hierarchies operate in all known organizations; universities are no exception. More prestige accrues to the position of provost than to professor, to associate professors than to assistants, to teaching assistants than to undergraduates. Davis and Moore (1945) have called such stratification in any social system a "universal necessity." They assert that every social system includes a division of labor which allocates tasks required for the social system's survival. The positions thus created require different skills and talents; differential rewards must be provided for their performance in order to attract sufficient numbers of properly trained personnel for positions requiring different amounts of skill. Davis and Moore (1945:243) said that the highest amounts of prestige go to positions which (1) are most important to the social system, (2) require the greatest training or talent, and (3) are in short supply of qualified personnel.

The social evaluation of prestige attached to positions in a university social system is the central focus of this paper. We distinguish here between prestige and esteem. Prestige is the reward attached to a position as such, without regard to who occupies it or how its requirements are carried out. At the same time, we recognize that role requirements may be fulfilled well or poorly. An individual gains esteem for effectively fulfilling the obligations of the position (Davis, 1949:93-4). Most studies of stratification in science have been confined to measuring rewards for effective fulfillment of role expectations. For the institution of science, Cole and Cole (1973:45) noted that the most highly valued scientific activity was original contribution to knowledge. Thus, the Coles (1973) examined three kinds of recognition (honorific rewards,

appointment to prestigious universities, and personal visability or reputation) that accrue to those who successfully contribute to scientific knowledge. Zuckerman (1970) also noted a high correlation between contributions to science and one's scientific standing. She described how the elite integrate into a top stratum, in many ways isolated from other strata. Below the topmost stratum, is a group of productive academicians at prestigious universities (see Roose and Anderson, 1970). Reskin (1977) has recently examined the causal links between background variables and collegial recognition.

Similarly, esteem is granted to those who effectively fulfill role requirements within a university social system. Hamblin and Smith (1966) found that the esteem of professors increased as teaching ability and professorial demeanor increased, along with merit of publications and length of service. On the other hand, Ellis (1962) had previously found no evidence that teaching performance affected status accorded professors by graduate students in the same department.

Yet there remains very little empirical evidence regarding the prestige rankings of positions within the university setting. The available evidence pertains to the ranking of disciplines without regard to academic levels. For example, Cole and Cole (1973:43) noted that the only available evidence of differences in the social rankings of disciplines and specialities derives from flows of scientific manpower and subjective evaluations. They suggested that:

> Although there is little hard evidence, it appears that, until the last few years, physics seems to have been the most prestigious of the scientific disciplines, followed roughly by chemistry, biology, astronomy and geology (Cole and Cole, 1973:43).

While differentiation of positions within the university setting remains obscure, it is clear that compared to other occupational groups, scientists rank high in occupational prestige. Siegel's (1971) rating of occupational prestige revealed that scientists, not otherwise identified, are outranked by only ten of the 600 occupational titles used in his several surveys. These ten include government officials, such as federal and supreme court judges, congressmen, state governors, cabinet members, and ambassadors; only two nongovernment occupations outranked scientists, namely physicians and university presidents. This is not to say that the general public does not distinguish between scientific disciplines. They do. Table 1 shows the prestige scores for several scientific disciplines and occupations that occur in university settings. While these ratings were based on evaluations made by the general public, they do conform to the Coles' (1973:43) expectations, at least in regard to physical scientists. As raters of scientific occupations, the general public has become more knowledgable since the first National Opinion Research Center's (NORC) survey of occupational prestige in 1947. In the 1947 study, 51 percent of the respondents were unable to rate the occupation of nuclear physicist. By 1963, this percentage had declined to ten percent (other scientific occupations showed similar declines). Along with a greater knowledge of scientific occupations, the general public rated scientific occupations higher in 1963 than in 1947. For example, the position of scientist increased in rank from eighth in 1947 to third in 1963 (see Hodge, Siegel, and Rossi, 1964). More recent, fragmentary data suggest scientists may have declined somewhat in their aggregate level of prestige (National Science Board, 1973:97; 1975:146).

- - - - - - - - - -
INSERT TABLE 1 HERE
- - - - - - - - - -

The relatively small differences in prestige accorded the several kinds of scientific and university occupations by the general public tend to obscure the differentiations that are made within the university. The university is, in fact, sharply stratified. In terms of workaday activities, the prestige hierarchy within the university is probably more important than the occupancy of a prestigious position in the national occupational structure. Yet the only evidence of differentiation within the university has been based on reports by the general public (Siegel, 1971). Where university personnel have been used as respondents (Ellis, 1962; Hamblin and Smith, 1966), they did not rate the prestige of positions; rather, they rated the esteem scientists award each other for fulfilling role expectations. Universities themselves have even been rated according to their reputation (Cartter, 1966; Roose and Anderson, 1970). But the prestige attached to positions within the university social system has not been empirically verified. The present study, therefore, focuses on positions in a university setting, and determines the attribution of prestige attached to those positions.

PRESTIGE SCORES FOR UNIVERSITY POSITIONS

In this section, the procedures employed in deriving the prestige scores analyzed in subsequent sections will be described.

Questionnaire Design

Before constructing the questionnaire, the issue of how best to make an assessment of prestige had to be addressed. There are at least two different conceptions of prestige held by researchers. One suggests that these assessments are merely expressions of personal feeling, and leads to asking respondents to express their own personal evaluation of positions. Early studies of national occupational prestige (Counts, 1925; Smith, 1943) used this approach. The other conception suggests that the prestige hierarchy is a reality sui generis, and all informed subjects are aware of its structure. The latter approach is clearly the conception of prestige that more nearly approaches that of Davis and Moore (1945), and leads to asking respondents to provide information regarded as common knowledge about the general evaluation of positions. Siegel (1971) used the latter approach. The present study duplicated as closely as possible the procedures developed for the NORC surveys of national occupational prestige, as reported by Siegel (1971).

At its core, the questionnaire consisted of a method for evaluating the relative standing of university positions. Each respondent was provided, during a personal interview, with a ladder (a card separated into nine numbered rectangles, the ninth one labeled "top," the fifth one labeled "middle," and the first one labeled "bottom") on which he or she was asked to distribute a set of 108 university positions into the nine categories on the ladder. The order of presentation of the 108 positions

was determined at random, and the interviewers were instructed to alter the starting point of the stack of cards by two or three cards for each subsequent respondent.

The stimulus question used to obtain the ratings was:

> Now let's talk about jobs. Here is a ladder with nine boxes on it, and a card with the name of a position which exists in universities. (INTERVIEWER LAYS DOWN THE LADDER AND HANDS FIRST CARD TO RESPONDENT.) Please put the card in the box at the top of the ladder if you think that position has the highest possible social standing within a university. Put it in the box at the bottom of the ladder if you think it has the lowest possible social standing within a university. If it belongs somewhere in between, just put it in the box that matches the social standing of the position. Don't think about a particular person -- think about the position itself, and its social standing. (INTERVIEWER OBSERVES PLACEMENT OF FIRST CARD, AND REPEATS INSTRUCTIONS IF NECESSARY.) Here are some more cards with names of university positions. (INTERVIEWER HANDS RESPONDENT REST OF CARDS.) Just put them in the boxes on the ladder which match the social standing they actually have. If you want, you can change your mind about where a position belongs, and move its card to a different box. (INTERVIEWER WAITS UNTIL THE RESPONDENT IS FINISHED PLACING THE ENTIRE DECK ON THE LADDER.) Would you like to change the placement of any university position (or place a card which you couldn't place earlier)? Would you like to go through the ladder to see if there are changes you would like to make?

The Sample

The sampling frame consisted of on-campus personnel at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. A self-weighted, stratified, probability sample of faculty and secretarial personnel was systematically drawn from the payroll department's list of current employees. The sample consisted of 91 faculty and 42 secretaries. Among the faculty, there were 23 nonrespondents, including seven refusals. The response rate, therefore, was approximately 75 percent. Among secretaries, the response rate was 83 percent; most of the nonrespondents were not found, due no doubt to high turnover rates. The total usable sample size was 103. Although the sample was limited to a single university, the discussion to follow concerns universities in general. It is our judgment that prestige hierarchies will exhibit only small variances across universities, which is empirically verifiable, but not addressed in the present study.

Ratings to Prestige Scores

The transformation of ratings of stimulus university positions into prestige scores was accomplished by assigning weights to each of the nine ladder boxes. The weights were multiplied by the proportion of respondents who sorted the positions into the box, and summed over the nine boxes. For example, the prestige score of the jth position, P_j, is given by

$$P_j = \sum_{i=1}^{9} (12.5)(i - 1)(X_{ij})$$

where X_{ij} is the ratio of the number of respondents who sorted the jth position into the ith box to the number of respondents who sorted it into

any box on the ladder, and i is just the number of the box as printed on the ladder. Thus, the boxes on the ladder were arbitrarily scored, from bottom to top, 0, 12.5, 25.0 . . . .100, and the prestige score received by a university position was merely the average score of the boxes into which it was sorted. This score could theoretically range from 0 to 100, and for the sample data actually ranged from 5.9 to 98.8.

Table 2 presents the results of these activities. The 108 university positions rated in the survey are arranged in rank order from the position that received the highest prestige score, university president, to the lowest, janitor. The titles reported in Table 2 are the exact titles used as stimuli. The choice of titles represents an effort to cover the range of occupational duties required in a university setting, and also includes several academic disciplines rated at three professorial levels. The disciplines were selected in an effort to cover the range of disciplines without attempting to be exhaustive. Table 2 also shows the standard deviation of each rating, which both indicates the certainty or uncertainty with which respondents located the position in the prestige hierarchy, and also proves crucial to interpreting differences in prestige scores, a matter to which we now turn.

- - - - - - - - - -
INSERT TABLE 2 HERE
- - - - - - - - - -

Interpreting Differences in Prestige Scores

How large must a difference in university prestige scores be before one can assume one position has higher prestige than another? Conventional statistical principles would indicate that this judgment be evaluated relative to the standard error of the difference between two means, because each prestige score is a mean. The appropriate formula would be:

$$S_{1-2} = \frac{[S_1^2 + S_2^2 - 2S_1S_2r_{12}]^{1/2}}{N^{1/2}}$$

where S_{1-2} is the standard error of difference between mean prestige 1 and mean prestige 2; S_1^2 and S_2^2 are the respective element variances of prestige 1 and prestige 2, and S_1 and S_2 are the standard deviations; r_{12} is the correlation between prestige 1 and prestige 2; and N is the sample size. Clearly, the standard error will be different for each pair of positions, and there are 5253 such combinations! Instead of providing such a colossal matrix, only a few standard errors will be given, and these will exceed almost all other comparable differences. First, let's take the two prestige scores which have the largest variance; these are the director of alumni association and the president's secretary. Furthermore, let's assume that the correlation (over individual respondents) between these two prestige scores was zero (it was actually .32). By selecting these values to be entered into the formula for the standard error of the difference between two means, we force the standard error to assume a particularly large value, which in most cases will overestimate the true standard error. Be that as it may, the standard error which results from the above computation is 3.15. If we multiply this value by the abscissa of the standard normal distribution corresponding to a probability of inclusion of .95 (1.96), we obtain an interval of 6.17. This value will be exceeded by chance less than 5 percent of the time over all possible samples if the true prestige means are equal. In this sample, therefore, differences in prestige scores of more than six points may be considered significant.

Alternatively, and less conservatively, we might allow the correlation entered into the standard error formula to be nonzero. In most realistic applications, one will want to inquire as to the significance of a difference between nearly adjacent positions, but these are exactly those that are likely to be positively correlated. Accordingly, the zero-order correlations of nearly adjacent positions were examined; many were large in value; a few were as small as .20. Let's therefore, inquire as to differences along the list when the ratings are correlated at .20. For example, is the difference of 4.3 prestige points between an assistant professor of education and a track coach significant? Using standard deviations as given in Table 2, and assuming the correlation between these two ratings was .20 (it was actually .46), the standard error would be 2.13, and multiplying by 1.96 would indicate a value of 4.2 would be necessary to assume significance. The actual difference is larger. Thus, for those who are more comfortable with these less restrictive assumptions, one may consider differences in prestige scores of more than approximately four points significant.

Below we will want to inquire as to differences in prestige scores among the several academic disciplines. Accordingly, let's examine the standard error of between-discipline prestige scores. Not only are the variances within the several disciplinary positions lower in value, the correlations are greater. The lowest correlations are between the medical and educational fields; these were about .40. Furthermore, only one of the standard deviations exceeded 15. Using the lowest correlation and

highest variances yields a standard error 1.45, and multiplying by 1.96 yields a value of 2.84. Thus, when examining differences between disciplines, differences of more than three points may be considered significant. For example, the scientific discipline with the highest prestige at the professorial level was physics (72.7), but professors of medicine (76.0) had significantly higher prestige.

THE VALIDIATION OF PRESTIGE RATINGS

The usual approach toward validation of a construct like prestige has rested "upon the convergence of evaluations apart from any general agreement upon the criteria for making the evaluations" (Reiss, 1961: 195). Operationally, comparisons are made between the ratings of occupations by individuals with different characteristics, who are presumably applying different evaluative criteria. For ratings of national occupations, the correlations of ratings by different groups have been high, leading researchers to postulate the existence of an underlying structure of occupational prestige (Reiss, 1961:195; Siegel, 1970). Their findings are supportive of Davis's declaration that if a prestige hierarchy exists to structure matters of reciprocal expectations, it "must be publically and commonly conceived by everyone in the group" (Davis, 1949:87). This common conception seems to exist for ratings of national occupations, and we can reasonably inquire as to whether it exists in the university social system.

To effect this analysis, separate prestige scales were constructed from the ratings of six groups: five respondents who held administrative rank, 16 full professors, 11 associate professors, 18 assistant professors, 8 instructors, and 30 secretaries. These six scales were correlated over the 108 stimuli positions. If an underlying, commonly perceived prestige hierarchy exists, the correlations among the six scales should be high. These correlations are shown in Table 3, and show a very high level of agreement in the way occupants of different levels of the structure differentiate between prestige of positions over the whole hierarchy.

With one exception, all groups rate positions in a way that yields correlations above .97, indicating that at a minimum 94 percent of the variation in one group's ratings can be explained by another group's ratings. One group did not share in this high level of agreement. The ratings of administrators correlated about .95 with the other five groups. An examination of the scatter diagrams (not shown here) explains this phenomenor The administrators, unlike the other groups, seemed reluctant to accord low prestige to positions other groups rated as possessing low prestige. As a result, the relationship of administrators' ratings with those of other groups was curvilinear, tailing away at the bottom of the scale.

- - - - - - - - - -

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

- - - - - - - - - -

Table 3 also shows the average level of prestige accorded the 108 positions by each of six groups. Consistent with the above discussion, administrators gave all positions a higher prestige rating than did any of the other five groups. Full and associate professors accorded all positions a lower mean prestige rating than did the other groups. This phenomenon is consistent with results that occur in ratings of national prestige. Full professors, say, lump most of the positions at the bottom of the scale in order to make finer distinctions among positions at the top. This is not simply an artifact of measurement, but agrees with what we know about reference group theory. On the other hand, secretaries reserve the bottom of the scale in order to make finer distinctions for the positions in their reference group, lumping more positions toward the upper end of the scale. As a result, secretaries accorded positions a higher mean prestige.

WHAT DOES UNIVERSITY PRESTIGE SCALE?

Hauser and Featherman (1977) recently addressed the underlying criteria upon which national scales of occupation are based. They concluded that, "the common core and dominant dimension of occupational status is socioeconomic in nature" (Hauser and Featherman, 1977:5). We have reached the same conclusion about the scaling of positions within a university social system. Furthermore, Hauser and Featherman (1977), like Reiss (1961) and Siegel (1971) before them, concluded that occupational prestige scales are multidimensional. We find little evidence to indicate our respondents maintained a single dimension to determine prestige inequality. The classical, sociological conceptions of prestige are apparently not maintained by either raters of national prestige hierarchies, or academically based raters of university prestige.

Having rejected the notion of a unidimensional scale, just what does university prestige scale? The evidence to be considered below suggests that university prestige reflects the prestige accorded the position in the national prestige hierarchy. The latter has been shown (Siegel, 1971; Hauser and Featherman, 1977) to be based primarily on mean levels of education and income possessed by members of the occupation. The same dimensions also apparently underlie university prestige. But university prestige occurs within a single organization, and it may be that positional power also underlies organizational prestige. Indeed, Hauser and Featherman (1977:6) have speculated that power may be the dominant dimension of national occupational prestige. Finally, we were interested in explaining, if possible, the different amounts of prestige accorded the several academic disciplines. Based on Davis and Moore's (1945) theory of stratification,

we would be led to believe that the disciplines with the highest prestige require the greatest amounts of training or talent. There is some fragmentary evidence to suggest this may be true; but first let's consider socioeconomic explanations.

A university in a sense is merely an industrial setting in which certain occupations are necessary for production. An electrician, for example, may be employed by an appliance manufacturer, a utility company, a maritime firm, or even a university. The occupation is the same; merely the industrial setting is different. We should not, therefore, be surprised if the measurement of prestige of occupational positions within a university reflects the prestige accorded the position nationally. Our data suggest that the prestige of occupations is nearly identical, whether measured on a national scale by the general public or within a university setting by intramural observers. We base this conclusion on admittedly fragmentary evidence. Some of the stimulus titles used in our survey were also used (or had close matches) in the NORC surveys reported by Siegel (1971). Other titles could be matched by averaging prestige scores for several positions. For example, the NORC surveys used as a stimulus the title, "chemist." We calculated a match for the national prestige score by averaging the university prestige scores received by assistant, associate, and full professors of chemistry. The NORC surveys also included the title, "athletic coach," which was matched to the average scores of "football coach" and "track coach." Other positions were matched directly, such as university president, computer programmer, file clerk, electrician, and others. In all, we found 22 positions that could reasonably be matched between the university and national indices. The 22 university positions were then regressed on the 22 matched national occupations. The resulting

coefficient of determination (R^2) was .81, indicating that the agreement between national and university prestige was high.

If, then, prestige scores of university positions are similar to comparable occupations outside university settings, we should also expect university prestige to be based on socioeconomic differences. From Siegel (1971:259, 265), one can calculate the following regression equation, relating occupational prestige to education and income, each measured in their original metric:

$$\hat{P} = -11.91 + .0029(I) + 3.17(E); \; R^2 = .796,$$

where P is the national prestige score, I is mean income, and E is mean education.

In order to compare the basis of university prestige with that of national occupational prestige, we also regressed university prestige on mean income and mean education. Once again, the evidence is fragmentary, and is based on only a few of the stimuli positions. Seventeen stimuli positions were matched with mean income and education reported for census occupational categories for persons employed in educational and kindred services (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1972:Tables 3 and 4). When we regressed university prestige on mean income and mean education, the resulting equation was:

$$\hat{P} = -52.46 + .0026(I) + 4.60(E); \; R^2 = .975.$$

The slopes are similar to those computed from Siegel's (1971) data, and we are led to believe that the relationships between prestige and income and education are nearly the same within the university as in the national occupational structure. The large coefficient of determination for the university regression is probably caused by a U-shaped distribution of education and income within the university. The positions that entered the above regression were divided into two very distinct groups. The professors and

administrators all had high prestige, comparatively large incomes, and a lot of education. At the other extreme, secretaries and service personnel had relatively low prestige, substantially less education, and lower incomes. There was practically no position in between, particularly as regards education. As a result, the association of prestige and education within the university is nearly identical to the national occupational structure, but there are two clustered groups with small residual errors. The U-shaped distribution of education within the university does not affect the overall conclusion -- prestige within the university, like national occupational prestige, is apparently a linear combination of two predominantly socioeconomic dimensions.

Titmuss (1962), Svalastoga (1972), Goldthorpe and Hope (1974), and Hauser and Featherman (1977) have suggested that power (variously called authority or command over resources) is an underlying dimension of national occupational prestige. Unfortunately, there are no strong empirical tests of the notion. But it certainly makes sense to consider power a dimension of prestige within a single organization. Once again, the evidence we have to offer is fragmentary, and is based on only nine university positions for which we could obtain perceived measures of power. Gross and Grambsch (1974) asked respondents in 68 universities to rate "how much say" 16 categories of persons had about university goals. Nine of Gross and Grambsch's categories could be matched either to a single or an averaged combination of several positions used as stimuli in the present study. We regressed university prestige on university power, with the following results:

$$\hat{P} = -30.82 + 29.58(Po);\ R^2 = .54,$$

where P is the university prestige score, and Po is the Gross and Grambsch (1974: 122) 1971 university power score. Although the association is

moderately strong, it does not approach the degree of association provided by socioeconomic dimensions. We should not be too surprised. While the university is a hierarchical organization with defined lines of authority, these are not nearly as well defined as one would expect, say, in a corporate structure. This may even be evident in the tendency of boards of trustees and some university administrators to look upon faculty as employees of the university, whereas many scholars feel that the faculty and students are the university. Even the power of a university president is ill-defined. As described by Dykes (1970:169), "Presidential authority in the contemporary world of higher education is dispersed and tempered by countervailing forces." As a result of the unique characteristics of the university, power provides only a loose basis for prestige. The more powerful dimensions of prestige remain socioeconomic.

Finally, let's consider the basis for prestige accorded the several academic disciplines Based on Davis and Moore's (1945) theory of stratification, we would be led to believe that the disciplines receiving the highest prestige require the greatest amounts of training or talent. In terms of talent, the evidence is fragmentary, but supportive. Harmon (1963) has provided measures of mean intelligence scores by academic disciplines. An average discipline prestige score for seven academic areas was obtained by averaging the discipline's score at the full, associate, and assistant levels. These seven university prestige scores were regressed on mean intelligence scores of U.S. Ph.D.'s by field reported by Harmon (1963). The resulting equation,

$$\hat{P} = 38.13 + .34(IQ);\ R^2 = .70,$$

provides supportive evidence that academic fields of high prestige have incumbants of high ability.

In sum, the basis of university prestige is manifold, but seems to be predominantly socioeconomic. When we regressed a subset of university prestige scores on income and education, the regression slopes almost duplicated the situation in the national occupational structure. Positions of power in the university tend also to be positions of prestige, but this association is weak due to the manifold nature of authority in universities. Finally, the basis for prestige of academic disciplines seems to be based, in part, as predicted by Davis and Moore (1945), on the degree of talent required of incumbents to fill the position.

THE STRUCTURE OF UNIVERSITY PRESTIGE

Let us now turn to a comparison of the prestige levels of several groups within the university. The university presidency is clearly the most prestigious position in a university. Grouped below the president are the vice-presidents and the dean of the medical school, and then next come the other deans. There is a statistically significant prestige gap between the deans and full professors. All full professors enjoy higher prestige than all associate professors who, in turn, enjoy more prestige than all assistant professors; but the amounts of prestige blend from one group to another with no significant gaps. In most cases, the department head does not possess more prestige than his or her full professors, who organizationally at least are responsible to their department head. Perhaps this helps explain why most department heads rule their professors by persuasion, but are more autocratic with more junior professors.

A few positions outside the normal academic department structure have a level of prestige at least the equivalent of associate professors. These tend to be positions supportive of the real goals of the university, such as the directors of the library and computing center, and like it or not, the football coach. Many new assistant professors believe it is important to curry favor with the secretaries of his or her supervisors, but the informal loci of power enjoyed by senior secretaries is not translated into a prestige level higher than assistant professors. Students enter the university with no more prestige than most clerks and operatives, but graduate students have levels of prestige nearly equivalent to the managers of service facilities.

CONCLUSIONS

Prestige hierarchies exist in universities, but there was until now little empirical evidence regarding its structure. Using Davis and Moore's (1945) theory of stratification as a framework, and Siegel's (1971) analysis of the national occupational structure as a guide, we developed a procedure for determining the prestige of university positions. It appears that university prestige is merely a microcosm of national prestige, and the bases of university prestige, like those for national prestige, seem to be socioeconomic in nature. Of course, many of the titles used as stimuli in the present study do not have counterparts in studies of national occupational prestige, yet an analysis of some of these (i.e., titles by academic disciplines) seems to indicate that they, too, are ranked by prestige in accordance with the skills and talents required of incumbents, as predicted by Davis and Moore (1945).

Table 1. Prestige of Scientific and University Occupations

Title Rated	Prestige Score
College or University President	82.4
Scientist	80.8
Nuclear Physicist	80.8
College Professor	78.3
Physicist	73.8
Psychologist	71.4
Chemist	68.8
Biologist	67.7
Geologist	67.2
Sociologist	65.6
Mathematician	65.0
Economist	56.8
Statistician	55.4

Source: Paul M. Siegel, Prestige in the American Occupational Structure. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1971.

Table 2. Mean Ratings and Standard Deviations of 108 University Positions

Rank	University Position*	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation of Ratings
1	University President	98.8	4.80
2	Academic Vice-President	92.4	10.54
3	Administrative Vice-President	90.0	10.84
4	Dean of Medicine	87.9	10.57
5	Financial Vice-President	87.4	13.73
6	Dean of Graduate School	85.8	10.51
7	Dean of Engineering	85.3	10.71
8	Dean of Arts and Sciences	85.0	11.66
9	Member, Board of Regents	84.4	16.54
10	Dean of Business	83.4	11.92
11	Dean of Agriculture	83.3	10.87
12	Dean of Education	82.9	11.21
13	Chaired Professor	77.3	15.53
14	Professor of Medicine	76.0	12.34
15	Professor of Law	73.5	12.78
16	Professor of Physics	72.7	12.47
17	Professor of Engineering	71.8	12.22
18	Professor of Mathematics	71.7	13.09
19	Department Head	71.6	14.87
20	Professor of Statistics	70.9	13.03
21.5	Professor of Chemistry	70.8	12.44

Table 2. continued

Rank	University Position*	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation of Ratings
21.5	Professor of Economics	70.8	12.69
23	Professor of History	70.0	13.93
24	Professor of Agriculture	69.9	12.31
26.5	Professor of Biology	69.7	12.57
26.5	Professor of Business	69.7	13.17
26.5	Professor of English	69.7	13.51
26.5	Professor of Humanities	69.7	13.85
29	Professor of Sociology	68.9	13.88
30	President, Faculty Senate	67.2	18.03
31	Professor of Education	67.0	14.52
32	University Legal Counsel	65.7	20.01
33	Associate Professor of Medicine	64.2	12.38
34	Commandant, ROTC	63.8	18.27
35	Associate Professor of Law	62.5	13.33
36	Associate Professor of Physics	62.3	12.74
37	Associate Professor of Engineering	62.0	12.12
38	Associate Professor of Mathematics	61.4	12.39
39	Director of Library	61.3	16.65
40	Associate Professor of Statistics	61.0	13.25
41	Associate Professor of Chemistry	60.9	11.96
42	Director of Computing Center	60.2	17.30
43	Associate Professor of Biology	60.0	12.42
44.5	Associate Professor of Economics	59.8	12.08

Table 2. continued

Rank	University Position*	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation of Means
44.5	Associate Professor of English	59.8	12.82
46	Physician, Student Health Center	59.7	19.49
47	Associate Professor of Agriculture	59.3	12.46
48.5	Associate Professor of Business	59.1	12.52
48.5	Associate Professor of History	59.1	13.12
50	Associate Professor of Humanities	59.0	13.26
51	Associate Professor of Sociology	58.7	13.31
52	Football Coach	58.1	21.70
53	Associate Professor of Education	57.6	13.81
54	Director, Alumni Association	55.3	22.25
55	Assistant Professor of Medicine	55.0	12.78
56	Member, Faculty Senate	53.2	18.42
57	Assistant Professor of Law	53.0	14.27
58	Assistant Professor of Physics	51.7	13.10
59	Assistant Professor of Statistics	51.3	13.77
60	Assistant Professor of Mathematics	51.0	12.58
61	Assistant Professor of Engineering	50.7	12.72
62	Assistant Professor of History	50.1	15.21
63	Assistant Professor of Chemistry	50.0	13.10
64	Assistant Professor of Biology	49.8	13.78

Table 2. continued

Rank	University Position*	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation of Ratings
65	Assistant Professor of Economics	49.5	13.55
66.5	Director, Buildings and Grounds	49.3	18.51
66.5	Assistant Professor of English	49.3	13.87
68	Assistant Professor of Humanities	49.2	14.25
69	Assistant Professor of Agriculture	48.8	14.17
70	Assistant Professor of Sociology	48.7	13.99
71	Assistant Professor of Business	48.5	13.93
72	Assistant Professor of Education	47.1	14.24
73	Secretary to the President	43.9	22.95
74	Track Coach	42.8	19.38
75	Assistant Football Coach	40.5	20.52
76	Librarian	40.0	18.80
77	Counselor, Student Counseling Center	39.0	19.36
78	Manager of Bookstore	38.0	16.04
79	Secretary to Dean	36.5	20.16
80	Computer System Analyst	36.4	17.34
81	Instructor	36.4	15.64
82	Nurse, Student Health Center	32.5	15.59
83	Computer Programmer	32.0	17.48
84	President of Student Government	31.8	21.71
85.5	Manager of Dining Hall	31.7	17.40
85.5	Secretary to Department Head	31.7	18.76
87	Graduate Student	29.9	18.29

Table 2. continued

Rank	University Position	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation of Ratings
88.5	Graduate Research Assistant	29.7	16.62
88.5	Graduate Teaching Assistant	29.7	16.16
90	Editor, Student Newspaper	26.7	19.57
91	Laboratory Technician	23.4	16.11
92	Glassblower, Chemistry Lab	22.8	16.64
93	Undergraduate Senior	21.4	17.73
94	Library Attendants & Assistants	21.3	14.46
95	Undergraduate Junior	18.3	15.83
96	Cashier	17.7	17.81
97	Undergraduate Sophomore	16.5	15.58
98	Typist	15.7	16.02
99	Electrician	15.3	14.53
100	Security Guard	14.4	15.44
101	Undergraduate Freshman	14.2	15.36
102	Carpenter	13.6	14.12
103	Mail Clerk	11.3	13.39
104	File Clerk	11.2	12.85
105	Painter	9.6	12.65
106	Truck Driver	8.5	13.47

Table 2. continued

Rank	University Position*	Mean Ratings	Standard Deviation of Ratings
107	Food Service Worker	7.2	10.88
108	Janitors and Sextons	5.9	10.91

* Exact title used as stimulus

Table 3. Correlations, Means and Standard Deviations of Prestige Ratings by Several University Groups

	Correlation Coefficients						
	T	A	F	Ac	As	I	S
T: All groups	1.00	.970	.990	.987	.992	.990	.993
A: Administrators		1.00	.946	.950	.976	.950	.960
F: Full Professor			1.00	.979	.976	.985	.977
Ac: Associate Prof.				1.00	.978	.980	.973
As: Assistant Prof.					1.00	.983	.978
I: Instructors						1.00	.976
S: Secretaries							1.00
Means	51.8	55.4	45.2	49.5	53.8	50.4	54.3
Standard Deviations	22.6	22.6	23.9	20.6	24.4	23.9	20.9

REFERENCES

Cartter, Allan M.

1966 An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Cole, Jonathan R., and Stephen Cole

1973 Social Stratification in Science. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Counts, George S.

1925 "The social status of occupations: A problem in vocational guidance." School Review 33:16-27.

Davis, Kingsley

1949 Human Society. New York: Macmillan.

Davis, Kingsley, and Wilbert E. Moore

1945 "Some principles of stratification." American Sociological Review 10:242-249.

Dykes, Archie

1970 "Presidential leadership in academe." Pp. 168-174 in Stanley Leher (ed.), Leaders, Teachers, and Learners in Academe. New York: Appleton-Century, Crofts.

Ellis, Robert A.

1962 "Three dimensions of status: A study of academic prestige." Pp. 189-200 in Norman F. Washburne (ed.), Decisions, Values, and Groups. New York: Pergamon Press.

Goldthorpe, John H., and Keith Hope

1974 The Social Grading of Occupations: A New Approach and Scale. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gross, Edward, and Paul V. Grambsch

1974 Changes in University Organization, 1964-1971. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hamblin, Robert L., and Carole R. Smith

1966 "Values, status, and professors." Sociometry 29:183-196.

Harmon, Lindsey R.

1963 "High school backgrounds of science doctorates. Science 133: 679-688.

Hauser, Robert M., and David L. Featherman

1977 The Process of Stratification: Trends and Analyses. New York: Academic Press.

Hodge, Robert W., Paul M. Siegel, and Peter H. Rossi

1964 Occupational prestige in the United States, 1925-63." American Journal of Sociology 70:286-302.

National Science Board

1973 Science Indicators 1972. Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation.

1975 Science Indicators 1974. Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation.

Reiss, Albert J.

1961 Occupations and Social Status. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Reskin, Barbara F.

1977 "Scientific productivity and the reward structure of science." American Sociological Review 42:491-504.

Roose, Kenneth D., and Charles J. Anderson

1970 A Rating of Graduate Programs. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Siegel, Paul M.

1970 "Occupational prestige in the Negro subculture." Pp. 156-171 in Edward O. Laumann (ed.), Social Stratification: Research and Theory for the 1970s. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

1971 Prestige in the American occupational structure. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

Smith, Mapheus

1943 "An empirical scale of prestige status of occupations." American Sociological Review 8:185-192.

Svalastoga, Kaare

1972 "The determination of occupational prestige." Unpublished paper, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Titmuss, R.

1962 Income Distribution and Social Change. London: Allen and Unwin.

U. S. Burea of the Census

1972 Census of Population:1970, Occupation by Industry, Final Report PC (2)-7C. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Zuckerman, Harriet

1970 "Stratification in American science." Pp.235-257 in Edward O. Laumann (ed,), Social Stratification: Research and Theory for the 1970s. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.