2011

Leadership Frames of College Presidents, Their Executive Cabinets, and Teams in Public and Not-for-Profit Master's Institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida

Richard B. Pagan
West Virginia University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Pagan, Richard B., "Leadership Frames of College Presidents, Their Executive Cabinets, and Teams in Public and Not-for-Profit Master's Institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida" (2011). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 3040.

<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/3040>

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

Leadership Frames of College Presidents, Their Executive Cabinets, and Teams in Public
and Not-for-Profit Master's Institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio,
Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida

Richard B. Pagan

Dissertation submitted to the
College of Human Resources and Education
at West Virginia University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Doctor of Education
in
Educational Leadership Studies

Approved by

Elizabeth Jones, Ph.D., Chair
Sebastian Diaz, Ph.D., J.D.
Ernest R. Goeres, Ph.D.
Mark A. Friend, Ed.D.
Gerald Bacza, Ed.D.

Department of Higher Education Leadership Studies

Morgantown, West Virginia
2011

Keywords: Leadership Frames, College Presidents, Higher Education Executive
Cabinets, Teams

Copyright 2011 Richard B. Pagan

ABSTRACT

Leadership Frames of College Presidents, Their Executive Cabinets, and Teams in Public and Not-for-Profit Master's Institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida

Richard B. Pagan

This study investigated leadership frames of college presidents and members of their executive cabinets (vice presidents for academic affairs, vice presidents for student affairs, and chief financial officers) to determine their predominant leadership frame(s). It also determined if the leadership frames of the presidents' group and the cabinet members' group diverged or converged. Public and not-for-profit master's degree granting institutions, large, medium, and small, in the states of West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida participated in this study. Of the 384 senior administrators that were invited to participate, 147 completed Bolman & Deal's Leadership Orientation (Self) (1990) questionnaire. The survey instrument consisted of 32 items measuring the four leadership frames espoused by Bolman & Deal. The instrument was formatted electronically using SurveyMonkey and sent via electronic mail to each participant. Frequencies and descriptive statistics were used in analyzing the mean scores of leadership frames of the individual participants and as groups. Analyses of variance (ANOVA) were used between groups to determine if significant differences existed in each of the leadership frames. Tables graphically displayed the results in answering each research question. Demographic information was collected and analyzed to determine gender, administrative roles, and years in administrative role. The findings indicated that presidents often operated as multi-framed leaders with no significant differences regarding years in role and leadership frames. Additionally presidents had mean scores above 4 out of a possible 5 in the political, symbolic, and structural frames. Cabinet members saw similar results. All operated as multi-frame leaders at times, but tended to operate in the human resource, political, and structural frames with their mean scores supporting the results. In comparing leadership frames between groups, two significant differences were found. Presidents significantly more often used the political ($p = .013$) and symbolic ($p = .003$) frames than did their cabinet members.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to all those involved in making this dissertation project a reality. I could not have completed this project if it were not for your support, advice, and patience.

To Dr. Richard Hartnett who inspired me and guided me into identifying my research topic and whom I shared a common interest in running. Your directness in steering me on the right path was essential.

To my committee members for their support, advice, and guidance ensuring that I not deviate from the path set before me. Dr. Elizabeth Jones for stepping in and volunteering to serve as my committee chair. I thank you. Your wisdom, insight, and belief in me to be able to complete this project are deeply appreciated. You went above and beyond in working with me the weeks before the defense. Dr. Sebastian Diaz, a wizard in statistics, I thank you for your support and for working with me in analyzing the data and for your sound advice and recommendations concerning the appropriate research methodology for this project. Your support and comments were invaluable. Gracias amigo. To Dr. Ernest Goeres, although I was not fortunate of being one of your students in class, I was a student and learned from you when we met to discuss the project. Your wisdom and humor helped me to continue forward and to take time to enjoy the journey – I felt fortunate to have you on my committee. Dr. Mark Friend, meeting you in Florida and finding out you were from Fairmont was not a mere coincidence. Your friendship and encouragement are greatly appreciated. Every time I stopped in to visit you in Florida, I always left feeling motivated and inspired to move forward. And, Dr. Gerald Bacza, thank you. I've known you for 14 years now and consider you indeed a friend and trusted colleague. Your enthusiasm is contagious and pushed me forward to finishing this dissertation. I value our friendship.

I would also like to express my thanks to my father and mother, who always believed in me and provided a shining example, to my brother and sisters and me, of doing the best you can to succeed. A special thank you to my mother, although she is not

here today to witness this milestone in my life, I know she can see me from above. I miss you. Thank you, Mom.

To my five children, Vincent, Derek, Rebekah, Joel, and Lorissa. Thank you for your love and for giving up of your time to enable me to work on this project. Besides your beautiful Mother, you guys are the reason for living. I love you all so much.

To my beautiful wife Patricia, thank you. Without your love, belief in me, support, and encouragement, this project would never have been finished. You are the reason why I have made it this far. Your consistent encouragement and uplifting words propelled me forward. I am the richest man in the world. I thank God for you. You are the absolute best. We did this together.

Lastly, to my heavenly Father, thank you. You gave me the hunger and desire to learn, the passion to explore, the strength to endure, and the encouragement and motivation to succeed.

Thank you all.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Tables.....	viii
List of Figures.....	x
Chapter One: Introduction of the Study.....	1
Background of the Study.....	1
Statement of Problem.....	5
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Research Questions.....	6
Significance of the Study.....	7
Delimitations of the Study.....	8
Definition of Terms.....	8
Proposal Structure.....	12
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	13
Defining Leadership.....	13
Leadership vs. Management.....	14
Leadership Models.....	15
Bolman & Deal's Four-Frame Leadership Model.....	26

Research Using Bolman & Deal's Four-Frame Leadership Model...	32
Constructing the College Presidency: College Presidents' Images of Their Leadership Roles, A Comparative Study.....	34
Leadership Challenges in Higher Education.....	38
Leadership Teams.....	39
Summary.....	46
Chapter Three: Research Methodology.....	47
Introduction.....	47
Research Methodology.....	47
Institutional Approval.....	48
Procedures.....	49
Target Population and Sample.....	49
Demographics.....	50
Instrument.....	50
Bolman & Deal (Self) Orientation Questionnaire.....	50
Anonymity.....	51
Data Analysis.....	52
Limitations to the Study.....	54
Summary.....	54
Chapter Four: Results of the Study.....	55
Gender of Participants by Administrative Role.....	56

Number of Years in Current Administrative Role.....	58
Research Question One.....	59
Research Question Two.....	61
Research Question Three.....	63
Research Question Four.....	65
Research Question Five.....	67
Research Question Six.....	70
Research Question Seven.....	76
Chapter Five: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	85
Summary of the Study.....	85
Conclusions.....	87
Gender.....	87
Role.....	87
Experience in Role.....	87
Predominant Frames of Presidents.....	87
Predominant Frames of Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs.....	87
Predominant Frames of Vice Presidents for Student Affairs.....	88
Predominant Frames of Chief Financial Officers.....	88
Differences among Presidents Based on Years	

Experience.....	88
Differences among Cabinet Members Based on Years Experience.....	89
Differences between College or University Presidents and Cabinet Members Leadership Frames.....	90
Recommendations.....	92
Recommendations for Practice.....	92
Recommendations for Further Research.....	93
References.....	95
Appendices.....	100
A. Bolman & Deal's Leadership Orientation (Self) Instrument.....	100
B. Demographic Questions on SurveyMonkey.....	103
C. Letter of Request to Dr. Lee Bolman.....	104
D. Letter by Dr. Bolman Granting Permission.....	105
E. First Email Letter to Participants.....	106
F. Letter Inviting Participants.....	107
G. Second Email Letter to Participants.....	109

List of Tables

Table 2-1	Overview of the Four-Frame Model.....	27
Table 2-2	Four Interpretations of Organizational Process.....	31
Table 2-3	Differences Between Groups and Teams.....	40
Table 3-1	Research Questions and Procedural Methods Used.....	52
Table 4-1	Gender of Participants.....	56
Table 4-2	Gender of Presidents.....	57
Table 4-3	Gender of Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs.....	57
Table 4-4	Gender of Vice Presidents for Student Affairs.....	57
Table 4-5	Gender of Chief Financial Officers.....	58
Table 4-6	Gender – Other Roles.....	58
Table 4-7	Time in Current Administrative Position.....	59
Table 4-8	Mean Frames Scores of Individual Presidents.....	60
Table 4-9	Composite Mean Frames Scores of College and University Presidents.....	61
Table 4-10	Mean Frames Scores of Individual Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs.....	62
Table 4-11	Composite Mean Frames Scores of Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs.....	63
Table 4-12	Mean Frames Scores of Individual Vice Presidents for Student Affairs.....	64

Table 4-13	Composite Mean Frames Scores of Vice Presidents for Student Affairs.....	65
Table 4-14	Mean Frames Scores of Individual Chief Financial Officers.....	66
Table 4-15	Composite Mean Frames Scores of Chief Financial Officers.....	67
Table 4-16	Number of Years as College or University President.....	67
Table 4-17	Presidents' Structural Frame Scores by Years in Role.....	68
Table 4-18	Presidents' Human Resource Frame Scores by Years in Role.....	69
Table 4-19	Presidents' Political Frame Scores by Years in Role.....	70
Table 4-20	Presidents' Symbolic Frame Scores by Years in Role.....	71
Table 4-21	Structural Frame Mean Scores by Role and Years.....	73
Table 4-22	Human Resource Frame Mean Scores by Role and Years.....	75
Table 4-23	Political Frame Mean Scores by Role and Years.....	77
Table 4-24	Symbolic Frame Mean Scores by Role and Years.....	79
Table 4-25	Structural Frame Means Comparison.....	81
Table 4-26	Human Resource Means Comparison.....	82
Table 4-27	Political Frame Means Comparison.....	83
Table 4-28	Symbolic Frame Means Comparison.....	84

List of Figures

Figure 2-1	SLT Managerial Grid.....	23
------------	--------------------------	----

Chapter One:

Introduction of the Study

Background of the Study

Leadership has been the subject of scholarly study since Plato and represents a major field of study within higher education. Plato emphasized the roles of knowledge, rationality, and ethics in the *Republic*. He stated that wise leaders had the knowledge and skill to morally wield power and authority (Samier, 2008). Later in the sixteenth century, Machiavelli stated that right leaders had an understanding of what surrounded them. They were realistic and prepared for changes in their surroundings. Unafraid to act accordingly, as “foxes” or “lions” the Machiavellian leader adapted to changing conditions (Samier, 2008). In the twenty-first century, we find that leadership has been studied and researched extensively, specifically over the last two decades in higher education (Chrisyie & Lingard, 2001). Studies in higher education have focused primarily on the leadership of university presidents and department chairs. Estela Bensimon, Anna Newmann, Robert Birnbaum, and William Tierney, and numerous others have conducted studies on public two-year community colleges and four-year universities. Focusing on the behaviors, traits, and leadership styles of presidents and department chairs, the underlying assumption about these studies is the affect their leadership has had on their institutions’ organizational life.

The goal of this study is to focus on frames and their application in higher education leadership teams of public master’s degree granting colleges and universities in the states of West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida. The researcher will try to develop an integrated understanding of higher education leadership using Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal’s frames model within the context of presidential teams. The study identified the predominant frames of senior leadership within higher education institutions to determine if they are multi-frame (MF), paired-frame (PF), or single-frame (SF). It identified the predominant frames

of each of the college presidents and key members of their executive cabinets. Additionally, the study investigated if the predominant frames of the executive cabinets diverged or converged from those of their presidents.

As stated earlier, this study will delve into the leadership styles of college presidents and their teams using Bolman and Deal's four-frame leadership model. The four frames are structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. Using the four-frames allows leaders in various organizations to view problems or dilemmas from different angles or perspectives. The flexibility of viewing situations from different perspectives, that is using the four-frames, is the art of reframing. A multi-frame leader is one that is flexible in his or her thinking, he or she is a "re-framer". A multi-framed leader has learned to apply all four frames and by doing so has developed a deeper appreciation and understanding of his or her organization (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p15). Paired-framed individuals view the world from two perspectives. Often one frame is dominant over the other. Single-framed individuals address problems from one perspective. Single-framed leaders and managers have not learned to be flexible in their thinking and typically resort to what's worked for them in the past when faced with any given problem. This study strived to determine if college presidents and each of their cabinet members are multi-frame (MF), paired-frame (PF), or single-frame (SF) leaders.

Leadership in higher education should not solely be based on the personal leadership college or university presidents' provide, but on the combined leadership of the presidents and the people that they surround themselves with. Quite often, it is the president of the college that is viewed as the leader and is praised or criticized for his leadership. This study addressed how college presidents and their cabinet members predominant frames can compliment each other so as to function as leadership teams. By addressing each of the predominant leadership frames of each president and of each member of their executive cabinet, the predominant leadership frame of each of the individual teams can then be determined using the four-frame model. These presidential teams will be categorized as MF, PF, or SF. Presidential teams for this study will consist

of the college president, the vice president for academic affairs (VPAA), the vice president of student affairs (VPSA), and the chief financial officer (CFO).

In their book, *Redesigning Collegiate Leadership: Teams and Teamwork in Higher Education*, Estela Bensimon and Anna Neumann (1991) addressed issues surrounding the effective use of presidential teams. They describe team functions as being either “real,” that is working together collectively in meeting the goals and objectives of their respective institutions or “illusory,” teams that function in a utilitarian fashion whereby the college president is seen as the primary individual making decisions for the institution and the cabinet serves at the will and pleasure of the president.

However, presidential teams to be effective must function as real teams and not illusory, that is using their teams in a utilitarian manner. The president should not “go it alone” but should count on his team for the effective operation of the institution (Bensimon & Neumann, 1991). People need leaders that can provide information, are accessible, can provide resources, are trusting, and provide follow-through. (Wheatley, 2000). Leaders must realize that it is not about them, as leaders, but about ensuring that the organization understands itself (Wheatley, 2000). Leadership in higher education should not be about a single individual, but about forming teams that will enable the institution at large to fulfill its goals and mission effectively. It is about caring, relationships, and what we do. It should never be about a position or title ((Kouzes & Posner, 2003).

These roles are often assumed by faculty that have had little to no formal training in leadership (Whitsett, 2007). This often leads to ineffective leaders and managers. Mentoring programs, such as the administrative fellowship program developed by the academic affairs department of the University of Northern Colorado, do exist with the purpose of developing future administrators (Strathe & Wilson, 2006). Similar leadership programs are being developed in other institutions as well, but are not the mainstay for developing future higher education leaders.

Future and current leaders should possess certain qualities or attributes to be effective. The notion that a faculty member is next in line for a leadership position should

not be the only criteria for selecting a leader; one must consider other qualities. Hockaday and Puyear, (2000) identified nine traits needed to be an effective leader. These traits are vision, integrity, confidence, courage, possessing technical knowledge, effective collaborators, persistence, practice good judgment, and a desire to lead. But, to be effective, college presidents and their teams need more than leadership traits or attributes.

To be effective college presidents and their teams must exercise “good” leadership. Leadership that encompasses clear bureaucratic structures, exert charismatic influence, maneuvers coalitions, and builds human communities (Bensimon & Neumann, 1990). It is the president that articulates a clear vision to the team, defines its agenda, and facilitates the team’s work processes, enabling the team to not only assist the president in a utilitarian function, but in expressive and cognitive functions as well. According to Bensimon and Neumann “real” teams function in such a way to incorporate all three functions. Teams exercising an expressive function have a strong sense of connectedness among its members. Those operating in a cognitive function allow team members to enlarge their intelligence by enabling the team to act as a creative system (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993). This idea of promoting participatory leadership is referred to as self-managed teams (Wheatley, 2000). The interaction among presidential team members, in terms of their individual leadership styles and roles, must mesh to create a form of collective leadership that is best suited for their organization, one that will enable the team to be able to meet challenges effectively, and yet fulfill the objectives of their institutions. By reframing, those in higher education leadership roles will be flexible in their thinking gaining a keener insight into their organizations.

Universities and colleges have a vested interest in leadership, especially in a time when financial resources and state appropriations are drastically dwindling. With the escalation of tuition and attendance costs and greater demands of accountability from the public, those serving in senior leadership positions face challenges that are new to higher education. They must be multi-framed thinkers.

Statement of the Problem

The study investigated the leadership frames of college presidents and their executive cabinet members to determine if they are multi-framed, paired-framed, or single-framed and to determine if a significant difference exists with the predominant frames of college presidents and those of the executive cabinet members. It identified the predominant frames of each of the major groups of administrators that participated in the study. As teams, college and university presidents and their key cabinet members must work as teams. It is imperative that these teams work collectively not for the good of one individual, but for the good of the institution. This is the essence of multi-frame teams.

Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal, in their book *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership* (2003), described frames as the windows that allow leaders to view situations from different perspectives. These lenses enable leaders to look at circumstances differently. By “reframing,” that is applying a different frame or perspective to a given situation or problem, they can better diagnose and develop strategies to move forward in determining the optimum solution.

The researcher aimed to identify these perspectives among the leaders participating in this study. The purpose of this study was to identify those leadership frames that are predominant among leaders and key staff members. How leaders perceive situations surrounding their institutions and how they resolve problems can have a lasting effect on the institution even long after they have gone. The vitality or demise of the institution often rests upon leadership (Walker, 1999).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the predominant frames of each college president and of each key member (Vice President of Academic Affairs, Vice President of Student Affairs, and Chief Financial Officers). The study also identified the predominant frames of each role to determine if they converged or diverged from the predominant frame(s) of the presidents.

Determining predominant frames of each participant was accomplished by having each of them complete the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientations Questionnaire (Self) (1990). The participants completed the questionnaires electronically using SurveyMonkey and the data was collected and analyzed to determine each of the participants' leadership frames.

The study was conducted in higher education institutions in the states of West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida that met the Carnegie classification of Master's Colleges and Universities in all three categories of larger, medium, and smaller programs (Carnegie Foundation, 2005). As defined by the Carnegie Classification System, this included institutions that award a minimum of 50 master's degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees per year. Demographic information was also included of each for the participants of the study.

This study investigated the research questions listed below.

Research Questions

1. What are the predominant frames of presidents of public and not-for-profit master's degree awarding institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida?
2. What are the predominant frames of vice-presidents of academic affairs of public and not-for-profit master's degree awarding institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida?
3. What are the predominant frames of vice-presidents of student affairs of public and not-for-profit master's degree awarding institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida?
4. What are the predominant frames of chief financial officers of public and not-for-profit master's degree awarding institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida?

5. Are there significant differences in the presidents' leadership frames by number of years experience in the administrative role?
6. Are there significant differences in the cabinets' members' leadership frames by numbers of years experience in their administrative roles?
7. Are there significant differences between the presidents' leadership frames and the cabinet members?

No comparative studies addressing frames of presidential teams of master's colleges and universities have been conducted in the past of institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida. This study provides a comparative analysis to determine if significant differences in leadership frames existed among the selected academic leaders participating in this study.

Significance of the Study

The importance of this study is threefold. First of all, understanding the leadership frames and identifying the predominant frames of higher education leaders can provide insight into their leadership styles. Secondly, the predominant frames among the team members can provide a deeper understanding on how they relate to their college president's leadership style by identifying whether they converge or diverge from the predominant frames of the president. The significance of understanding whether the predominant frames of each of the executive cabinet members converge or diverge from those of the presidents will provide a clearer understanding of the relationship that exists among them and if they are functioning as multi-frame teams.

The results of this study may prove to be a catalyst for future studies aimed at exploring leadership frames and their application in higher education leadership. A thorough investigation of multi-frame leaders and their leadership teams can give further revelation into how teams function in higher education institutions.

Delimitations of the Study

The delimitations of the study are listed here:

1. The sample size represents only public and not-for-profit master's degree granting institutions in the states of West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida and as such may not be reflective of higher education institutions as a whole.
2. Those participating in the study were selected from the presidential leadership teams of the presidents and did not include all of the members. Only the president and three of his/her executive cabinet members participated.
3. The study is based on the answers provided by each of the participants from the electronic survey instrument. It is hoped that the answers provided were both sincere and honest.

Definition of Terms

Based on the intent of this study, several terms were used and are defined here:

1. Four Frames Model: The model developed by Terrence E. Deal and Lee G. Bolman that is based on flexible thinking using four frames to view problems, dilemmas, and situations. The four frames are structural, human resource, political, and symbolic.
2. Reframing: the art of viewing situations and problems from different perspectives utilizing the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames.
3. Structural frame: a framework based on the belief that the right formal arrangements will result in minimal problems and maximum performance. Its six core assumptions are:
 - a. Organizations exist to achieve established goals and objectives.
 - b. Organizations increase efficiency and enhance performance through specialization and a clear division of labor.
 - c. Appropriate forms of coordination and control ensure that diverse

efforts of individual and units mesh.

- d. Organizations work best when rationality prevails over personal preferences and extraneous pressures.
 - e. Structures must be designed to fit an organization's circumstances (including its goals, technology, workforce, and environment).
 - f. Problems and performance gaps arise from structural deficiencies and can be remedied through analysis and restructuring.
4. Human Resource Frame: a framework based on people as the heart of an organization and as such if the needs and personal goals of the people are met those of the organizations will be met as well. It emphasizes support and empowerment. The four core assumptions are:
- a. Organizations exist to serve human needs rather than the reverse.
 - b. People and organizations need each other. Organizations need ideas, energy, and talent; people need careers, salaries, and opportunities.
 - c. When the fit between individual and group is poor, one or both suffer. Individuals are exploited or exploit the organization - or both become victims.
 - d. A good fit benefits both. Individuals find meaningful and satisfying work, and organizations get the talent and energy they need to succeed.
5. Political Frame: this framework has its base on the political realities of organizations consisting of power, conflict, and coalition. Its five propositions are:
- a. Organizations are coalitions of diverse individuals and interest groups.
 - b. There are enduring differences among coalition members in values, beliefs and perceptions of reality.
 - c. Most important decisions involve allocating scarce resources – who gets what.
 - d. Scarce resources and enduring differences make conflict central to the

organizational dynamics that underline power as the most important asset.

- e. Goals and decisions emerge from bargaining, negotiation, and jockeying for position among competing stakeholders.
6. Symbolic Frame: this framework is based on the organization's distinctive culture. It asserts that over time organizations develop distinctive values, beliefs, artifacts, and practices. The assumptions are:
 - a. What is most important is not what happens but what it means.
 - b. Activity and meaning are loosely coupled; events have multiple meanings because people interpret experience differently.
 - c. In the face of widespread uncertainty and ambiguity, people create symbols to resolve confusion, increase predictability, find direction, and anchor hope and faith.
 - d. Many events and processes are most important for what is expressed than what is produced. They form a cultural tapestry of secular myths, heroes, and heroines, rituals, ceremonies, and stories that help people find purpose and passion in their personal and work lives.
 - e. Culture is the glue that holds an organization together and unites people around shared values and beliefs.
 7. College President: an individual that was appointed or elected to preside over a college or university. This individual supervises the college or university and reports regularly to a Board of Governors or Trustees. The college president serves as the chief executive officer of the institution.
 8. Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA): an administrative officer who holds high rank and is concerned with the curriculum, faculty appointments, and academic affairs of the institution.
 9. Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA): the officer that provides leadership for promoting the academic, personal, and professional development and growth of the institution's student body. This individual

oversees programs that provide advocacy, development and coordination of extra or co-curricular initiatives, and services and activities.

10. Chief Financial Officer (CFO): the corporate executive with the financial authority to make appropriations and authorize expenditures for the institution.
11. Team: a number of persons associated in some joint action.
12. Presidential Team: a team consisting of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Student Affairs, Vice President for Fiscal Affairs, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, and others as appointed by the college or university president.
13. Real Team: teams that function in all three domains of utilitarian, expressive, and cognitive.
14. Utilitarian function: used as a formal structure for achieving rational organization and for maintaining control institutional functioning. It is purposive and task oriented in activities such as providing information, coordinating and planning, and making decisions.
15. Expressive function: a social structure aimed at team members' needs for collegial relations and affiliation as well the president's needs for counsel and commitment.
16. Cognitive function: the most complex of the functions; members within a team are collectively involved in perceiving, analyzing, learning, and thinking. It is the most challenging and most problematic function to develop within a team.

Proposal Structure

The study begins with an introduction of leadership, leadership frames, its importance in higher education, and leadership teams. The problem statement is defined and the purpose of the study is expressed. Key research questions, the significance of the study, and key terms and definitions are presented.

The literature review begins with defining “leadership”. It moves into espousing different leadership theories and styles. It then moves into Lee Bolman and Terrence Deal’s leadership frames describing in detail the four frames of structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. A review of research that incorporated Bolman and Deal’s leadership frame model is provided focusing primarily on studies dealing in education. A thorough review of Anna Neumann’s and Estella Bensimon’s study of *Constructing the College Presidency* follows and is included providing an understanding of real teams and their function.

Chapter three describes the research methodology used for this study. The chapter reviews the approach used for this study and justifies why this approach is appropriate. Included in this chapter are the selected participants, instruments, procedures, and the data analysis used. A demographic description of the college presidents and their presidential teams is presented in terms of gender, role, and total years in current position. The chapter concludes with a summary of the data.

A detail description and explanation of the findings of the study is given in chapter four. Each of the research questions introduced in chapter one is answered based on the findings.

Finally, a summary of the study, its findings, applications, and recommendations are discussed in chapter five.

Chapter Two:

Literature Review

This literature review examines leadership and leadership frames to include the following topics: an operative definition of leadership, a comparison between leadership and management, leadership theories, a detailed description of Bolman and Deal's four frame leadership model, research using Bolman and Deal's leadership model, a thorough review of Anna Neumann's and Estela Bensimon's study entitled *Constructing the Presidency: College Presidents' Images of Their Leadership Roles, A Comparative Study*, challenges facing higher education leadership, and leadership teams.

Defining Leadership

We will begin first by defining leadership. Is leadership simply an individual taking charge and guiding others when no one else will? Or is it an individual with the title of "the boss" and because of this person's position as an authoritative figure, he or she demands that subordinates follow their lead without question? Leadership is more than taking action when no one else will or being the boss.

Leadership in itself is ambiguous, it is difficult to define. It has different meanings for different people. It is a concept that is defined by individual perspectives (Fincher, 1987). For some, it can be a person that steps up when no one else will or a person with authority. However, it is not simply taking charge or having power and authority. Power, for example, can come from sources such as money, position, or control. An example distinguishing power from leadership is that of a military dictator (Gardner, 2000). A dictator may have power but may not have leadership qualities. Having legitimate authority is not leadership either. Legitimized authority is nothing more than legitimized power (Gardner, 2000). A police officer has legitimate authority that is granted to him or her by the state, county or municipality in which the officer has jurisdiction, but that in itself does not indicate that the police officer is a leader. Leadership can include having

power and authority, but it is much more. It is an influential interaction between people. Bass states that leadership is “an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves a structuring or restructuring of the situation and the perceptions and expectations of the members” (Robles, 1998, p. 2). Burns defines it using the platform of purpose or collective needs (Burns, 1987). John Gardner in his article “The Nature of Leadership,” puts it this way, leadership is “the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers (Gardner, 2000).” Leadership involves interaction between those that lead and those that follow. It is the leader that determines how he or she will “influence” others to follow, either passively or coercively. Howard Gardner defines a leader as “an individual (or, rarely, a set of individuals), who significantly affects the thoughts, feelings, and/or behaviors of a significant number of individuals” (Gardner, 1995). For this study, leadership is defined as the actions of an individual or group of individuals, having a position of authority that influences the behaviors of others in their realm of influence to perform a particular function, goal or objective.

Leadership vs. Management

Leadership is not synonymous with management. There is a distinction between the two. They are not the same although some elements of each may exist in both. According to John Gardner, leaders think long term, and have an understanding of their department and its relationship within the larger organization. They reach out to constituents, they emphasize vision, values, and motivation, they have political skills, and they think in terms of restructuring their department or organization to meet the ever changing times (Gardner, 1990). Leaders concerned themselves with the direction of the group (Hackman & Johnson, 2000) and strive do the right thing (Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

Managers, on the other hand, are involved in the daily activities of coordinating and supporting the functions of the organization (Day, 2001). They are involved in the daily maintenance of the organization, such as directing processes, implementing

policies, allocating resources, and directing and managing people. Managers are more likely to tend to the status quo (Hackman & Johnson, 2000). They are individuals who do things right (Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

Leadership is about providing guidance into how goals and objectives are to be met, while management is concerned with the daily operations, functions, and activities of an organization.

Leadership Models

It is evident that we have had leaders that some would consider to be great and others as poor. We have all probably experienced both in our lives in areas such as our workplaces, churches, and within our communities. But what makes a leader great? And what do we look for in a leader? The age old question “Are leaders born or made?” has yet to be answered. Some believe that great leaders are born with certain leadership abilities and skills, and that these are intuitive and instinctive. Others propose that leadership is a concept that can be learned through developing skills and abilities and by studying leadership theories, models, and conceptualizations. John Maxwell (1993), in his book *Developing the Leader Within You* lists four categories of leaders: the leading leader; the learned leader; the latent leader; and the limited leader. He states that the leading leader is born with certain leadership qualities and the materials for making of a great leader, the learned leader has learned leadership through training and mentoring, the latent leader has recently seen leadership modeled and is learning to become a leader, and the limited leader is one who has had little to no exposure to leaders, but has the desire and willingness to become a leader (Maxwell, 1993).

Taking a historical view of past leaders may help in answering the question of whether leaders are born or made. Some consider leaders such as Napoleon Bonaparte, President Ronald Reagan, Mother Theresa, and General Electric (GE) Corporation’s former CEO, Jack Welch as great leaders. Others consider leaders such as Saddam Hussein, Jimmy Carter, and even Larry Summers to be less than effective leaders.

Napoleon Bonaparte was one of history's greatest military leaders and the ruler of France. He instituted major reforms including centralized administration of the departments, higher education, a tax code, road and sewer systems, and the country's first central bank. Ronald Reagan, actor turned Governor of California and President of the United States, was the founder of Reaganomics, and "trickle-down" economics. He is one of the few presidents that has had a high approval rating and has been credited with bringing the United States back to its superpower status. Mother Teresa was a Nobel Prize winner and known throughout the world as one of the greatest and humblest humanitarians. She ministered to lepers and the poor in the slums of Calcutta and taught school for 17 years. Jack Welch turned fledgling GE around, making it one of the world's most innovative and prosperous leaders in manufacturing and technology. During his tenure as CEO of GE the market value of the company increased from \$14 billion to \$410 billion in 2004.

On the other hand, Saddam Hussein was a military dictator who governed Iraq using fear, tyranny, and coercion. Former President Jimmy Carter is known for his poor handling of inflation, the country's energy crisis, the war in Afghanistan, and the debacle of the Iran hostage situation. Larry Summers, former president of Harvard, essentially resigned because Harvard's faculty did not follow his leadership even after five years of bringing a new vitality and vision into Harvard under his leadership. The faculty called for his dismissal after he made negative comments about female science professors. These examples of leaders do not provide us with a definitive answer of whether great leaders are born or made. However, research into leadership, particularly in the twentieth century has led to three popular theories; traits, behavioral, and contingency.

Traits theory. It was thought in the early twentieth century that leaders had certain physical and psychological characteristics that prepared them for leadership roles (Hackman & Johnson, 2004). In a study conducted by Ralph Stogdill in 1948 of leaders from a 43 year period, he came to the conclusion that leaders did not become leaders because they had innate abilities or certain physical attributes, but rather that they

reflected their relationship with their followers (Hackman, et. al, 2004). During the 1970s, however, he reviewed 163 trait studies and found that among the studies leaders did possess certain characteristics such as: vigor and persistence in pursuing goals, drive for responsibility and task completion, initiative, self-confidence, willingness to accept consequences and tolerate frustration, and lastly the ability to influence others' behavior (Stodgill, 1981). These leadership characteristics were later cited by Bensimon (1998) as confidence, courage, fairness, respect for the opinions of others, and sensitivity. One can determine that it would be impossible to develop an all inclusive list of leadership characteristics and traits. However, Jago (1982) stated that the more leadership qualities a person possesses, the more likely that person will be an effective leader.

Traits theorists studied leaders by observing which leadership characteristics they possessed, but did not measure leadership effectiveness (Bass, 1990). Determining whether a leader was effective based on the leadership traits he or she possessed was rather subjective. Trying to connect a specific leadership trait to leadership effectiveness was not possible (Fisher, Tack, & Wheeler, 1988). Situational factors were overlooked. Traits theories continue to influence leadership because some employers still look for individuals that possess certain leadership traits to fulfill leadership roles, specifically in higher education.

Behavioral theories: Transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire leadership constructs. J.M. Burns developed the theory behind transactional and transformational leadership in 1979 (Spinelli, 2006). Factors associated with transactional leadership are completion, compliance, and clarification as opposed to those of transformational leadership which are charisma, consideration, and creativity (Friedman, 2004). Transactional leadership is based on providing instructions or assigning tasks with a clear understanding that compliance in completing the tasks is of grave importance. It is a style of leadership wherein employees or subordinates follow “orders” without question – much like the style used by the military. The idea is based on

the premise that an employee will perform the job with an exchange of payment for the work performed. The factors of clarification, completion and compliance are essential for getting the work done. A transactional leader expects employees, subordinates, or followers to do the assigned task or job without question. The relationship between the supervisor and employee is one in which a transaction has taken place (Friedman, 2004). There has been an exchange between the two. The supervisor provides the instructions or assigns the task with explicit instructions and the employee must then understand, complete, and comply with the assigned task. It can be active or passive and does involve a contingent reward basis. Bernard Bass stated that transactional leadership is based upon contingent reinforcement, (Waldman, Bass & Einstein, 1987).

Transformational leadership is based on developing followers to reach higher potentials. It has a psychological platform rooted in meeting the needs of people as part of the organization. It fosters the growth of both leader and follower. Similar to Maslow's *Hierarchy of Needs*, after one's physical and safety needs have been satisfied, transformational leadership espouses to meet the esteem, and to some degree self-actualization needs of followers (Jones, 2004). Esteem needs such as praise, having pride, confidence, and feelings of importance and appreciation are needs that can be satisfied by the transformational leader. Developing followers to reach a certain performance level or mastery in their areas of expertise are examples of attaining self-actualization that can be reached through the involvement of the transformational leader. An example of fulfilling such needs in higher education is through faculty development endeavors wherein faculty are afforded the opportunity to attend seminars and conferences for developing mastery and confidence in their disciplines. It is the transformational leader who through his or her leadership can see the benefits in investing in their followers so as to fulfill the goals and objectives of the organization in working towards the organization's vision. Leaders who employ the factors of transformational leadership produce within their followers positive organizational outcomes (Barbuto & Burbach, 2006).

In a study conducted by Thomas D. Kane and Trueman R. Tremble (2000), of United States Army leaders, transformational leadership as compared to transactional leadership promoted behaviors of subordinates of admiration, respect, trust, and motivation and commitment to goals and visions. The report went on to state that it also promoted innovation and creativity among individual followers (Kane & Tremble, 2000). It is a style of leadership that motivates followers to capture the vision of the leader. Three assumptions of transformational leadership according to ChangingMinds.com are 1) people will always follow a person who inspires them, 2) a person with vision and passion can achieve great things, and 3) the way to get things done is by injecting enthusiasm and energy (ChangingMinds.com, 2006). Based on the factors in the study conducted by Avolio, et al., three factors characterized transformational leadership - 1) charisma/inspirational, 2) intellectual stimulation, and 3) individualized consideration. In yet another study conducted by S.A. Masood, S.S. Dani, N.D. Burns, and C.J. Backhouse, that focused on leadership styles and their affect on organizations and the effect that organizational cultures have on leadership, provided a synopsis based on Bass (1985) on the characteristics that a transformational leader typically possesses. The study stated that transformational leaders have attributes such as good visioning, use rhetorical and impression management skills, and establish strong emotional bonds with their followers. Notice the relationship here between the transformational leader and the follower. The leader is employing both charisma and inspiration to sway followers to capture his or her vision. It is not a transaction. The follower decides that he or she wants to participate in the vision espoused by the leader. It is not a matter of exchanging services for pay, but one of becoming a part of the organization. The study cited Burns (1979) in which Burns stated “leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation” (Masood, et al.).

Bass (1985) proposed eight original factors that are prevalent in transformational as well as transactional leadership. These factors are charisma, intellectual stimulation, inspirational, contingent rewards, individualized consideration, management-by-

exception, and laissez-faire (Avolio, Bass, & Jong, 1999). Later, in 1988, his conceptualization of these factors were reduced to six, removing charisma and inspirational leadership (Avolio, et al.). He conducted a study of 198 field Army officers and he was able to extract six of the original eight leadership factors. These factors were categorized as three transformational, two transactional, and one avoidance or laissez-faire. The study measured how subordinates rated their superior officers' leadership styles. It is a study that could be applied in higher education institutions for determining the multifactor leadership styles of administrators in higher education. Avolio, Bass, and Jong designed a study using the six factors as prescribed by Bass in the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire. The six factors are defined as follows (Avolio, Bass, & Jong 1999) as:

1. Charisma/Inspirational: providing followers with a clear sense of purpose that is energizing, is a role model for ethical conduct and builds identification with the leader and his or her articulated vision.
2. Intellectual Stimulation: gets followers to question the tried and true ways of solving problems, and encourages them to question the methods they use to improve upon them.
3. Individualized Consideration: focuses on understanding the needs of each follower and works continuously to get them to develop their full potential.
4. Contingent Reward: clarifies what is expected from followers and what they will receive if they meet expected levels of performance.
5. Active-Management-by-Exception: focuses on monitoring task execution for any problems that might arise and correcting those problems to maintain current performance levels.
6. Passive-Avoidant Leadership: tends to react only after problems have become serious to take corrective action, and often avoids making any decisions at all.

The transactional construct will employ two of the factors defined above; contingent reward and active-management-by-exception. Both transactional and transformational leadership are what is considered to be *active* leadership whereas

laissez-faire is *passive*. The distinction between the two is that active leadership seeks to develop its followers and promotes active relationships, stimulates intellectualism, and fosters increased performance. Passive leadership is reactionary - that is leadership may only respond when problems arise (Avolio, et al.) In a higher education academic setting passive leadership styles could be problematic.

The implications of transactional leadership in higher education administrations can be detrimental to the institution in meeting its goals and objectives successfully. Faculty members are often known to be autonomous and at times display a sense of anarchy whenever they are mandated to comply with certain policies, without their input. Higher education institutions tend to be loosely coupled. Faculty express academic freedom by believing they have the liberty to manage and teach their courses without any outside intervention. They tend to work independently, are professionals in their respective disciplines, and as such do not adapt to transactional leadership readily. Although a transactional leadership structure may be in place at the administrative level, it is loosely coupled from the faculty.

Organizations, such as higher education institutions, consists of complex and personal dynamics, and can only be managed effectively by leaders possessing an emotional intelligence that can meet the fluidity and dynamics of the organizational culture. Factors such as empathetic response, mood regulation, interpersonal skill, internal motivation, and self-awareness (Barbuto and Burbach, 2006) affect the leadership of a transformational leader daily. It is the leader that can manage these factors successfully that will build strong positive relationships with their followers (Barbuto & Burbach, 2006). Applying these emotional intelligence factors to higher education leadership can result in highly motivated faculty and staff. The higher education transformational leader is one that has intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence. It is a leader that can encourage and motivate faculty and staff to greater levels of performance and satisfaction. This in turn will perpetuate the organization's effectiveness.

The *laissez-faire* leadership style contrasts with both transactional and

transformational leadership. Both of these leadership styles are active; that is, they are actively involved in decision-making to correct problems when they arise. Not so with the laissez-faire. This type of leader is one that avoids decision making and leadership responsibility (Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997). A laissez-faire leader is one that is inactively involved in the organization, it is a leader that assumes a passive role. Some would suggest that a laissez-faire leader is the absence of leadership (Hartog, et al.). Laissez-faire leadership brings with it a negative connotation. Although it is considered a form of leadership it typically does not produce the positive outcomes of followers. This type of leadership may be implemented in organizations where the employees are autonomous and self-directed. Laissez-faire leadership would not be effective in higher education institutions. Although faculty are autonomous and highly independent, a laissez-faire leader would not bring the unity and cohesion needed in moving the institution toward meeting the goals and objectives of strategic plans and the mission of the institution.

Contingency theories: Situational leadership. Several contingency models exist such as Fiedler's Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness (1976), House and Mitchell's path-goal theory (1974), and the Vroom-Yetton model (1973). However, in this section of the literature I will focus on one of the earlier models introduced in the 1960s, the Situational Leadership Theory or SLT.

Introduced by Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard in the 1960s (Yeakley, 2002), situational leadership is for the practicing leader. The theory has its conceptual framework built upon the daily perceptions and observations of the leader. The leader does not rely on research data to support his or her decision making. The leader must be able to adapt to the situation at hand to be effective (Bensimon, 1989). Once referred to as the Life-Cycle Theory of Leadership, SLT has a different perspective on the leader-follower relationship. This theory couples the relationship-oriented behaviors and task-oriented behaviors with the subordinates' level of maturity and experience.

Maturity, as defined by SLT, is “the capacity to set high but attainable goals, the willingness and ability to take on responsibility, and the education and experience of an individual or group” (Yeakley, 2002). The theory relies on effective communication between leader and follower. It is not a theory based on task versus relationship behavior but rather on the correlation between the two dimensions (Brown & Barker, 2002). The two dimensions of task behavior and relationship behavior (Brown & Barker, 2002) are defined as follows:

1. Task behavior: the amount of direction and information the leader provides to subordinates regarding a task.
2. Relationship behavior: the amount of two-way or multi-way supporting and encouraging communication the leader provides subordinates.

It is the relationship between the two dimensions that is important. The grid below in Figure 2-1 is used to explain this relationship. Four components make up the grid, they are supporting, coaching, delegating, and directing. The arrangement of the components within the grid is as follows:

Figure 2-1. SLT Managerial Grid

The communication between the leader and the follower is based on the situation of the follower. The directing component (S1) has a very high directive behavior associated with it. In this situation the leader defines the task(s) or role(s) of the followers.

Communication is predominantly one-way, that is from leader to follower. Coaching (S2) still leaves most of the decision-making with the leader. The leader defines the roles as with directing, however the leader encourages the follower to offer suggestions and ideas. Communication is an exchange between both leader and follower. Supporting (S3) leaves the control of the decision making with the follower however, the leader facilitates and can, at times, be involved in the decision making process. Lastly, delegating (S4) is very low on directive behavior. In this situation the follower determines to a large degree the involvement of the leader in the task.

The dynamics of the SLT model involve setting expectations, listening, feedback, and delegating. The leader must be able to set expectations, listen to his or her followers, receive feedback from his or her followers, and delegate responsibilities to those followers that have achieved a level of job maturity for increased responsibility. The level of the interrelationship between the components is based on the job maturity level of the follower. According to Hersey and Blanchard, job maturity is the ability and technical knowledge as well as the psychological maturity and self confidence needed to do the task (Yeakley, 2002). The communication process depends greatly on the maturity level of the follower. A new hire may require much directing initially but, after the individual has been trained he or she may only need to be “coached”; that is mentored. Once the coaching phase is completed the individual would progress to the supporting phase of the relationship and eventually into delegating. It is the situational leader who must have a strong grasp and understanding of the interrelationship of these components and he or she must be able to adapt accordingly based on the maturity levels of the followers.

Situational leadership in higher education institutions works to some degree as depicted in the grid. One of the exceptions is the level of job maturity that faculty bring into higher education institutions. Faculty are professionals and are considered to be experts in their respective fields. As experts, leaders will not be directing them in how to do their job tasks as faculty. However a newly hired faculty may need to be directed in the areas of institutional procedures, policies, and practices. Expectations are provided and some level of coaching is given to assist the new faculty in assimilating into the

collegiate environment. A seasoned faculty member needs very little directing and usually has a high level of delegating authority. Higher education administrators need to be flexible to be able to effectively lead both newly hired faculty, with little to no experience in academia, and seasoned professors as well.

The SLT is based on the interactions between the leader and follower as seen by Hersey and Blanchard's managerial grid. However in higher education, a leader that does not have the necessary skills of effective communication, facilitating, and delegating his or her authority may not succeed in applying this style of leadership. The SLT relies heavily on the communicative process to be successful. In an article by Charles S. Lauer, (2002) entitled *The Basic Recipe for a Leader*, he mentions that every employee is different, so it is in higher education, every faculty is different. Each has different backgrounds, levels of experience, and motivations. It is the effective leader, one with the necessary skills, both learned and innate, that can effectively lead the institution into meeting its mission. In his article Lauer stated that effective leaders must have the ability to listen with their eyes, ears, and instincts. It is the leader that has his or her finger on the pulse of the institution and one that can effectively articulate the goals, mission, and vision of the institution to his or her followers that will be able to lead the organization in accomplishing those goals by involving others to "buy in" to the vision of the institution.

Contingency leadership models provide us with a greater understanding concerning the relationship between a leader and subordinates. However, the relationship between a leader and his or her subordinates is only one aspect of leadership and management. Leadership is more complex. It involves other factors such as discipline, people skills, vision, momentum, emotional strength, timing, and the list continues (Maxwell, 2003).

Leadership in higher education is going through a metamorphosis. Change is taking place across campuses all over the country. Changes such as diversity, technology including technological tools available for students and faculty, and paradigm shifting of higher education as a business enterprise has impacted leadership. These changes, just as

in the post-industrialized world, require leaders that can introduce organizational change that followers can subscribe to (Masood, et al.)

Examining leadership using Bolman and Deal's Four-Frame leadership Model brings into account not just the relationship aspect of leader influencing follower, or the transaction between leader and follower, but it gets into how leaders think about situations, problems or dilemmas they may face and what actions they should take. This view is not only important in the corporate business world, but in higher education leadership as well.

Bolman and Deal's four- frame leadership model. In *Reframing Organizations*, Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal, based on a report by Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan (1994), estimated that approximately one-half to three-quarters of American managers are incompetent (Bolman & Deal, 2003). The report was based on American business enterprises, but one may find like results in higher education administration. The estimation is astounding because it reflects on the ineffectiveness of today's leaders. This component of the literature review focuses on Bolman and Deal's four-frame leadership model. The goal of this section of the review is to provide a level of understanding of each of the frames.

Bolman and Deal's model is one of balance. It views leadership through multiple frames and how leaders think and respond to different situations within their organizations. They believed that there is always more than one way to respond to any problem or dilemma (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Viewed as coherent frames, (Bolman & Deal, 1984), the four frames are labeled as: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic (Bolman & Deal, 1984, 1991a, 1991b, 1997, 2003). These lenses or window panes provide the leader with a different view of looking at a situation, problem, or circumstance. By viewing situations using different frames, leaders can make a more informed decision, and take the appropriate necessary action. An overview of each of the frames is depicted in Table 2-1. Metaphors are used to describe the frames.

Table 2-1. Overview of the Four-Frame Model

	Frame			
	Structural	Human	Political	Symbolic
	Resource			
<i>Metaphor for organization</i>	Factory or machine	Family	Jungle	Carnival, temple, theatre
<i>Central Concepts</i>	Rules, roles, policies, technology, environment	Needs, skills, relationships	Power, conflict, competition, organizational politics	Culture, meaning, metaphor, ritual, ceremony, stories, heroes
<i>Image of leadership</i>	Social architecture	Empowerment	Advocacy	Inspiration
<i>Basic leadership challenge</i>	Attune structure to task, technology, environment	Align organizational and human needs	Develop agenda and power base	Create faith, beauty, meaning

Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership. (Bolman & Deal, 2003)

Structural frame. The main thrust of the structural frame is to bring a level of structure and design to problems and situations facing the leader. It is one in which clarification of institutional goals, lines of authority, and the effective management of the external environment is emphasized. It is a frame that clarifies and specifies goals as well as efficiency. The leader tailors his/her processes or actions to the appropriateness of the situation. This is accomplished by the following:

- Clarifying organizational goals

- Managing the external environment
- Developing a clear structure appropriate to the task and environment
- Clarifying lines of authority
- Focusing on task, facts, and logic (not personality or emotions)

This frame is one of specificity and clarity. It allows leaders to clearly define roles, assign responsibilities, coordinate activities, develop plans and procedures, and make policies. It is based on clear lines of authority or a vertical chain-of-command, if you will. The leader is viewed as a social architect and the organization is understood metaphorically as a machine or factory (Bolman & Deal, 2003). This frame is appropriate to use when information and goals have been clearly defined and understood, little conflict exists, technologies are strong, and there is stability in legitimate authority (Leadership & Management Models, 2009). Six assumptions undergird the structural frame (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p45), they are:

1. Organizations exist to achieve established goals and objectives.
2. Organizations increase efficiency and enhance performance through specialization and a clear division of labor.
3. Aggressive forms of coordination and control ensure that diverse efforts of individuals and units mesh.
4. Organizations work best when rationality prevails over personal preferences and extraneous pressures.
5. Structures must be designed to fit an organization's circumstances (including its goals, technology, workforce, and environment).
6. Problems and performance gaps arise from structural deficiencies and can be remedied through analysis and restructuring.

Human resource frame. Unlike the structural frame, the human resource frame is about caring for people and their needs. The leader views the needs and goals of the people within the organization as paramount to the success of the organization. A leader espousing the human resource frame believes in putting people first and by doing so, the organizational goals and objectives will be met. Its emphasis is on support and

empowerment. Human resource leaders are supportive of people and work toward meeting the organizational needs by taking care of the needs and problems of people first. Its major assumptions (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p115) are:

1. Organizations exist to serve human needs rather than the reverse.
2. People and organizations need each other. Organizations need ideas, energy, and talent; people need careers, salaries, and opportunities.
3. When the fit between individual and system is poor, one or both suffer.
Individuals are exploited or exploit the organization – or both become victims.
4. A good fit benefits both. Individuals find meaningful and satisfying work, and organizations get the talent and energy they need to succeed.

Political frame. Its premise is on coalition building and advocacy and derives from political science. The leader recognizes the political climate of the institution and works toward creating an environment of negotiating differences with the goal of developing reasonable compromises. Conflict is inevitable and is a normal by-product of the collective action. Political frame leaders understand the political realities that exist within organizations. They understand power and use it carefully through negotiation, bargaining, compromise, and coercion. Five assumptions summarize the political frame (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p186).

1. Organizations are coalitions of diverse individuals and interest groups.
2. There are enduring differences among coalition members in values, beliefs, information, interests, and perceptions of reality.
3. Most important decisions involve allocating scarce resources – who gets what.
4. Scarce resources and enduring differences make conflict central to organizational dynamics and underline power as the most important asset.
5. Goals and decisions emerge from bargaining, negotiation, and jockeying for position among competing stakeholders.

Symbolic frame. The symbolic frame is one of inspiration and vision. A symbolic leader is one that values organizational traditions and is often very visible among the organization. This type of leader believes in providing the institution with a clear vision.

It is rooted in cultural and social anthropology. The symbolic leader believes that people need something to believe in. They promote traditions and culture in building a common vision. Ceremonies, myths, stories, symbols, and rituals are essential to maintaining the culture of the organization. Its major assumptions are (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p242):

1. What is most important is not what happens but what it means.
2. Activity and meaning are loosely coupled; events have multiple meanings because people interpret experiences differently.
3. In the face of widespread uncertainty and ambiguity, people create symbols to resolve confusion, increase predictability, find direction, and anchor hope and faith.
4. Many events and processes are more important for what is expressed than what is produced. They form a cultural tapestry of secular myths, heroes and heroines, rituals, ceremonies, and stories that help people find purpose and passion in their personal and work lives.
5. Culture is the glue that holds an organization together and unites people around shared values and beliefs.

Each of the frames are valuable within themselves, however together they form the complete window allowing leaders to view problems, dilemmas, and situations from different perspectives. Using all of the frames is what Bolman and Deal call “reframing.” Reframing is far removed from thinking mechanically. Reframing is multi-frame thinking (Bolman & Deal, 2003). It is a skill and ability that allows the leader to look at a problem using different frames. Reframing is continued until the best solution or action is decided upon. However, multi-frame thinking is challenging. Leaders must be able to see their organizations as an integrated organism comprised of needs, roles, power, and symbols. A multi-frame leader must be able to view the organization as a jungle, factory, family, or theatre. Table 2-2, *Four Interpretations of Organizational Processes* ties the process with each of the frames.

Table 2-2. Four Interpretations of Organizational Processes

<i>Process</i>	<i>Structural</i>	<i>Human Resources</i>	<i>Political</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
Strategic Planning	Strategies to set objectives and coordinate resources	Gathering to promote participation	Arenas to air conflicts and realign power	Ritual to signal responsibility, produce symbols, negotiate meanings
Decision Making	Rational sequence to produce right decision	Open process to produce commitment	Opportunity to gain or exercise power	Ritual to confirm values and provide opportunities for bonding
Reorganizing	Realign roles and responsibilities to fit tasks and environment	Maintain balance between human needs and formal roles	Redistribute power and form new coalitions	Maintain image of accountability and responsiveness; negotiate new social order
Evaluating	Way to distribute rewards or penalties and control performance	Process for helping individuals grow and improve	Opportunity to exercise power	Occasion to play roles in shared ritual
Approaching conflict	Maintain organizational goals by having authorities resolve conflict	Develop relationships by having individuals confront conflict	Develop power by bargaining, forcing, or manipulating others to win	Develop shared values and use conflict to negotiate meaning
Goal Setting	Keep organization headed in right direction	Keep people involved and communication open	Provide opportunity for individuals and groups to make interests known	Develop symbols and shared values

(continued)

Table 2-2. Four Interpretations of Organizational Processes (cont.)

<i>Process</i>	<i>Structural</i>	<i>Human Resources</i>	<i>Political</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
Communication	Transmit facts and information	Exchange information, needs, and feelings	Influence or manipulate others	Tell Stories
Meetings	Formal occasions for making decisions	Informal occasions for involvement, sharing feelings	Competitive occasions to win points	Sacred occasions to celebrate and transform the culture
Motivation	Economic incentives	Growth and self-actualization	Coercion, manipulation, and seduction	Symbols and celebration
<i>Process</i>	<i>Structural</i>	<i>Human Resources</i>	<i>Political</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>

Source: Reframing Organizations; Bolman and Deal; 2003; Table 15.1, pages 306-7

In summary Bolman and Deal's four-frame model can be used in both qualitative and quantitative studies for measuring a leader's or manager's effectiveness. Their leadership orientation survey instruments, self and others, are useful in predicting this effectiveness among leaders. The research data suggests that multi-frame thinking is essential to the effectiveness of leaders and managers. They found that by using the four frames as predictor variables in regression analyses, they were able to predict a minimum of 66% of the variance to perceived managerial effectiveness and 74% to leadership effectiveness. The independent variables were associated with leadership effectiveness. (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

Research Using Bolman and Deal's Four-Frame Model

Bolman and Deal's four-frame leadership model has been used extensively to investigate leadership effectiveness in higher education: Estela M. Bensimon, 1989, *The Meaning of Good Presidential Leadership: A Frame Analysis*, Linda S. Knudson, 1997, *Team Leadership in Three Midwestern Community Colleges: The Presidents; Cognitive Frame of Reference and Its Relationship to Real and Illusory Teams*, and Terry Bentley,

Fangxia Zhao, Ellen H. Reames, and Cindy Reed, 2004, students who were a part of a cohort, *Frames We Live By: Metaphors from the Cohort*, just to name a few. Others have studied leadership using the four-frame model in corporate business, the government, and K-12 public school systems.

In Bensimon's study, she concluded that multi-frame presidents were more effective in their leadership than those that were single frame (Bolman & Deal, 2003). She found that of the 32 college presidents that participated in the study, 40% were single framed, 34% were paired-framed, and 25% were multi-framed. Interesting to note is of those that were primarily single frame; they tended to lean toward the structural or human resource perspectives. She found that the presidents believed they used more frames than what their colleagues indicated and often viewed themselves as having a primarily human resource or symbolic frame perspective.

A paper authored by Gary Bingham and Charles Reavis studied leadership frames of school principals with regard to implementing a state-wide teacher appraisal system (Bingham & Reavis, 2001). 195 principles were asked to participate, 125 responded to the surveys. The teacher appraisal system consisted of eight domains that measured teacher performance. The principles were asked to respond to a questionnaire that reflected their leadership frame reference for each of the domains of the appraisal system. The results indicated that the principals preferred the human resource frame significantly over the other frames, followed by the structural, symbolic, and political frames respectively.

Chang (2004) studied the leadership styles of department chairs and faculty utilization of instructional technology. He invited 232 department chairs and 4726 faculty to participate in the study. The faculty were invited to rate their department chairs using Bolman and Deal's instrument. A total of 230 faculty rated 81 chairs with the following major findings: the human resource frame had the highest mean ($M=3.2$), followed by the structural frame ($M=3.1$), the political frame ($M=3.0$), and the symbolic frame ($M=2.8$). The frequency distributions for the frame patterns for the three categories of single, paired, or multi-frame were 14.8% were multi-frame, 13.6% were paired,

14.8% were single, and 56.8% were no-frame. The most prominent frame of single frame chairs was the human resource frame at 41.7%. The highest percentage of paired-frame chairs were the structural/human resource frame combination (54.5%) and the most popular frame combination for multi-frame chairs was the structural/human resource/political (25%).

In summary, the Bolman and Deal four-frame model has had a major impact into the cognitive leadership frame theory and has resulted in similar findings among the various studies. Most leaders tend to view themselves as espousing the human resource frame followed by the structural frame. The political frame typically came in third with the symbolic view last.

This segment of the literature review discussed Bolman and Deal's four-frame leadership model and how it has been used in past research. The intent of this study is to not only determine the predominant frames of presidents, but of their teams and investigate if their frames converge or diverge from each other. This perspective is different than other research using Bolman and Deal's four-frame model because it is designed to look into the relationship of the frames of college presidents and their presidential teams. However, to gain a better insight into college presidents and their leadership roles, a review of Estela Bensimon's and Anna Newmann's study is provided in the following section.

Constructing the Presidency: College Presidents' Images of Their Leadership Roles, A Comparative Study

Anna Neumann and Estela Bensimon, (1995) collaborated on this study positing that college presidents' personal or implicit theories concerning organizational life and their roles as presidents work hand-in-hand in guiding and delimiting what they hear, see, or sense, and how they interpret what they perceive and their responses to them. The purpose of the study was to explore and identify patterns in how presidents "personal theories, tacit knowledge, and assumptions, enable them to interpret and make sense of what they do. The study also considered how these personal theories and interpretive

schemes influence the life of the organization (Neumann & Bensimon).

Leadership as described in their study has been viewed in several different ways. As having certain traits or qualities, as relationships and influences stemming from power and dynamics between leader and followers, and specific actions leaders are apt to exercise in dealing or confronting various situations. The study aimed at examining presidents' cognition, strategy, and learning as well as trying to understand how followers perceive their leaders actions and words.

The methodology employed for this qualitative study was longitudinal. Research samples from thirty-two institutions participating in the Institutional Leadership Project (ILP) provided a cross sectional analysis for the study. For diversity sake, the sample population consisted of eight research/doctoral granting universities (public and private), eight state colleges, eight community colleges, and the remaining eight from independent colleges. Geographic location, size, and setting varied among the institutions. Diversity among the presidents varied as well by including both "new" and "old", women, and minority presidents.

Transcribed presidential interviews were analyzed assessing how personal theories of the presidents described their actions and how they compared to existing leadership theories. Through studying the transcripts, the researchers learned why the presidents took specific actions and the experiences each had in making mistakes and in achieving successes. Comparisons were made among the presidents resulting in similarities in some that the researchers termed as "look-alikes." These "look-alikes" when faced with similar situations responded in like manner. Four clusters were studied noting the commonalities among the participants. These clusters or presidential types were labeled A, B, C, and D.

These presidential types are explained as follows:

1. Type A: These individuals are initiators and entrepreneurs who focus on the future rather than the present. Their preoccupation with the future drives them to strategize events that favor their institutions. They are externally directed and was concerned with contributing largely to the

state, country, humanity in general, or to local regions and communities. They view their institutions as participants in an interdependent world and involvement in the hopes, dreams, and frustrations of their communities. These individuals exercise formal management practices and planning structures. They depend on their executive officers by delegating responsibilities because “the president cannot do it all”.

2. Type B: This type of individual sees him or herself as a “cheerleader”, “coach”, or mentor. They are internally directed and prefer to describe themselves as teachers and supporters. They view the institution as a means of developing people. They are concerned with the well-being of the institution’s people. The type B president emphasizes processes that encourage organizational life and remains “in touch” with the internal life of the institution via building relationships with faculty and staff.
3. Type C: This type of president is externally driven. They are concerned with short-term resource allocation for special projects. These presidents are not initiators but rather reactors and are known for major fundraising and image-building campaigns. They rely heavily on delegating and tend to relegate internal matters to their chief academic officers. They prefer not to make most of the decisions affecting their institutions, but would rather occupy themselves with acquiring resources.
4. Type D: Similar to the type B president; the type C is internally directed. These individuals are concerned with the inanimate features of their institutions. They focus their attention on program reviews, organizational structures, and budgetary processes. They believe that their efforts to achieve institutional goals should be supported by the college community. They are involved in every facet of the college and believe it is their responsibility to make final decisions. The type D president believes strongly in authority, chain-of-command, and exercising formal structures.

They tend to form their own bureaucratic preconceptions with the expectation that the college community conform to them. They are extremely rational and remain distant from the emotional and political life of their organization.

The comparative analysis addressed the four presidential types in terms of their target of attention, mode of action, and relatedness to the institution. Data concerning institutional type indicated that type A presidents were dominant in research and doctoral granting institutions (6), type B in community colleges (3), type C in state colleges (4), and type D were found in 2 universities, 2 state colleges, and 2 community colleges. Interesting to note is institutions that did not indicate one of the cluster types were independent colleges (4). When referring to institutional control, the data indicated that 5 public universities and 4 private universities subscribed to type A. Type B indicated 5 public and 1 private, while type C showed 4 public and 1 private. Lastly type D depicted institutional control as 5 public and 2 private. The analysis summarized the results by stating that the four presidential types are tools for analyzing presidential thinking for a given instance in time. The study emphasized how presidents viewed their roles and how problematic contexts may hinder their ability to lead.

The Neumann and Bensimon, (1989) study is one that sheds light on presidential roles and their overall leadership orientations. It delved into how college presidents think and their reaction to situations or problems based on their environment. It is the goal of this study to examine how college presidents think as well, but to determine if they are single, paired, or multi-frame thinkers. The researcher will extend the investigation further by analyzing how the presidents framing interact with those of their executive cabinets using Bolman and Deal's four-frame model. However, to better understand higher education leadership, a look into the challenges facing higher education is warranted.

Leadership Challenges in Higher Education

Higher education is big business today. The days wherein administrators did not concern themselves so much with focusing their efforts in raising monies for their institutions are gone. The profitability margin has decreased and institutions of higher education compete for resources. Schools are competing for students. Public institutions continue to face funding and budgetary cuts from their respective state legislatures. Because of this, leadership in higher education is going through a metamorphosis. Some institutions have hired presidents without any higher education experience or background. Frank Toda, a retired 30-year military man, took the helm at Columbia Gorge Community College as president (Meyer, 2006). Toda, a retired United States Air Force colonel with no higher education administration background, believes his military leadership training prepared him to motivate people and that campus environments are not much different than military organizations.

Institutions across the country are adopting a corporate style of leadership across college campuses today. Academic leaders are becoming corporate managers and are leading academic institutions as business enterprises. In the past, senior academic leaders rose through the ranks from senior faculty to leadership positions based on their academic abilities and research qualities (Yielder & Codling, 2004). This was common among higher education and seemed to meet the needs of most institutions. However with boards of trustees consisting more and more of business members, higher education institutions are increasingly operating as corporate enterprises. Academic leaders that have progressed through the faculty ranks may experience difficulties leading in this new corporate culture. The economic culture today views higher education as a business and administrators today should view problems associated with higher education as business problems with business solutions to these problems (Rich, 2007). With that mindset, it seems that administrators should have business backgrounds rather than academic backgrounds. Marketing, commercialization, cost-cutting, and other such business tools have been imported into higher education today (Rich, 2007). Administrators are faced with a conundrum, that of ensuring that their respective institutions thrive in a business

world, while at the same time, not compromising on teaching, scholarship, research, and community service responsibilities.

Another dimension to consider in higher education leadership is the increase of women serving in positions of leadership. In a meta-analysis study conducted by Alice H. Eagly, Mary C. Johannesen-Schmidt, and Marloes L. van Engin, (2004) of 45 studies that compared transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles between men and women, it was discovered that male leaders had a tendency toward transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles and women towards transformational (Eagly, et al.).

The study pointed out the importance of the possibility that women and men may be different in their leadership behaviors as one that is indicative of their own behaviors as a major determinant of their effectiveness as leaders which may lead to future advancements and promotions. This is essential when comparing leadership styles of academicians since more women are attaining higher levels of administrative leadership positions. An understanding of the differences of leadership styles based on gender may provide an acceptable explanation as to the leadership behavior of senior managers and leaders in higher education.

Changes and challenges facing higher education institutions are inevitable. How administrators and their teams handle these changes and challenges often rests in their ability to work as teams using a cognitive frame of reference that promotes the functions of real teams. This next section of the literature review will look into leadership teams, their types, and functions.

Leadership Teams

Leadership or leading teams are prevalent in corporations, industry (manufacturing, technology, and services), and in academia. One must be clear that a team is not just a group of people, but a group of people that are working together to accomplish a task or fulfill a specific goal. In reviewing Table 2-3, *Differences Between Groups and Teams*, one can better understand the role and function of teams as compared to groups.

Table 2-3. Differences Between Groups and Teams

Group	Teams
- Has a designated strong leader	- Shares/rotates leadership roles
- Individual accountability	- Mutual/Individual accountability
- Intentional purpose for group and organization	- Specific team vision or purpose
- Performance goals set by others	- Performance goals set by team
- Works within organizational boundaries	- Not inhibited by organizational boundaries
- Individual work products	- Collective work products
- Organized meetings, delegation	- Mutual feedback, open-ended discussion, active problem-solving

Source: Leadership Theory & Practice; R. Daft, 1999, p270

A team has purpose. It is typically comprised of 2 or more people interacting and coordinating their work to accomplish a specific goal. Most teams consist of between 5 to 12 people with the ideal team consisting of 7. To be able to accomplish their assigned goal(s), every team member has to possess or develop some leadership capability and each team must have authority to function (Daft, 1999). Team leaders must be sensitive to their team's needs and ensure that they have all that they require to accomplish their specific task. To function effectively team members must be interdependent. They depend on one another for information, resources, ideas, and coordination. Teams typically display one of three types of interdependence: pooled, sequential, and reciprocal. Pooled interdependent teams are considered to be the lowest form. Team members usually function independently from one another, but share a common resource. An example would be a typical departmental office at a higher education institution. Faculty members from the department operate independently, but may share office help such as an office manager. Sequential interdependent teams are teams in which the output of one team member is the input to another. Performance of each team member is critical to the overall effectiveness of the team. If each team member performs well – the team performs well. An example could be a manufacturing assembly line. Each member on the assembly line must perform his or her task well because it could very well affect the satisfactory completion of other tasks required down the line by other team members. The

highest form of interdependence is the reciprocal interdependence. This occurs when team members influence and affect one another reciprocally. It occurs in teams that are involved in knowledge-based work. A doctoral student writing his or her dissertation is an example. The student will write a chapter and submit it for review and in turn the chapter is returned with revisions from his or her committee. Corrections are made and the chapter goes back for further review and comment. This reciprocal interdependence continues until the work is satisfactory to all team members involved.

Teams fall into three functional types: functional, cross-functional, and self-directed. Functional teams are the traditional vertical hierarchy teams. These teams have structure and have a formal chain-of-command in place with clearly identified supervisors and subordinates. A military squadron is a functional team. A clear rank structure exists and each individual understands their position and role within the squadron. Cross-functional teams consist of members from different departments within an organization. They work together to complete an assigned task or project. An example would be teams formed in higher education for the purpose of developing a strategic plan for their institution. Members are selected from various departments (faculty and staff) to work together in accomplishing their specific goal. Self-directed teams are teams in which team members rotate their jobs or functions to produce a service or product. They include three elements: 1) team members have varied skills and functions and the combined skills are sufficient enough to produce a major organizational task; 2) the team is granted access to resources essential to completing their tasks; and 3) the team is empowered with decision-making authority. Self-directed teams consist of members who are jointly responsible for the effectiveness of the team and often elect one of their team members to serve as the team leader (Daft, 1999).

In higher education, college presidents are faced with forming cohesive teams, that is teams that will compliment and work together with them to accomplish the mission and goals of their institutions. According to Leo I. Higdon, Jr., President of the College of Charleston, a team mentality is not automatic and is not based on people

assembled together that have different levels of talent and experience (Higdon, 2003). He states that it is up to the president to build a cohesive team, one that he or she can lead. This requires four essential and interdependent elements: trust, open communication, collaboration, and alignment. Notice that trust is mentioned first. Team trust, can be defined as a “dynamic concept which describes faith in or positive expectations for the thoughts, words and actions of others and the willingness to rely on others and take risks, and signifies the existence of team-to-individual and individual-to-team interdependence” (Shen & Chen, 2007, p. 644). One of the fundamental truths about teams is that they must have a relationship built upon trust in order to succeed in accomplishing their specified goals. Conflict within teams has the opposite effect and can incapacitate a team’s effectiveness. It is therefore up to the college president to foster trust among his team by emphasizing the importance of a team mentality in all senior-management actions (decision-making and communications) and that each team member understand that their cooperation is essential for the good of the institution.

Open communication is another element that has at its core trust and it cannot exist without it. It is essential that team members understand fully their roles and when it is the function of the team to make a group decision or to act as advisors to the president when the decision must be made by the president. This can only be communicated effectively by the president and will add in building trust among his or her team. Next is collaboration. All institutions of higher education are extremely complex and are made up of schools, departments, and offices. These agencies often have overlapping responsibilities and functions and many decisions that must be made affect more than one office or department. To be effective in the decision-making process, the president must set the tone by inviting key individuals from these different offices and departments to the table to discuss these matters openly, thereby creating a spirit of collaboration among them. Last, we have alignment. Team members must be allowed to have a voice within their teams, however once discussions are over, they must agree and have a united front. If an impasse is reached it is the responsibility of the college president to bring the team members together to discuss the matter further until they are all in agreement (Hogdin,

2003). It is apparent that presidents of higher education institutions influence to a large degree the effectiveness their presidential teams in performing as teams. How presidents choose to use their teams for the collective good of their institutions is yet another aspect of leading teams.

Estela Bensimon and Anna Newmann, (1992) conducted a study entitled *Redesigning Collegiate Leadership: Teams and Teamwork in Higher Education* in 1992; they found that teams can function in three capacities based on the needs and direction of their respective president. What they discovered from the findings is that presidents who are effective team builders think in complicated ways about their team's work. They based their team's work on three functions: utilitarian, expressive, and cognitive.

The utilitarian function is purposive and task oriented. It gives the president a sense of control in the functioning of the institution. It is a function engaged in doing - connecting the president to the campus. This function is practical and useful to the president yet formal. Common activities performed include: 1) providing information, 2) coordinating and planning, and 3) decision making. Some college presidents involved in their study viewed the informational activity as educative and concerned themselves with how "news" affected his or her team. Others saw it as a method of "delivery" that kept them abreast as to institutional events and were not concerned about their team's understanding of collegiate issues. Coordinating and planning involved the team members in institutional agendas and allowed them to work outside of their formal areas and departments. The activity of decision-making is one that allowed the team to contribute in making decisions for the whole of the institution. It is designed to allow members to voice their concerns when involved in the decision-making process. Some presidents in the study involved their teams only as advice-givers when making decisions, with the final decision being made by the president. Teams that function solely in a utilitarian manner, even though they were involved in the activities associated with this function, are not considered to be real teams.

The expressive function is one that reinforces a sense of "groupness" among individuals involved in a joint venture (Bensimon & Neumann, 1991). It is a function

wherein the president views the team as a social structure. The team and the president provide mutual support for one another. The president helps in meeting the team's need of collegial relations and affiliations and the team assists in fulfilling the president's needs of commitment and counsel (Bensimon & Neumann, 1992). Members work together supporting one another to achieve their goals as a team. The activities associated with this function are twofold: 1) providing mutual support and 2) providing counsel to the president. The team gives advice to the president and feedback which allows the president to see him or herself as others do. The president can be counseled by the team before taking any action that could affect his or her leadership adversely. This function is built on the relationship between the team members, and between the team as a whole and the president. It is one of intimacy and collegiality. This function instills coherency and cohesiveness among the team bringing a sense of unity to the team.

The cognitive function is the most challenging but the most critical of the three functions for presidents to develop within their teams. Teams using this function are involved collectively in perceiving, analyzing, learning, and thinking – much like a brain. The team is involved in intellectual and analytical activities. These activities are: 1) viewing problems from multiple perspectives; 2) questioning, challenging, and arguing; and 3) acting as a monitor and feedback system (Bensimon & Neumann, 1992). Because of cognitive nature of this function, it can be problematic for the president. For this function to operate effectively, the president must allow an openness among the team members to raise substantive and analytical issues and questions. Presidents involved in the study stated that the most valued activity of the cognitive function was that of viewing problems from multiple perspectives. Team members can provide their individual perspectives and views. One president put it this way, “the team brings more ideas to me than I bring to them” (Bensimon & Neumann, 1992, p.77). The activity of raising questions, challenges, and arguments is one that should be nurtured and supported by college presidents. By doing so the teams would avoid over-simplifying problems they face and brings a level of digging deeper by asking the challenging questions and

bringing about intellectual arguments that foster learning and collegiality among the team and president. The last activity, monitoring and feedback, is one that ensures that the institution is not deviating from its desired path. Most institutions today have a strategic plan, a blueprint if you will, that is used to guide the institution in ensuring that it remains on the right path toward fulfilling its mission, goals, and objectives. This activity is engaged in attending to signs that indicate the institution is deviating from its desired course. It is also effective in keeping the institution from becoming entrenched or content with business as usual. Teams practicing this function challenge one another and are constantly looking for ways of stimulating their institutions.

These three functions; utilitarian, expressive, and cognitive, are evident in real teams. Presidents who aspire to build real teams must understand the importance each of these functions has in the life of the team. Although real teams are complex, they have the capacity to be able to meet diverse challenges and issues effectively.

Linda Knudson (1997) studied three Midwestern community college presidents' cognitive frames of reference and their relationships to real versus illusory teams. She interviewed the presidents and 12 team members to assess their perceptions of team performance and effectiveness. This was accomplished by analyzing the teams using the three functions espoused by Bensimon and Neumann in their study to find evidence of real teams among the institutions in her study. She concluded that all of the teams were cognitively and functionally complex based on Bensimon's and Neumann's key indicators of real teams. However, she discovered that each team lacked an element of effectiveness as she observed them in action in their natural settings. Even though the researcher concluded that each of the teams observed were real teams, each team did not fit the model conclusively.

In summary it is evident that teams are a real and important part of organizations. They are needed by both the president and the institution. A team is not solely a group of people, but a group that is functioning to achieve a common purpose. Effective teams are complex - they are living organisms bringing life and vitality to their institution. Real teams function in the three domains of utilitarian, expressive, and cognitive. Building a

real team is challenging and requires a president that can perceive the three functions within their team.

Summary

This chapter provided a review of literature pertinent to the purpose of this study and the research questions. Topics included were: an operational definition of leadership, a comparison between leadership and management, a discussion of popular leadership theories (traits, behavioral, and contingency models), a detailed description of Bolman and Deal's four frame leadership model, a discussion of research incorporating their model, a synopsis of Anna Neumann's and Estela Bensimon's study on constructing the presidency, challenges facing higher education leadership, and presidential and team leadership. These topics were carefully selected for this review because they provided the foundational groundwork for this study. A large body of research in the areas of leadership, leadership theories and models, the roles of presidents and teams exists. However, no research has been undertaken using Bolman and Deal's four frame leadership model on determining the predominant frames of college presidents, VPAA, VPSA, and CFO, and as presidential teams within public four-year baccalaureate primarily nonresidential institutions. Further, no studies were discovered determining whether the predominant frames of college presidents and their presidential teams were divergent or convergent among these very same institutions.

Chapter Three:

Research Methodology

The intent of this chapter was to describe the research methodology used in accomplishing this study. The population used for this study included college and university presidents, vice presidents for academic affairs, vice presidents for student affairs, and chief financial officers of master's degree granting institutions as defined by Carnegie classification of schools at the large, middle, and small categories of both public and not-for-profit private institutions in the states of West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida. For ease of readability, the masculine pronoun will be used when addressing participants involved in the study.

This chapter encompasses several topics. The topics included are: the Research Methodology, the Institutional Approval, the Procedures, the Target Population and Sample, the Demographics, the Measuring Instruments, Confidentiality and Anonymity, the Data Analysis, and the Limitations of the Study.

Research Methodology

This quantitative method research study investigated the leadership frames of college presidents and key members of their presidential cabinets to identify their predominant leadership frames. This dissertation research study also examined if there were significant differences in the utilization of leadership frames according to the number of years experience within the administrative role.

A quantitative research methodology approach was used for this study for the several reasons. The research method was driven by the research questions. These research questions and the related purpose were identified using an iterative process. By employing a purely quantitative approach to this study, the research purpose and questions were fulfilled and answered providing a greater understanding and insight into leaders and leadership teams within public and not-for-profit private masters degrees

granting institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, North and South Carolina, and Florida. Since there have been numerous research studies examining leadership styles, it is appropriate to investigate research study questions using a quantitative design.

In order to fulfill the requirements for the quantitative analysis, the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientations (BDO) (1990) (Self) (Appendix A) questionnaire was used. The questionnaires were sent electronically using an electronic link to SurveyMonkey to each college or university president, to each vice president of academic affairs (VPAA), to each vice-president of student affair (VPSA), and to each chief financial officer (CFO) of each of the participating institutions. The surveys were sent out over a two day period. Participants were instructed to complete and submit the surveys within ten days of receiving them. Approximately 69 participants completed and submitted the surveys electronically over the ten day period. The researcher sent an electronic reminder to the participants after the initial period. An additional 123 participants that did not respond initially submitted the surveys over the next five days. The total number of surveys originally sent was 384. The total number of received surveys was 192, of which 147 completed the survey.

Each participant was asked to complete the Bolman & Deal Leadership Orientation (Self) questionnaire. Data collected from the survey instruments was used to identify the predominant leadership frames of each of the participants. Demographic data was collected identifying years of experience, gender, and number of years in current position.

Institutional Approval

A request for approval from the West Virginia University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects was submitted since this study qualified for exemption status.

Approval for this study was granted as an exemption from the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Once approval was granted, the researcher sent out the survey

instrument electronically to each of potential participants from the identified institutions. Electronic mail (email) addresses of each identified participant were obtained from each of the identified institutions' websites. Information regarding key administrators was collected for making contact with the college presidents, VPAAAs, VPSAs, and CFOs. A formal letter was attached and sent to each participant via email detailing the purpose for the study and inviting them to participate. The Bolman and Deal Orientation survey was linked to SurveyMonkey and each participant was instructed on how to access the survey. The survey instrument required seven to ten minutes to complete.

Procedures

After obtaining the email addresses of each of the participants, the researcher contacted each one explaining who the researcher was and what the email was about. The researcher attached a formal letter inviting each of the potential participants to be a part of the study and why their participation was essential. The participants were informed that the email was legitimate and included pertinent information such as the principal investigator's contact information and that record of the study was on file with the West Virginia University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects. All of the participants were instructed not to provide any identifiable information on their surveys such as their names and were informed that they were assured of complete anonymity.

Target Population and Sample

The population for this study consisted of college or university presidents, vice presidents of academic affairs, vice presidents of student affairs, and chief financial officers of public and not-for-profit masters degree granting institutions in West Virginia, Maryland, Ohio, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida as defined by the Carnegie classification of colleges located within the selected states. Approximately 436 potential participants were identified and categorized as follows: 109

college/university presidents, 109 VPAAAs, 109 VPSAs, and 109 CFOs. It was expected that each participant would complete the BDO (Self) Leadership survey. However, of the 436 potential candidates, all but 52 email addresses could not be obtained. This left a total of 384 potential participants. Surveys were sent to each of the 384 potential participants. Of the 384 participants, 191 responded. Of those, 147 completed the survey (29 Presidents, 29 VPAA, 43 VPSA, 31 CFO, and 15 Other). Those identified as “Other” were not used in analysis for answering the research questions. A total of 132 participants were identified and used in the study addressing each of the research questions.

Demographics

Demographic information for each of the participants was gathered using the BDO (Self) leadership survey. Three items were included in the instrument addressing gender, current administrative role, and years in current position. Information concerning each of the participating institutions was not included.

Instrument

The survey instrument used for this study was the Bolman and Deal Orientation (Self) (1990) instrument (Appendix A).

B&DO (Self). The Bolman and Deal Orientation (Self) instrument was developed by Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal in 1991 and it is designed to be a self-administered questionnaire. Permission to use their instrument for this study was granted (Appendix D). The questionnaire consists of 32 questions representing the four frames. Each frame is represented equally by eight items on the questionnaire. Questions pertaining to the structural frame include items 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, and 29; the human resource frame include items 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, and 30; the political frame items 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, and 31; and the symbolic frame items 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, and 32. To rate the degree to which they exhibit leadership behavior in each of the four frames, the respondents use a five-point Likert scale (1 Never, 2 Sometimes, 3 Occasionally, 4 Often, and 5 Always). The questionnaire was designed to be completed

within 7 to 10 minutes. Once the completed surveys were received, a score for each frame was calculated for each of the participants and a predominant frame was identified. A composite mean score for each of the cabinet member groups was calculated as well with a predominant frame identified for each group.

The survey was sent to each of the 384 participants electronically. Upon reviewing the data collected it was discovered that the ordinal scale used on the sent surveys were scaled incorrectly. The electronic version of the BDO (Self) Leadership instrument scale read as follows: 1 Never, 2 Sometimes, 3 Always, 4 Occasionally, and 5 Often. The scale was corrected and the syntax was corrected in SPSS to perform the statistical analysis. The findings reflect the corrected scale.

The validity of the B&DO (Self) instrument was established by the authors in an unpublished paper in 1990. A factor analysis of 681 higher education administrators, using principal components and varimax rotation, yielded a high degree of internal consistency (Bolman & Deal, 1991b). “The results of this factor analysis support the conclusion that the items do measure the four intended leadership orientations. The correlations were all well within the acceptable range” (Meade, 1992, p. 76). Additionally, Cronbach’s alpha for the frame measures was very high, ranging from .91 and .93 (Bolman & Deal, 1991b). It is interesting to note that the Bolman & Deal Self questionnaire has been used in numerous studies (Bensimon, 1989; Bethel, 1998; Bolman & Deal, 1991b; Cantu, 1997; Chlidress, 1994; Crist, 1999; Eck, 1997; Eckley, 1997; Gibson, 1994; Harlow, 1994; Mathis, 1999; Redman, 1991; Scott, 1997; Strickland, 1992; Suzuki, 1994; Vander Veer, 1991.)

Anonymity

This study relied on the responses provided on the survey instruments by the participants and required their voluntary participation. Consistent with the standards and policies of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) the participants’ anonymity was protected. In the cover letters (Appendix C) that were sent to the participants the following information concerning the study was provided: (1) the purpose of the study,

(2) participation was strictly voluntary, (3) the participants need not respond to every item, (4) and anonymity was maintained. The BDO (Self) Leadership survey did not have a provision for including the participants' names nor their institutions' name.

Data Analysis

The seven research questions are listed in Table 3-1. The research strategy used for each question is included in this table.

Table 3-1. Research Questions and Research Strategy Used

Research Question	Research Strategy	Data Used
1. What are the predominant frames of presidents of public and not-for-profit master's degree awarding institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida?	Frequency Distribution Table	B&DO (Self) – All items
2. What are the predominant frames of vice-presidents of academic affairs presidents of public and not-for-profit master's degree awarding institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida?	Frequency Distribution Table	B&DO (Self) – All items
3. What are the predominant frames of vice-presidents of student affairs of public and not-for-profit master's degree awarding institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida?	Frequency Distribution Table	B&DO (Self) – All items

(cont.)

Table 3-1. Research Questions and Research Strategy Used (cont.)

4. What are the predominant frames of chief financial officers of public and not-for-profit master's degree awarding institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida?	Frequency Distribution Table	B&DO (Self) – All items
5. Are there significant differences in the presidents' leadership frames by number of years experience in the administrative role?	Descriptives ANOVA Table	B&DO (Self) – All items
6. Are there significant differences in the cabinets' members' leadership frames by numbers of years experience in their administrative roles?	Descriptives ANOVA Table	B&DO (Self) – All items
7. Are there significant differences between the presidents' leadership frames and the cabinet members?	Descriptive ANOVA Table	B&DO (Self)- All items

In theory, presidents and their teams that are multi-framed in their approach to leadership are re-framers or multi-frame thinkers. It allows them to see their organizations as organic forms with needs, roles, power, and symbols. It gives them a better understanding of their organization and the ability to see new possibilities. Working together should result in the best possible solutions to dilemmas and problems facing colleges and universities today. The power of reframing should bring multi-frame presidents and teams together functioning as leadership teams in practice. Presidents and teams that are paired-framed may have more solutions but are limited because they view problems from only two frames. Depending on the predominant frame of the president and of his team would determine if they converge or diverge. If the predominant frames are the same, it is hoped that they converge.

Limitations of Study

This study had the following limitations:

1. This study employed self-reported survey instruments and depended on the honesty and integrity of the respondents.
2. It is possible that not all of the participants completed each item identified on each of the survey instruments and declined to answer some of them.
3. The study was limited to public and not-for-profit master's degree granting institutions in the states of West Virginia, Maryland, Ohio, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida.

Summary

This chapter discussed the research methods and procedures that were used for answering the seven research questions of the study. It reviewed the target population and sample, the quantitative instrument and security measures used, the confidentiality and anonymity statements provided, as well as the limitations of the study.

Chapter Four:

Results of the Study

This chapter provides a summary of the findings of the study resulting from the data collected from the respondents. It presents the findings using various tables. Each research question was analyzed using the data collected. The survey used for the study was Bolman and Deal's Leadership Orientation (Self) (1990) questionnaire (see Appendix A) and was sent to each participant as identified in Chapter Three.

The survey instrument included a small demographic component identifying the respondents' gender, current administrative role, and years of experience in that role. A brief analysis is provided to ascertain the demographic makeup of the participants involved in the study.

A detailed analysis will follow for each research questions introduced in Chapter One: The seven questions are as follows:

1. What are the predominant frames of presidents of public and not-for-profit master's degree awarding institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida?
2. What are the predominant frames of vice-presidents of academic affairs of public and not-for-profit master's degree awarding institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida?
3. What are the predominant frames of vice-presidents of student affairs of public and not-for-profit master's degree awarding institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida?
4. What are the predominant frames of chief financial officers of public and not-for-profit master's degree awarding institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida?
5. Are there significant differences in the presidents' leadership frames by

number of years experience in the administrative role?

6. Are there significant differences in the cabinets' members' leadership frames by number of years experience in their administrative roles?
7. Are there significant differences between the presidents' leadership frames and the cabinet members?

Gender of Participants by Administrative Role

The first and second demographic questions asked respondents to indicate their gender and role. The sample consisted of 147 individuals who completed the survey. Forty-nine (33.3 percent) were female and 98 (66.7 percent) were male. (see Table 4-1). Valid percentages indicate all those respondents that completed the survey items. The analysis indicates that of the 147 respondents, the ratio of male to female serving in the role of president, vice president for academic affairs (VPAA), vice president for student affairs (VPSA), chief financial officer (CFO), and other roles in the states of West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida was approximately 2:1.

Table 4-1. *Gender of Participants*

Gender					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	49	33.3	33.7	33.7
	Male	98	66.7	66.3	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	
Missing	System	0	.0		
Total		147	100.0		

Twenty-nine presidents completed the survey. Nine (31 percent) were female and 20 (69 percent) were male (see Table 4-2). Vice presidents for academic affairs had a total of

29 that completed the survey of which 14 (48 percent) were female and 15 (52 percent) were male (see Table 4-3). Fifty-one vice presidents for student affairs responded to the survey but only 43 completed it. Of those 43, 15 (35 percent) were female and 28 (65 percent) were male (see Table 4-4). Chief financial officers had a total of 31 respondents who completed the survey (see Table 4-5). Four (12.9 percent) were female and 27 (87.1 percent) were male. Based on these findings, clearly, CFOs participating in this study were predominantly male.

Table 4-2. *Gender of Presidents*

PRESIDENTS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	9	31.0	31.0	31.0
	Male	20	69.0	69.0	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Table 4-3. *Gender of Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs*

VPAA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	14	48.0	48.0	48.0
	Male	15	52.0	52.0	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Table 4-4. *Gender - Vice Presidents of Student Affairs*

VPSA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	15	35.0	35.0	35.0
	Male	28	65.0	65.0	100.0
	Total	43	100.0	100.0	

Table 4-5. *Gender - Chief Financial Officers*

CFO

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	4	12.9	12.9	12.9
	Male	27	87.1	87.1	100.0
	Total	31	100.0	100.0	

A total of 15 respondents considered themselves to be serving in roles other than presidents, VPAA, VPSA, and CFO. Roles such as provost, vice president for finance and administration, controller and assistant treasurer, chief advancement officer, and those back on faculty status, made up this group. Of those classified under other roles, 7 (46.7%) were female and 8 (53.3%) were male. As with the VPAA affairs this group had almost an even number of female to male ratio. (see Table 4-6). The individuals in the category of “other” were not included in the analyses of research questions one through seven.

Table 4-6. *Gender – Other Roles*

OTHER

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	7	46.7	46.7	46.7
	Male	8	53.3	53.3	100.0
	Total	15	100.0	100.0	

Number of Years in Current Administrative Role

The final demographic question asked the respondents to indicate how long in years they had been in their current administrative role. Of the 147 respondents, the majority 53 (36.1 percent) have been in their current position between 0 to 4 years, 42 (28.6 percent) have been in their current role between 5 and 8 years, 18 (12.2 percent)

between 9 and 12 years, 15 (10.2 percent) have been in their current position between 13 and 16 years, and lastly 19 (12.9 percent) have been in their position for 17 or more years (see Table 4-7). The majority of the respondents, 95 (64.79 percent), have been in their current roles 8 years or less.

Table 4-7. *Years in Current Administrative Position*

How long have you been in your current administrative position?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-4 Years	53	36.1	36.1	36.1
	5-8 Years	42	28.6	28.6	64.7
	9-12 Years	18	12.2	12.2	76.9
	13-16 Years	15	10.2	10.2	87.1
	17 or More Years	19	12.9	12.9	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	
Total		147	100.0		

Research Question One: Leadership Frames of Presidents

What are the predominant frames of presidents of public and not-for-profit master's degree awarding institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida?

The Bolman & Deal Leadership Orientation (Self) (1990) questionnaire was used to determine the predominant frames of college and university presidents of the targeted population. The questionnaire consisted of 32 questions of which 8 are specific to the structural frame, 8 to the human resource frame, 8 to the political frame, and 8 to the symbolic frame. All of the questions were asked of each respondent. Mean scores of each president as well as a composite mean for the group were calculated.

The mean frame scores of the 29 presidents who completed all 32 items on the survey are provided for each individual president below (see Table 4-8).

Table 4-8. *Mean Frame Scores of Individual Presidents*

N=29	Structural Frame Mean Score	Human Resource Frame Mean Score	Political Frame Mean Score	Symbolic Frame Mean Score
1	4.00	3.75	3.50	4.25
2	4.13	3.63	4.38	4.38
3	3.88	3.63	2.63	2.88
4	4.75	4.38	4.00	3.88
5	3.88	3.63	3.75	3.75
6	4.50	4.25	4.13	4.38
7	3.75	3.50	3.50	3.63
8	3.88	4.63	4.13	3.88
9	4.75	4.75	4.25	4.38
10	4.00	3.88	3.25	4.13
11	3.50	5.00	4.00	4.75
12	3.75	3.63	3.50	3.50
13	4.13	3.50	3.50	3.25
14	4.63	5.00	5.00	5.00
15	3.38	4.25	4.38	4.63
16	3.63	4.0	3.88	4.0
17	3.75	4.38	4.00	3.63
18	3.50	3.13	4.38	3.88
19	3.63	4.75	4.00	4.00
20	3.88	3.88	3.50	4.14
21	4.25	4.13	3.50	3.88
22	3.50	3.88	3.50	3.00
23	3.75	3.75	4.00	4.00
24	4.13	4.13	3.25	3.75
25	3.67	4.33	4.00	3.50
26	4.63	4.38	4.13	4.13
27	3.88	3.14	4.00	4.38
28	3.75	3.00	3.63	3.88
29	4.00	4.38	4.13	3.75

Table 4-9. *Mean Frame Scores of College & University Presidents*

Composite Mean Scores Presidents					
Frames	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
StrucMean	29	2.88	4.88	4.06	.61707
HRMean	29	2.71	5.00	3.94	.59785
POLMean	29	3.00	5.00	4.20	.55843
SymbMean	29	3.00	5.00	4.16	.57759
Valid N (listwise)	29				

The composite mean score for each frame of the college and university president group is revealed in Table 4-9. Determining which of the four leadership frames was predominant among college or university presidents was predicated on which of the mean scores among the leadership frames mean scores was the highest. All of the mean scores for each of the four leadership frames were very similar for the university and college presidents. Across the four frames, university presidents reported often utilizing each of the four frames. Again, these mean scores were relatively close with a small difference between the political frame score and the human resource frame score of 0.3. The results indicate that college and university presidents in master's degree granting public and not-for-profit institutions in the states of West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida often used all four leadership frames with no frame clearly emerging as the dominant frame. This finding suggests that the presidents' leadership style is multi-framed.

Research Question Two: Leadership Frames of Vice-Presidents of Academic Affairs

The second research question focused on identifying the leadership frames of vice-presidents for academic affairs of public and not-for-profit master's degree awarding institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida?

All of the 32 items of the B&D Leadership Orientation (Self) (1990) were used.

Individual mean frame scores for each VPAA is listed below (see Table 4-10).

Table 4-10. *Mean Leadership Frame Scores for Individual VPAA*

N=	Structural	Human	Political	Symbolic
1	3.5	4.38	3.38	3.63
2	4.38	4.38	4.38	4.38
3	4.63	4.38	3.88	2.38
4	4.25	4	4.25	3.5
5	4.88	4.88	3.63	3
6	3.63	4.13	3.38	3.38
7	4.25	4	3.5	3.25
8	4.13	3.88	3.13	3.38
9	3.88	3.25	3.88	3.25
10	3.83	4	4	3.63
11	4	4	2.88	2.5
12	4.38	4.63	3.25	3.75
13	5	5	5	4.75
14	4	4	3.75	4
15	3.67	4	3.5	4
16	3.5	5	2.5	3.63
17	3.75	4.25	2.38	2.25
18	3.5	3.5	2.75	3.5
19	4.5	5	4.75	3.25
20	4.63	4.63	3.63	3.75
21	3.88	4	3.5	3.13
22	4.25	4.13	3	3.63
23	4	4.38	3.75	2.88
24	4.88	4.63	4.25	4.5
25	3.25	3.88	3.13	3
26	4	4	4	4
27	3.88	3.75	4.38	3.5
28	3.75	4	3	3
29	3.75	4.13	2.75	3.13

Table 4-11. *Composite Mean Frame Scores for VPAA*

Composite Mean Frame Scores VPAA					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
StrucMean VPAA	29	2.50	5.00	3.91	.76441
HRMean VPAA	29	2.75	5.00	4.08	.75392
POLMean VPAA	29	2.13	5.00	3.90	.66700
SymbMean VPAA	29	2.00	5.00	3.81	.76531
Valid N (listwise)	29				

Twenty-nine VPAA responded completing all of the 32 items addressed on the B&DO (Self) Leadership survey. The mean scores for VPAAs were very similar demonstrating that they often used all four leadership frames (see Table 4-11). As administrators VPAA, should be able to work with and support faculty and staff while maintaining structure. They also compliment the leadership styles of presidents who also tend to use all four frames.

Research Question Three: Leadership Frames of Vice-Presidents for Student Affairs

The third research question asked: What are the predominant frames of vice-presidents for student affairs of public and not-for-profit master's degree awarding institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida?

The mean frame scores of both individual vice-presidents for student affairs and their composite frame scores are provided in Tables 4-12 and 14-13.

Table 4-12. *Mean Frame Scores of Individual VPSA*

N=43	Structural Frame	Human Resource	Political Frame	Symbolic Frame
1	4.25	4.25	3.0	3.5
2	4.63	5.00	4.88	4.88
3	3.50	3.50	4.00	3.25
4	4.00	4.43	3.00	3.75
5	4.00	4.25	4.13	3.63
6	3.75	4.63	4.13	4.50
7	4.63	4.00	3.25	4.25
8	3.25	3.25	3.00	2.50
9	2.38	4.63	3.50	3.13
10	3.00	3.88	3.88	4.14
11	4.13	4.00	4.00	3.25
12	4.25	4.63	4.00	4.13
13	2.63	4.50	2.75	3.13
14	5.00	5.00	3.88	3.88
15	3.63	4.88	4.63	4.63
16	3.88	4.75	4.00	4.14
17	4.00	4.38	3.88	4.13
18	4.63	3.63	3.75	3.88
19	4.50	4.13	3.75	3.75
20	4.50	4.88	4.63	4.50
21	4.00	4.38	4.75	4.38
22	3.88	3.63	3.75	3.63
23	3.88	4.63	3.75	3.88
24	3.25	4.38	2.00	2.13
25	4.13	4.00	3.25	3.13
26	4.50	4.75	3.50	3.50
27	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.38
28	4.25	3.88	2.88	2.75
29	3.38	5.00	3.00	3.13
30	4.50	4.13	3.75	3.38
31	3.50	4.00	3.38	3.13
32	4.63	4.88	4.50	4.63
33	3.13	4.00	3.75	3.88
34	3.38	4.75	4.13	3.88
35	3.88	4.63	3.75	4.25
36	2.50	4.63	3.50	3.50
37	3.13	3.63	3.13	2.63
38	4.00	3.63	3.63	3.50

(cont.)

Table 4-12. *Mean Frame Scores of Individual VPSA (cont.)*

	Structural Frame	Human Resource	Political Frame	Symbolic Frame
39	5.00	4.75	4.25	4.38
40	3.88	4.00	4.00	4.00
41	4.00	3.88	3.25	3.75
42	3.25	3.38	2.25	2.63
43	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.50

Forty-three VPSA responded to the Bolman & Deal Leadership Orientation (Self) (1990) survey. It was the largest group of all of the groups of respondents. All of the 32 items of Bolman & Deal's Leadership Orientation (Self) (1990) survey were used in calculating the means scores for each of the VPSA and their composite mean scores. The minimum score was 2 and the maximum was 5.

Table 4-13. *Composite Mean Frames Scores of VPSA*

Composite Mean Frame Scores VPSA					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
StrucMean VPSA	43	2.13	5.00	3.88	.65550
HRMean VPSA	43	2.75	5.00	3.99	.66143
PolMeanVPSA	43	2.00	5.00	3.88	.69302
SymbMeanVPSA	43	2.38	5.00	3.76	.69804
Valid N (listwise)	43				

All of the mean scores were very similar demonstrating that VPSAs tend to often use all four frames. The results indicate that VPSA operate in a leadership style that is multi-framed. The results support the role of VPSA in that they are individuals who are "people" oriented, but must also maintain structure and build and support coalitions with students, faculty, and administrators.

Research Question Four: Leadership Frames of Chief Financial Officers

Thirty-one CFOs responded to all of the 32 items of the BDO (Self) Leadership survey. The mean scores of each Chief Financial Officer and their composite mean frame scores as a group are listed in Tables 4-14 and 4-15. The human resource and political frames have the highest mean scores (both close to 3.9). This means that Chief Financial Officers often use these frames. However, the remaining two frames of symbolic and structural frames are both close to 3.7 indicating that these frames are often used as well. The results support the role of CFOs. They must be able to operate in the human resource and political frames in supporting and managing staff as well as in building coalitions within their institutions as administrators.

Table 4-14. *Mean Frame Scores of Individual CFO*

N=31	Structural Frame	Human Resource	Political Frame	Symbolic Frame
1	3.88	4.00	3.50	3.38
2	4.13	4.00	4.50	3.50
3	4.00	4.13	4.38	4.75
4	4.25	4.50	2.75	2.75
5	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
6	5.00	4.50	4.13	3.75
7	5.00	3.75	3.75	3.25
8	5.00	3.50	4.50	3.00
9	4.50	4.75	4.63	4.50
10	3.63	4.00	3.25	3.00
11	3.13	4.13	3.50	3.75
12	4.50	4.75	3.25	3.88
13	4.38	4.38	4.00	3.63
14	4.38	3.00	4.88	4.25
15	4.38	3.88	2.88	2.63
16	4.50	4.13	3.38	3.75
17	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
18	3.38	3.50	2.75	2.88
19	4.38	5.00	4.25	4.38
20	5.00	5.00	4.88	4.63
21	4.63	4.63	4.00	4.38
22	4.38	4.00	4.25	3.63
23	5.00	3.13	4.25	2.75
24	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.50
25	5.00	5.00	3.75	4.50

(cont.)

Table 4.14. *Mean Frame Scores of Individual CFO (cont.)*

26	4.88	4.50	4.13	3.75
27	4.25	4.25	3.00	2.88
28	4.75	4.88	4.13	3.63
29	4.25	4.63	3.50	2.75
30	3.75	4.00	2.86	3.00
31	3.38	5.00	2.50	3.00

Table 4-15. *Composite Mean Frame Scores CFO*

Composite Mean Frame Scores CFO					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
StrucMean	31	3.00	5.00	3.68	.55419
HRMean	31	3.00	5.00	3.86	.69206
PolMean	31	2.38	5.00	3.84	.56558
SymbMean	31	2.63	5.00	3.65	.54047
Valid N (listwise)	31				

Research Question Five: Significant Differences in Leadership Frames by Years Experience

In the survey, respondents were asked to indicate the number of years in their current role as was discussed earlier. Six (20.7 percent) of the respondents have been college presidents for 4 years or less, followed by 11 (37.9 percent) who have been college presidents between 5 and 8 years. The remaining 12 have been presidents, four (13.8 percent) in each year group of 9-12, 13-16, and 17 or more years. This is a cumulative percentage of 41.4 percent. When combined 17 (58.6 percent), over half of the respondents, have been college presidents 8 years or less (see Table 4-16).

Table 4-16. *Years as President*

		Years as President			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-4 year	6	20.7	20.7	20.7
	5-8 years	11	37.9	37.9	58.6
	9-12 years	4	13.8	13.8	72.4
	13-16 years	4	13.8	13.8	86.2
	17 or more years	4	13.8	13.8	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

No significant difference exists within the mean frame scores of each of the leadership frames among the college and university presidents regarding years in current role.

Table 4-17 provides the structural frame mean scores for each of the year group of the college presidents and the analysis of variance (ANOVA). It is interesting to note that college presidents with 0 to 4 years in position had the higher mean score (4.29) than any of the other year groups of presidents. The 5 to 8 year group had the largest number of the college presidents and had a mean score of 4.09. The 9-12, 13-16 and 17 or more year groups had four individuals in each of the respective groups. The year group with the lowest mean score was the 13 to 16 year group with a score of 3.66.

As may be noted in Table 4-17, the ANOVA indicated there was not a significant difference. In this analysis, the independent variable was years in position (five groups). The dependent variable was structural frame mean scores. This analysis of variance in mean Structural Frame scores yielded no significant difference when comparing longevity in current position ($F=.625$, $df = 4/24$, $p = .649$). Accordingly, the structural frame scores did not differ significantly among the presidential year groups.

Table 4-17. *Presidents' Structural Frame Scores by Years in Role*

Presidents’ Structural Frame Mean Scores by Years (Means and Analysis of Variance)					
Years in Position		N		Mean Frame Score	
0-4		6		4.29	
5-8		11		4.09	
9-12		4		4.09	
13-16		4		3.66	
17 or more		4		4.00	
Total		29		4.06	
Presidents’ Structural Frame Analysis of Variance					
	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	1.006	4	.252	.625	.649 (NS)
Within Groups	9.656	24	.402		
Total	10.662	28			

*Note: NS = Not Significant

The presidents' human resource frame by years showed that the group with the highest mean score was the 5 to 8 year group with a mean score of 4 (see Table 4-18). The group with the lowest mean score was the 13-16 year group with a score of 3.75. The 9-12 and 17 or more year groups had mean scores of 3.93.

The ANOVA indicated there was not a significant difference among the year groups regarding the human resource frame scores (see Table 4-18). In this analysis, the independent variable was years in position (five groups) and the dependent variable were the human resource frame scores. The analysis of variance yielded $F = .117$, $df = 4/24$, $p = .975$ (not statistically significant). As such, the human resource frame scores among the presidents did not differ significantly based on years in position.

Table 4-18. *Presidents' Human Resource Frame Scores by Years in Role*

Presidents’ Human Resource Frame Mean Scores by Years (Means and Analysis of Variance)					
Years in Position	N	Mean Frame Score			
0-4	6	3.96			
5-8	11	4			
9-12	4	3.94			
13-16	4	3.75			
17 or more	4	3.94			
Total	29	3.94			
Presidents’ Human Resource Frame Analysis of Variance					
	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	.192	4	.048	.117	.975 (NS)
Within Groups	9.816	24	.409		
Total	10.008	28			

*Note: NS = Not significant

For the political frame the year group of presidents with the highest mean score of 4.44 was the 9 to 12 year group (see Table 4-19). The 17 or more year group followed next with a score of 4.31. Next the 5-8 year group had a mean score of 4.24 followed by the 0-4 year group with a score of 4.1. The 13-16 year group had the lowest score of 3.9.

The ANOVA indicated there was not a significant difference. In this analysis the independent variable was the years in position (five groups) and the dependent variable was the political frame mean scores. The analysis of variance yielded $F = .517$, $df = 4/24$, $p = .724$ (not statistically significant) (see Table 4-19). The political frame scores did not differ significantly among the presidents based on years in role.

Table 4-19. *Presidents' Political Frame Mean Scores by Years in Role*

Presidents Political Frame Mean Scores by Years (Means and Analysis of Variance)					
Years in Position	N	Mean Frame Score			
0-4	6	4.10			
5-8	11	4.24			
9-12	4	4.44			
13-16	4	3.91			
17 or more	4	4.31			
Total	29	4.20			
Presidents' Political Frame Analysis of Variance					
	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MF</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	.693	4	.173	.517	.724 (NF)
Within Groups	8.039	24	.335		
Total	8.732	28			

*Note: NS = Not Significant

The highest mean score for the presidents' symbolic frame are in the 9-12 and 17 or more year groups (see Table 4-20). Each had frame scores of 4.44. The group with the lowest mean score of 3.92 was the 13-16 year group. The 5-8 year group had the second highest score of 4.15 and the 0-4 year group had a mean score of 3.96.

As noted in Table 4-20, the ANOVA indicated there was not a significant difference. Years in position was the independent variable and the dependent variable was the symbolic frame mean scores. The ANOVA yielded $F = .802$, $df = 4/24$, $p = .536$ (not statistically significant). The symbolic frame mean scores among the presidents were not significantly different based on years in position.

Table 4-20. *Presidents' Symbolic Frame Mean Scores by Years in Role*

Presidents Symbolic Frame Mean Scores by Years (Means and Analysis of Variance)					
Years in Position	N	Mean Frame Score			
0-4	6	3.96			
5-8	11	4.15			
9-12	4	4.44			
13-16	4	3.92			
17 or more	4	4.44			
Total	29	4.16			
Presidents Symbolic Frame Analysis of Variance					
	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MF</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	1.101	4	.275	.802	.536 (NS)
Within Groups	8.240	24	.343		
Total	9.341	28			

Based on the findings and the analysis of variance for each leadership frame among the presidents based on years in position, there were no significant differences across all of the four leadership frame mean scores. Although it was clear that some of the frame mean scores were higher it does not mean that a significant difference exists among college and university presidents within this study. This finding is related to the fact that the mean scores for each leadership frame are very similar to each other. A limitation that might have affected these results is that there were unequal sizes for each of the subgroups.

Research Question Six: Significant Differences in Leadership Frames by Years Experience of Cabinet Members

Research question six asked: Are there significant differences in the cabinet members' leadership frames by number of years experience in their administrative roles?

To answer this research question ANOVA were conducted for each of the four leadership frames among the group of cabinet members consisting of vice presidents for academic affairs, vice presidents for student affairs, and chief financial officers. Each leadership frame will be analyzed based on frame mean scores and years in the role.

The means and analysis of variance for structural frame among the cabinet member group is listed in Table 4-21. A total of 103 respondents comprised this group.

For vice presidents for academic affairs the largest group was the 0-4 year group ($n=15$). The highest mean score in the vice presidents for academic affairs group was in the 9-12 year group with a structural frame mean score of 4.35. The largest group for the vice presidents of student affairs was the 0-4 year group ($n=16$) with a mean score of 3.86. The second largest group ($n=12$) was in the 5-8 year group with a mean score of 3.97. The 17 or more year group had a mean score of 3.73. The 9-12 year group had a score of 3.84 and the 13-16 year group had a score of 4.04. Chief financial officers had their highest score in the 9-12 year group with a score of 4. The 13-16 year group followed next with a score of 3.73. The scores for the 0-4 and 5-8 year groups were 3.61 and 3.64 respectively. As indicated in the table, the mean scores (MS) for each year group is 0-4 MS=3.86, 5-8 MS 3.79, 9-12 MS=4.1, 13-16 MS=3.65, and 17 or more MS=3.7. The mean score for the entire group is 3.83.

The ANOVA did not indicate a significant difference among the cabinet members' group based on years in position and the mean scores of the structural frame. The independent variable was the years in position and the dependent variable was the structural frame mean scores. The analysis of variance yielded $F = .836$, $df = 4/98$, $p = .506$ (not statistically significant). Accordingly, the structural frame did not differ significantly among the cabinet members' year groups.

Table 4-21. *Structural Frame Mean Scores by Role and Years*

Cabinet Members' Structural Frame Mean Scores by Role and Years (Means and Analysis of Variance)						
Years in Role	VPAA N=29	VPSA N=43	CFO N=31	Total Cabinet Members N=103		
0-4	3.99 N=15	3.86 N=16	3.61 N=8	3.86 N=39		
5-8	3.71 N=7	3.97 N=12	3.64 N=10	3.79 N=29		
9-12	4.36 N=5	3.84 N=4	4 N=3	4.09 N=12		
13-16	2.88 N=2	4 N=3	3.73 N=5	3.65 N=10		
17 or More	NA N=0	3.73 N=8	3.65 N=5	3.7 N=13		
Cabinet Members' Structural Frame Analysis of Variance						
	<i>Sum of Squares</i>		<i>df</i>	<i>MF</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
Between Groups	1.471		4	.368	.836	.506 (NS)
Within Groups	43.136		98	.440		
Total	44.607		102			

*Note: NS = Not Significant

The analysis of the human resource frame mean scores and analysis of variance is depicted in Table 4-22 for the cabinet members' group.

For vice presidents for academic affairs the 9-12 year group had a mean score of 4.6, followed by the 0-4 and 5-8 year groups each with a mean score of 4. The vice

presidents for student affairs group with the highest mean score was the 13-16 year group with a score of 4.29, followed by the 0-4 year group with a 4.06 score, and the 5-8 year group with a score of 4. In the chief financial officers groups, the 9-12 year group had the highest mean score of 4.42. The 0-4 year group had a mean score of 3.77. The 13-16 year group and the 17 or more year groups had mean scores of 3.73 and 3.96 respectively. The cabinet members' mean score as a group was 3.97.

As may be noted in Table 4-22, the ANOVA indicated that there was not a significant difference. In the analysis, the independent variable was the years in position. The dependent variable was the human resource frame means. The analysis of variance yielded $F = .474$, $df = 4/98$, $p = .755$ (not statistically significant). Based on this analysis, the human resource frame scores did not differ significantly among the cabinet members' based on years in position.

Table 4-22. *Human Resource Frame Mean Scores by Role and Years*

Cabinet Members' Human Resource Frame Mean Scores by Role and Years (Means and Analysis of Variance)				
Years in Role	VPAA N=29	VPSA N=43	CFO N=31	Total Cabinet Members N=103
0-4	4.02 N=15	4.06 N=16	3.77 N=8	3.98 N=39
5-8	4.02 N=7	4 N=12	3.71 N=10	3.91 N=29
9-12	4.6 N=5	3.59 N=4	4.42 N=3	4.22 N=12
13-16	3.5 N=2	4.29 N=3	3.73 N=5	3.9 N=10
17 or More	NA N=0	3.791 N=8	3.96 N=5	3.92 N=13

(cont.)

Table 4.22. *Human Resource Frame Mean Scores by Role and Years (cont.)*

Cabinet Members' Human Resource Frame Analysis of Variance					
	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MF</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	.947	4	.237	.474	.755 (NS)
Within Groups	48.986	98	.500		
Total	49.932	102			

*Note: NS = Not Significant

Table 4-23 provides the mean scores of the political frame and ANOVA for the cabinet members' group. For vice presidents for academic affairs the 0-4 year group had a mean score of 3.86. The 5-8 year group had the highest mean score of 4.79. The 0-9 year group had a mean score of 4.35, and the 13-16 year group had a score of 3.38. Vice presidents for student affairs had the highest mean score in the 13-16 year group with a score of 4.5. The next highest mean score of 4 was in the 0-4 year group followed by the 17 or more year group with a 3.88 score. The 9-12 year group had a mean score of 3.84 and lastly the 5-8 year group had a score of 3.57. Chief financial officers' group had similar scores. The group with the highest score of 4.46 was the 9-12 year group. A score of 3.8 was calculated for both the 5-8 and 17 or more year group. The 13-16 year group had the lowest mean score of 3.6. The cabinet members' mean scores for each year group category was 0-4 MS = 3.9, 5-8 MS = 3.7, 9-12 MS = 4.21, 13-16 MS = 3.83, 17 or more years MS = 3.85. The group total mean score was 3.87.

The ANOVA indicated there was not a significant difference among the cabinet members' mean scores for the political frame based on years in position. The independent variable for the analysis was years in position and the dependent variable were the political frame mean scores. The analysis of variance yielded $F = 1.389$, $df = 4/97$, $p = .243$ (not statistically significant). The political frame scores did differ significantly among the cabinet members based on years in role.

Table 4-23. *Political Frame Mean Scores by Role and Years*

Cabinet Members' Political Frame Mean Scores by Role and Years (Means and Analysis of Variance)					
Years in Role	VPAA N=29	VPSA N=43	CFO N=31	Total Cabinet Members N=103	
0-4	3.87 N=15	4 N=16	3.77 N=8	3.91 N=39	
5-8	4.79 N=7	3.57 N=12	3.8 N=10	3.70 N=29	
9-12	4.35 N=5	3.84 N=4	4.46 N=3	4.21 N=12	
13-16	3.38 N=2	4.5 N=3	3.6 N=5	3.83 N=10	
17 or More	NA N=0	3.88 N=8	3.8 N=5	3.85 N=13	
Cabinet Members' Political Frame Analysis of Variance					
	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MF</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	2.268	4	.567	1.389	.243 (NS)
Within Groups	39.575	97	.408		
Total	41.842	101			

*Note: NS = Not Significant

Table 4-24 shows the results of the symbolic frame mean scores and ANOVA for the cabinet members' group. Vice presidents for academic affairs had the highest mean score in the 9-12 year group with a score of 4.15. Next, the 5-8 year group had a mean score of 3.95 followed by the 0-4 year group with a mean score of 3.79. The 13-16 year group had the lowest score of 2.56. The vice presidents for student affairs 0-4 year group had the highest mean score of 4.03. The 13-16 year group followed next with a mean score of 4.08 and the 17 or more year group had a score of 3.7. The 9-12 year group and the 5-8 year group had the similar mean scores of 3.5 and 3.46 respectively. The group with the highest means scores among chief financial officers was the 9-12 year group with a score of 3.88. The 0-4 year group followed next with a score of 3.75. The 17 or more year group had a score of 3.65 and the 5-8 year group had a score of 3.61. The 13-16 year group had the lowest mean score of 3.43 among them. The group total mean score was 3.74.

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated there was not a significant difference based on years in role and the symbolic frame mean scores among the chief financial officers (see Table 4-24). The independent variable was years in position and the dependent variable were the symbolic mean scores. The analysis of variance yielded $F = 1.232$, $df = 4/97$, $p = .302$ (not statistically significant).

Table 4-24. *Symbolic Frame Mean Scores by Role and Years*

Cabinet Members' Symbolic Frame Mean Scores by Role and Years (Means and Analysis of Variance)						
Years in Role	VPAA N=29	VPSA N=43	CFO N=31	Total Cabinet Members N=103		
0-4	3.79 N=15	4.03 N=16	3.75 N=8	3.88 N=39		
5-8	3.95 N=7	3.46 N=12	3.61 N=10	3.63 N=29		
9-12	4.15 N=5	3.5 N=4	3.88 N=3	3.86 N=12		
13-16	2.56 N=2	4.08 N=3	3.43 N=5	3.45 N=10		
17 or More	NA N=0	3.7 N=8	3.65 N=5	3.68 N=13		
Cabinet Members' Symbolic Frame Analysis of Variance						
	<i>Sum of Squares</i>		<i>Df</i>	<i>MF</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	2.198		4	.549	1.232	.302 (NS)
Within Groups	43.258		97	.446		
Total	45.456		101			

*Note: NS = Not Significant

The statistical analyses presented in answering research question six indicated that no significant differences existed among the cabinet members' group across all four leadership frames based on years in position. The cabinet members' group included vice presidents for academic affairs, vice presidents for affairs, and chief financial officers.

Research Question Seven: Significant Differences in Leadership Frames Between Presidents and Cabinet Members

Are there significant differences between the presidents' leadership frames and the cabinet members'?

Research question seven is answered based on the leadership frames mean scores and ANOVA for each group. The roles identified are presidents and cabinet members. Table 4-25 provides the results for structural frame mean scores for the presidents' group and the cabinet members' group. The mean score for the presidents' group is 4.06 compared to the mean score of the cabinet members' group of 3.83. The total structural mean score is 3.86. Although the structural frame mean score was the lowest mean compared to the other frame mean scores among the presidents, it is still higher than the cabinet members' scores.

The analysis of variance indicated there was not a significant difference (see Table 4-25). The independent variable was the role (presidents or cabinet members) and the dependent variable was the structural frame mean scores. The analysis of variance yielded $F = 2.887$, $df = 1/130$, $p = .092$ (not statistically significant). The structural mean scores did not differ significantly among the presidents' and cabinet members' groups.

Table 4-25. *Structural Frame Means*

Structural Frame Mean Scores by Presidents & Cabinet Members (Means and Analysis of Variance)					
Role	N		Mean Frame Score		
President	29		4.06		
Cabinet Member	103		3.83		
Total	132		3.88		
Structural Frame Analysis of Variance					
	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MF</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	1.227	1	1.227	2.887	.092 (NS)
Within Groups	55.269	130	.425		
Total	56.497	132			

*Note: NS = Not Significant

The human resource frame mean score comparisons and analysis of variance are presented on Table 4-26. The mean score for the presidents' group was 3.94 and the cabinet members' group was 3.97. The total mean score was 3.96. It is interesting to note that the cabinet members utilize the human resource frame slightly more than the presidents. This can be attributed to the functions required of each of the different roles.

The analysis of variance did not indicate a significant difference among the two groups regarding mean scores (see Table 4-26). The independent variable was the role and the dependent the human resource frame means. The analysis of variance yielded $F = .051$, $df = 1/130$, $p = .822$ (not statistically significant). No significant differences existed among the presidents' group and the cabinet members' group regarding their mean frame scores.

Table 4-26. *Human Resource Frame Means*

Human Resource Frame Mean Scores by Presidents & Cabinet Members (Means and Analysis of Variance)					
Role	N		Mean Frame Score		
President	29		3.94		
Cabinet Member	103		3.97		
Total	132		3.96		
Human Resource Frame Analysis of Variance					
	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MF</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	.023	1	.023	.051	.822 (NS)
Within Groups	59.940	130	.461		
Total	59.964	132			

*Note: NS = Not Significant

Next the political frame mean scores comparisons and analysis of variance are presented in Table 4-27. The mean scores are 4.2 for the presidents' group and 3.87 for the cabinet members' group. The total mean score was 3.94. The analysis of variance indicated a significant difference. The independent variable was the role and the dependent variable was the political frame mean scores. The analysis of variance yielded $F = 6.338$, $df = 1/129$, $p = .013$ (statistically significant). The political frame scores differed significantly among the presidents' and cabinet members' groups. College presidents significantly more often utilized the political frame than did the other cabinet members. This is to be expected since college and university presidents often function in the political arena working with community, state, and public constituents and stakeholders. The other cabinet members tend to work more internally and have less direct interactions with numerous external stakeholder groups.

Table 4-27. *Political Frame Means*

Political Frame Mean Scores by Presidents & Cabinet Members (Means and Analysis of Variance)					
Role	N		Mean Frame Score		
President	29		4.2		
Cabinet Member	102		3.87		
Total	131		3.94		
Political Frame Analysis of Variance					
	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MF</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	2.485	1	2.485	6.338	.013 (SD)
Within Groups	50.574	129	.392		
Total	53.059	131			

*Note: SD = Significant Difference

The last comparison is the symbolic frame. The mean scores and the ANOVA are represented in Table 4-28. The mean scores for each group are 4.16 for the presidents' group and 3.74 for the cabinet members' group. The total mean score was 3.83.

The ANOVA indicated significant differences among the presidents' and cabinet members' groups regarding the symbolic mean scores. The independent variable was the role and the dependent variable was the symbolic mean scores. The analysis of variance yielded $F = 9.159$, $df = 1/129$, $p = .003$ (statistically significant). The cabinet members' mean score was significantly lower than the presidents' group mean. College presidents significantly more often utilize the symbolic frame in their leadership. This finding is not surprising since college and university presidents represent their institutions symbolically among the public sector as well as within their respective institutions among faculty, staff, and students.

Table 4-28. *Symbolic Frame Means*

Symbolic Frame Mean Scores by Presidents & Cabinet Members (Means and Analysis of Variance)					
Role	N		Mean Frame Score		
President	29		4.16		
Cabinet Member	102		3.74		
Total	131		3.83		
Political Frame Analysis of Variance					
	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MF</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	3.891	1	3.891	9.159	.003 (SD)
Within Groups	54.797	129	.425		
Total	58.688	130			

*Note: SD = Significant Difference

In comparing the mean frame scores among the presidents' group and the cabinet members' group, two significant differences emerged. College presidents significantly more often use the political and symbolic leadership frames than did their cabinet members. It is interesting that the human resource and structural frames did not indicate any significant differences when analyzing the mean scores among the two groups. These findings are representative of the functionality of each of the roles. They provide insight into the leadership styles of senior leaders and highlight a couple of differences in leadership style between college presidents and their cabinet.

Chapter Five:

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the leadership frames of senior academic administrators in master's degree granting public and not-for-profit institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida. No other studies have been conducted that focused on the predominant leadership frames of college or university presidents, vice presidents for academic affairs, vice presidents for student affairs, and chief financial officers in the selected states. The purpose was to determine the predominant leadership frames of the college or university presidents and key members of presidential cabinets and to examine significant differences in certain areas.

The population of the study consisted of 384 identified potential participants in the master's degree granting public and not-for-profit institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, and Florida. Of the 384 potential participants, 191 responded. Of the 191 participants, 147 completed the entire survey - 29 were college or university presidents, 29 were vice presidents of academic affairs, 43 were vice presidents of student affairs, 31 were chief financial officers, and 15 identified themselves as other. Those identified as "other" were not included in the statistical analyses in answering the research questions.

The survey instrument used was Bolman and Deal's Leadership Orientation (Self) (1990) questionnaire (Appendix A). The survey was provided to each participant via an electronic link to SurveyMonkey. The survey consisted of 32 items addressing each of the four leadership frames. Eight of the items were aimed at the structural frame, eight at the human resource frame, eight at the political frame, and eight at the symbolic frame.

A demographic component was included consisting of three items requesting the participants to identify their gender, their role as an administrator, and their years of experience in their current position.

The research methodology for the study was quantitative. Permission was granted by Dr. Lee Bolman to use the survey instrument (Appendix C). The survey was sent to each potential participant with a formal letter inviting them to participate in the study (Appendix D) and instruction on completing the survey. The participants were asked to complete the survey within 10 days after receipt. A follow up request was made after the ten day period as a reminder and to generate greater participation (Appendix E).

Once the surveys were received by the researcher, they were analyzed using SPSS-19 statistical software for frequencies, descriptive statistics, and ANOVAs. The findings were used to answer the three demographic questions and the seven research questions. The results of the findings were reported in chapter four.

Conclusions

This section provides conclusions based on the results relevant to identifying the predominant leadership frames among college and university presidents and key presidential cabinet members who participated in the study.

Numerous studies have been conducted examining leadership styles using Bolman and Deal's four-frame leadership model. Some of these studies include Estella M. Bensimon (1989), Linda S. Knudson (1997), Tongshan Chang (2004), and Susan Goodall (2008). In Bensimon's study she found that of the 32 college presidents that participated in the study only 25% were multi-framed with the majority (40%) being single framed. Goodall, in her study *Perceptions of Leadership* (2008) found that 10 of the 34 principles (29.4%) involved in the study perceived themselves operating in all four frames, 5 (14.7%) operated using three frames, and 8 (23.5%) as paired framed. The majority 18 (44.1%) operated as multi-framed leaders since they utilized three of the four frames. In Chang's study of leadership styles among department chairs, 230 faculty rated 81 department chairs. Nearly 15% of the chairs were rated as being multi-framed, 13.6% as paired-framed, 14.8% as single-framed, and 56% as having no frame.

This dissertation study had similar results as reported previously by Bensimon (1989) and Goodall (2008). However, this dissertation study had findings that were not

consistent with the results gleaned through Chang's (2004) study. This study focused on senior academic leaders in master's degree granting public and not-for-profit institutions across eight states while Chang's study focused on department chairs. The results from this dissertation study indicated that the respondents operated as multi-framed leaders. This is not surprising when considering that the majority (64.6%) of the respondents had been in their roles eight years or less.

The results answered the three demographic questions and the seven research questions. The demographic information is as follows:

- Gender. There were more males than females in this study. Of the 191 respondents 65.6 % were male, 33.3 % were female, and 1 % chose not to respond. The group with the largest male to female ratio was the CFO with a ratio of 7:1. Only four of the 31 CFOs were female.
- Role. The highest frequency of the four identified roles was the vice presidents for student affairs at 32.6% followed by presidents and vice presidents of academic affairs each with 21.9% and chief financial officers at 23.5%.
- Experience in role. Experience in role had the highest frequency in the 0-4 years with 35.9 %, followed by the 5-8 year group with 28.6 %. When combined respondents with eight or less years in role comprised 64.79%.

The seven research questions had the following findings:

- Research question 1: Predominant frames of presidents. The highest composite mean frame score of college or university presidents was 4.20 out of a possible 5.0 for the political frame, followed closely by the symbolic frame mean score of 4.16. The mean frames scores for the structural and human resource frames were 4.06 and 3.94 respectively. The political, symbolic, and structural frames had mean scores over 4 suggesting that presidents most often use these frames and are multi-framed in their leadership styles. This is consistent with results reported by Bensimon (1989) and Goodall (2008) in previous studies.
- Research question 2: Predominant frames of vice presidents for academic affairs. The highest mean score was the human resource frame. The mean score

was 4.08. The next highest score of 3.91 was the structural frame. The political frame mean score was 3.90 and the symbolic frame score was 3.81. The findings indicate that vice presidents for academic affairs operate in all four leadership frames with the human resource frame being predominant. The findings reported here were similar to those reported by Bingham and Reavis (2001) that investigated leadership frames of school principals. They reported that the human resource frame was predominant followed by the structural, symbolic, and political frames respectively.

- Research question 3: Predominant frames of vice presidents for student affairs. Vice presidents for student affairs had a human resource frame mean score of 3.98 making it the predominant frame among them. Both the structural and political frames mean scores were 3.88. The symbolic frame score was the lowest at 3.76. It is not surprising that vice presidents for student affairs scored the highest in the human resource frame since their role involves working with and tending to the needs of students. As discovered in Chang's (2004) study, similar results were noted here. The human resource frame had the highest mean with the structural, political, and symbolic frames following in that order.
- Research question 4: Predominant frames of chief financial officers. The last group, chief financial officers, had a human resource frame mean score of 3.86, a political frame mean score of 3.84, a structural frame mean score of 3.68, and a symbolic frame mean score of 3.65. Both the human resource and political frame scores are relatively close suggesting that CFOs most often use these frames. It is surprising that the structural frame was not one of the predominant frames since the nature of the role is highly structured. Again, just as was reported in research question 3 in this dissertation study and in Chang's (2004) study, the human resource frame had the highest mean score, however the political, structural, and symbolic frames followed closely behind the human resource frame.
- Research question 5: Differences among presidents based on years experience. No significant difference was noted among presidents of colleges and universities

within the study between the four leadership frames and years in current role. The year group with the highest percentage was the 5-8 year group. Their leadership frames mean scores were: structural frame = 4.09; human resource frame = 4; political frame = 4.24; and symbolic frame = 4.15. All the mean scores were above 4 indicating that the 5-8 year group often use each of the four leadership frames in their leadership styles. The other year groups scored mean scores above 4 in 3 of the 4 frames. All of the groups operate as multi-frame leaders. Neuman and Bensimon (1995) in their collaborative study reported similar findings of presidential leadership styles and diversity regarding “new” and “old” presidents. They discovered that presidents viewed their roles based on how problematic contexts may hinder their ability to lead.

- Research question 6: Differences among cabinet members based on years experience. A comparison was made among the three cabinet member groups (vice presidents for academic affairs, vice presidents for student affairs, and chief financial officers) to determine if years experience made significant differences in their leadership frames. Each of the groups was not equal in number. The largest group was the vice presidents for student affairs (n=43), followed by the chief financial officers (n=31), and lastly vice presidents for academic affairs (n=29). The group with the highest mean score in the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames was the vice presidents for academic affairs. The 9 to 12 year experience group scored the highest structural and human resource frame scores of 4.04 and 4.60 respectively and 4.46 in the symbolic frame. VPAA scored the highest mean score of 4.79 in the political frame for 5 to 8 year group. The vice presidents for student affairs scored the next highest mean scores in all of the leadership frames. The 13 to 16 year group had the highest scores of 4.04, 4.29, 4.5, and 4.09 in the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames respectively. Chief financial officers in the 9 to 12 year group had the highest political frame mean score of 4.46. CFOs in the 17 or more year group scored 3.96 in the human resource frame, followed by a mean score of 3.88 in the

9 to 12 year group. Of the three cabinet member groups, the group with the highest mean frame scores was VPAA in the 9 to 12 year group. VPSA scored the highest leadership frame scores in the 13 to 16 year group. Chief financial officers in the 9 to 12 year group had the highest leadership frame mean scores for both the political and symbolic frames. When comparing the mean scores among the three groups it appears that all of three groups operate often as multi-frame leaders, but tended to score high (above 4) in only one or two frames, with the exception of CFO group who did not score above 4 in any frame. The findings are consistent with those of Goodall (2008). She discovered that the majority of leaders in her study operated as multi-frame leaders (44%). Knudson's (1997) study proposed that real teams are cognitively and functionally complex and though they may function as real teams, they did not fit Neuman and Bensimon's (1992) model of real teams exclusively. This supports the complexity of multi-frame leadership.

- Research question 7: Differences between college or university presidents' and cabinet members' leadership frames. Determining whether significant differences existed between the college and university presidents' group and the cabinet members' group was accomplished by comparing mean frame leadership scores and ANOVAs. The presidents' group had high mean frame scores (above 4) in the structural, political, and symbolic frames. Significant differences were discovered when comparisons were made between the presidents' and cabinet members' groups. Presidents had higher mean scores in both the political and symbolic frames when compared with the cabinet member group. The alpha for the political frame was $p = .013$ and for the symbolic frame $p = .003$). This was inconsistent with Bensimon (1989), Chang (2004), and Goodall (2008) studies which indicated that leaders tended to operate as multi-frame or paired-framed with predominant frames being human resource and structural.

The mean scores of the presidents that participated in this study indicate that they often operate as multi-frame leaders. This finding is not surprising since presidents work with numerous stakeholders. Using multiple frames allows college presidents to think and act in a flexible manner depending upon the situation. These leaders do not take a narrow view on academic matters. As Bolman and Deal (2008, p.438) note “the power to reframe is vital for modern leaders... to see new possibilities and to create new opportunities”. Vice presidents for academic affairs had similar results. The 29 participants often operate as multi-frame leaders. Again this result is not surprising due to the senior level of this particular position. When examining the mean scores for the vice presidents of student affairs and CFOs, similar results were found. Their scores are fairly consistent and indicate that these senior leaders consider themselves often to be multi-frame leaders.

The findings support the roles of each of the four groups involved in this study (presidents, vice presidents of academic affairs, vice presidents of student affairs, and chief financial officers). All four groups of senior administrators tend to often use all four leadership frames.

There were no significant differences found between college presidents and their utilization of leadership frames by number of years in their role. In addition, there were no significant differences among cabinet members and their leadership frames by number of years in their role. However, when comparisons were made with the leadership frames of presidents and their cabinet members, two significant differences were found. College presidents significantly more often used the political and symbolic frames than did their cabinet members.

Recommendations

Recommendations for practice.

The importance of identifying the predominant frames of college and university presidents and senior administrators in presidential cabinets cannot be understated. Effective leadership includes working as members of a team. This study sought to identify the utilization of leadership frames among presidents, vice presidents for

academic affairs, vice presidents for student affairs, and chief financial officers that were predominant. Knowing this can help to identify if these administrative teams are multi-framed, paired-frame, or single-framed and to identify if they operate as real teams. The results of this study found that all four groups of senior academic administrators tended to often use all four leadership frames.

It is recommended that higher education institutions identify the predominant frames of their senior administrators to determine which of the four leadership frames are predominant in their leadership style. Knowing this will provide insight into developing effective real teams among the institutions' senior leadership. Ideally leaders should use multiple frames so that they can "discover alternatives when options seem severely constrained" (Bolman & Deal, year, p. 438). Given the current economy and challenges that institutions are facing, senior administrators should be open to new possibilities. If the results from a distribution of the leadership instrument demonstrated very little utilization of multiple frames among certain administrators, then academic leaders could create professional development opportunities to help administrators strengthen their leadership skills and better understand the qualities of effective leadership. The goals of such professional development could be to help senior leaders understand the different leadership frames and when they are appropriate to utilize. Successful leaders who are multi-framed may serve as role models or even as mentors for administrators who want to sharpen their leadership skills. This type of professional development would be very useful for new senior administrators.

In order to better adapt to the environment and address changing needs, senior administrators should use multiple frames and work in partnership with their stakeholders. However, that does not mean that these senior leaders are working together as real teams. This study was not able to provide supporting evidence that that was the case since the selected instrument was not designed to assess team work.

The results also indicated that senior administrators operating in their predominant frames were not based on years of experience in that role. For example, vice presidents for academic affairs had the highest mean score for the human resources frame

in the 5-8 years of experience group than any other. And chief financial officers scored the highest leadership frame score among them for the human resource frame in the 17 or more years experience group. No consistency can be attributed to operating in one leadership frame or another based on years experience in that role. It is recommended that further investigation be conducted to identify if predominant frames are shaped or formed by years experience in the position.

Recommendations for further research.

There are seven specific recommendations for future research studies based upon the results from this dissertation study.

1. Additional research should be conducted focusing on higher education institutions by their senior administrative team to identify areas requiring training in developing multi-frame leadership teams.
2. Further research could examine if the leadership frames differ for administrators at smaller private colleges and universities as compared to public and not-for-profit institutions. The findings of the study would either replicate what was discovered in this study or may provide insight into the leadership dynamics of private institutions regarding the leadership frames.
3. Research comparing leadership frames among private for-profit and public institutions should be conducted to determine if significant differences exist and any resulting implications. This would further enhance our understanding of leadership within higher education and may provide some keen insight of differences of conducting business among these two diverse groups.
4. Another area of expanding this study is in determining if significant differences emerge among the leadership frames based on personality type. Numerous personality inventory surveys exist, such as the Myers-Briggs test, and can be employed to determine if personality type is a major factor in differences within the leadership frames. The implications of tying personality types to leadership frames can provide the higher education community with a

richer understanding of leaders and their predominant leadership frames. The results of such a study can prove to be invaluable. Leadership development can be geared toward providing training based on personality type and leadership frames.

5. Research investigating if significant differences exist within the leadership frames of senior academic leaders can be attributed to their career paths should be conducted. Senior administrators have diverse and varied backgrounds. A study based on where they came from; within academia, the military, or the corporate business sector may further enlighten our understanding of leadership frames among senior academic leaders.
6. Subsequent studies should identify if significant differences in the utilization of the leadership frames among senior administrators is based on gender. It is recommended that future studies focus on the relationships between paired groups, such as presidents and vice presidents for academic affairs, vice presidents for academic affairs and chief financial officers. This would provide senior administrators with a different perspective which may cause them to operate using the four leadership frames.
7. Lastly, it is recommended that this study be expanded to the community college system to determine if like results can be replicated to enhance our understanding of leadership among the community college system and how the four leadership frames impact senior administrators within the community college system.

References

- Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M., & Jung, D.I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(4), 441-462.
- Barbuto, Jr., J.E., & Burbach, M.E. (2006). The emotional intelligence of transformational leaders: A field study of elected officials. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(1), 51-64.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13, 16-40.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bensimon, E.M., & Neumann, A. (1990). Constructing the presidency: college presidents' images of their leadership roles, a comparative study. *Journal of Higher Education*, 61(6), 678-701.
- Bensimon, E.M. (1989). The meaning of "good presidential leadership": A frame analysis. *Review of Higher Education*, 12, 107-123.
- Bensimon, E. M., Newmann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1991). Higher education and leadership theory. In M. W. Peterson (Ed.), *Organization and Governance in Higher Education*, (389-398). Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Bensimon, E.M., & Neumann, A. (1993). What teams can do: How leaders use – and neglect to use – their teams. In M.W. Peterson (Ed.), *Organization and Governance in Higher Education*, (244-257). Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.

- Bensimon, E. & Newmann, A. (1992). *Redesigning collegiate leadership: Teams and teamwork in higher education*, (Report No. R117G10037). Washington, DC: Office of Education and Improvement (ED). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 357 698).
- Bigham, G. & Reavis, R. (2001). Preferred leadership frames of principals in implementing a state-wide teacher appraisal system. *Contemporary Education*, 72(2), 52-57.
- Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1991a). *Image of leadership*. (NCEL Occasional Paper No. 7). Nashville, TN: National Center for Educational Leadership. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 332 345).
- Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1991b). Leadership and management effectiveness: A multi frame, multi-sector analysis. *Human Resource Management*, 30 (4), 509-534.
- Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Fransico,CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, N. A. & Barker, R.T. (2001). Analysis of the communication components found within the situational leadership model: Toward the integration of communication and the model. *Journal of Technical Writing & Communication*, 31(2), 135.
- Burns, M. J. (1987). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2005). *The Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education*. Retrieved on April 17, 2009, from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp>.
- Chrisyie, P. & Lingard, B. (2001). *Capturing complexity in higher education leadership*. Seattle, WA: Educational Research Association.(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 461 930).
- Daft, R. (1999). *Leadership theory and practice*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Day,C. (2000). *Beyond transformational leadership*. *Educational Leadership*, 57(7), 56.

- Den Hartog, D.N., Van Muijen, J.J., & Koopman, P.L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 70(1), 19-34.
- Eagly, A. H, Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C, & van Engen, M.L. (2004). *Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(4), 569.
- Fincher, C. (1987). Administrative leadership in higher education. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, V III (155-198). New York: Agathon Press, Inc.
- Fisher, J. L., Tack, M. W., & Wheeler, K. J. (1988). *The effective college president*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Friedman, A. (2004). Beyond mediocrity: Transformational leadership within a transactional framework. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 7(3), 203-204.
- Gardner, J.W. (2000). The nature of leadership. In J. Wiley & Sons (Ed.), *Educational Leadership*, (3-12). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gardner, H.& Laskin, E. (1995). *Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Goodall, S. H.R. (2008). *Perceptions of leadership and school climate through eyes of principals and teachers of Appalachian no child left behind blue ribbon schools (NCLBBRS)*. Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, West Virginia.
- Hackman, M.Z. & Johnson, C.E. (2004). *Leadership: A communication perspective* (4th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Higdon, L. (2003). Making the Team. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(15), C1.
Retrieved February 10, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist*, 49(6), 493-504.

- Hockaday, J., & Puyear, D. (2000). Community college leadership in the new millennium. *New Expeditions Issues Paper No. 8*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Jago, A. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. *Management Science*, 28(3), 315-336.
- Jones, M. (2004). Maslow's hierarchy of needs can lower recidivism. *Corrections Today*, 66(4), 18-21.
- Kane, T.D.& Tremble, T.R. (2000). Transformational leadership effects at different levels of the Army. *Military Psychology*, 12(2), 137-160.
- Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (2003). Character development. *Executive Excellence*, 20(9), 3.
- Lauer, C. (2002). The basic recipe for a leader. *Modern Healthcare*, 32(8), 33.
- Leadership and Management Models. Retrieved on April 17, 2009, from <http://web.cba.neu.edu/~ewertheim/leader/models.htm>.
- Meyer, H. (2006). Thinking outside the leadership box. *Community College Week*, 18(21), 6-8.
- Masood,S., Dani, S., Burns, N., & Backhouse, C. (2006). Transformational leadership and organizational culture: the situational strength perspective. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers – Part B – Engineering Manufacture*, 220(6), 941-949.
- Napolean Bonaparte. (2009). Wikipedia.org. Retrieved on April 20, 2009 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Napoleon_I_of_France.
- Rich, D. (2006). Academic leadership and the restructuring of higher education. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 134, 37-48.
- Robles, H. (1998). *Leadership in higher education*, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 426 742).
- Ronald Reagan. (2009). Wikipedia.org. Retrieved on April 20, 2009 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ronald_reagan.
- Samier, E. (2008). *Political approaches to educational administration and leadership*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Strain, M., (2008). Political approaches to educational administration and leadership. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 37(2), 300-303.
- Shen, M., & Chen, M. (2007). Relationship of leadership, team trust and team performance: A comparison of the service and manufacturing industries. *Social Behavior & Personality*, 35(5), 643-658.
- Spinelli, R.J. (2006). The applicability of Bass's model of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership in the hospital administrative environment. *Hospital Topics*, 84(2), 11-18.
- Stodgill, R. M. (1981). Traits of leadership: A follow-up to 1970. In B. M. Bass (Ed.), *Stodgill's handbook of leadership*, (73-82). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Strathe, M.I., & Wilson, V.W. (2006). Academic leadership: The pathway to and from. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 134, 5-13.
- Tongshan, C. (2004). *Leadership styles of department chairs and faculty utilization of instructional technology*. (Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 2004). Dissertation Abstracts International, 65(11A), 4054.
- Waldman, D.A., Bass, B.M., & Einstein, W.O. (1987). Leadership and outcomes of performance appraisal processes. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 60(3), 177-186.
- Walker, D. A. (1999). *The leadership conundrum: leadership development perspectives in higher education*. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. 432 172).
- Wheatley, M. (2000). Good-bye command and control. In J. Wiley & Sons (Ed.), *Educational Leadership*, (339-347). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Whitsett, G. (2007). Perceptions of leadership styles of department chairs. *College of Student Journal*, 41(2), 274-286.
- Yeakley, G.W. (2002). Situational leadership. *Military Review*, 82(1), 72.
- Yielder, J. & Codling, A. (2004). Transformational Leadership. Retrieved from: ChangingMinds.com on Dec 9, 2006.

Appendix A

Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientations (Self) (B&DS) (Questionnaire)

Leadership Orientations (Self)

Copyright 1990 Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal, all rights reserved

This questionnaire asks you to describe your leadership and management style.

I. Behaviors

You are asked to indicate how often each of the items below is true of you. Please use the following scale in answering each item.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Always

Be discriminating! Your results will be more helpful if you think about each item carefully distinguishing the things you really do all the time from the those that you seldom or never do.

1. ____ Think very clearly and logically.
2. ____ Show high levels of support and concern for others.
3. ____ Have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.
4. ____ Inspire others to do their best.
5. ____ Strongly emphasize careful planning and clear time lines.
6. ____ Build trust through open and collaborative relationships.
7. ____ Am a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.
8. ____ Am highly charismatic.
9. ____ Approach problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.
10. ____ Show high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.
11. ____ Am unusually persuasive and influential.
12. ____ Am able to be an inspiration to others.
13. ____ Develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures
14. ____ Foster high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.
15. ____ Anticipate and deal adroitly with organizational conflict.
16. ____ Am highly imaginative and creative.
17. ____ Approach problems with facts and logic.
18. ____ Am consistently helpful and responsive to others.
19. ____ Am very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.
20. ____ Communicate a strong and challenging sense of vision and mission.
21. ____ Set specific, measurable goals and hold people accountable for results.
22. ____ Listen well and am unusually receptive to other people's ideas and inputs.
23. ____ Am politically very sensitive and skillful.

24. ____ See beyond current realities to generate exciting new opportunities
25. ____ Have extraordinary attention to detail.
26. ____ Give personal recognition for work well done.
27. ____ Develop alliances to build a strong base of support.
28. ____ Generate loyalty and enthusiasm.
29. ____ Strongly believe in clear structure and a chain of command.
30. ____ Am a highly participative manager.
31. ____ Succeed in the face of conflict and opposition.
32. ____ Serve as an influential model of organizational aspirations and value.

II. Leadership Style

This section asks you to describe your leadership style. For each item, give the number “4” to the phrase that best describes you, ‘3’ to the item that is next best, and on down to ‘1’ for the item that is least like you.

1. My strongest skills are:
 - ____ a. Analytic skills
 - ____ b. Interpersonal skills
 - ____ c. Political skills
 - ____ d. Ability to excite and motivate
2. The best way to describe me is:
 - ____ a. Technical expert
 - ____ b. Good listener
 - ____ c. Skilled negotiator
 - ____ d. Inspirational leader
3. What has helped me the most to be successful is my ability to:
 - ____ a. Make good decisions
 - ____ b. Coach and develop people
 - ____ c. Build strong alliances and a power base
 - ____ d. Energize and inspire others
4. What people are most likely to notice about me is my:
 - ____ a. Attention to detail
 - ____ b. Concern for people
 - ____ c. Ability to succeed, in the face of conflict and opposition
 - ____ d. Charisma
5. My most important leadership trait is:
 - ____ a. Clear, logical thinking
 - ____ b. Caring and support for others
 - ____ c. Toughness and aggressiveness
 - ____ d. Imagination and creativity
6. I am best described as:
 - ____ a. An analyst
 - ____ b. A humanist

_____c. A politician

_____d. A visionary

III. Overall Rating

Compared to other individuals that you have known with comparable levels of experience and responsibility, how would you rate yourself on:

1. Overall effectiveness as a **manager**.

1 2 3 4 5

Bottom 20% Middle 20% Top 20%

2. Overall effectiveness as a **leader**.

1 2 3 4 5

Bottom 20% Middle 20% Top 20%

IV. Background Information

1. Are you: _____Male _____Female

2. How many years have you been in your current job? _____

3. How many total years of experience do you have as a manager? _____

(http://bloch.emkc.edu/classes/bolman/self_rating.htm)

Appendix B

SurveyMonkey Demographic Questions

Demographic component added to electronic survey instrument.

1. Please indicate your gender:

1. Female
2. Male

2. Which of the following best describes your current administrative role?

1. President
2. Vice President for Academic Affairs
3. Vice President for Student Affairs
4. Chief Financial Officer
5. Other (please specify)

3. How long have you been in your current administrative position?

1. 0-4 years
2. 5-8 years
3. 9-12 years
4. 13-16 years
5. 17 or more years

Appendix C
Letter of Request to Dr. Bolman

May, 7, 2009

Dr. Lee G. Bolman
Bloch School of Business and Public Administration
University of Missouri - Kansas City
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, Missouri, 64110

Dear Dr. Bolman:

I am currently a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership Studies at West Virginia University, the College of Human Resources & Education and am currently preparing for my dissertation prospectus. The title of my dissertation is "Leadership Frames of College Presidents, Their Executive Cabinets, and Teams in Public Four-Year Baccalaureate Institutions in West Virginia." In order to conduct the needed research for my study I am asking your permission to be able to use the Leadership Orientation (Self) questionnaire. As a mixed-methods study, I would like to use your survey instrument to gather the needed data for the quantitative aspect of the study. I understand that if you grant permission to use the survey instrument that I will provide you with a copy of any reports, publications, papers, or theses resulting from this research. I am also willing to provide you with a copy of the data file from this research should you so desire.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this request or need additional information, please feel free to contact me via email at rpagan@mix.wvu.edu or by telephone at (304) 657-5232.

I am looking forward to hearing from and want to thank you for any assistance you can provide regarding this request.

Sincerely,

Richard Pagan
Doctoral Candidate
Educational Leadership Studies
West Virginia University

Appendix D
Letter by Dr. Bolman Granting Permission

Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2009 1:18 PM

To: Pagan, Richard

Dr. Pagan,

Thanks for your interest in the Leadership Orientations instrument.

I am pleased to offer you permission to use the instrument in your research in return for your agreeing to the following conditions: (a) you agree to provide us a copy of any publication, dissertation or report that uses data based on the instrument, and (b) you agree to provide, if we request it, a copy of your data file.

The instruments and information about their use, including data on internal reliability, and a list of research using the Bolman and Deal Four Frames Model, can be found at:

http://www.leebolman.com/leadership_research.htm

Best wishes in your research.

Sincerely,

Lee G. Bolman

Appendix E

First Email Letter to Participants

Dear Higher Education Administrator:

I am a doctoral candidate at West Virginia University in the School of Human Resources & Education completing my studies in Educational Leadership. I am completing my dissertation and would like to invite you to participate in the study. The title of my dissertation is “Leadership Frames of College Presidents, Their Executive Cabinets, and Teams in Public and Not-for-Profit Private Masters Institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, North and South Carolina, and Florida.” In order to conduct the needed research, I am asking for your participation.

I would sincerely appreciate it if you would take the time to complete the Bolman & Deal Leadership (Self) Questionnaire. The survey instrument is on SurveyMonkey and should take approximately seven to ten minutes to complete. The survey uses a Lickert scale and only one choice is permitted per survey item. The link to SurveyMonkey is <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/QFPXZHC>. Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary, and you do not have to respond to every item of the survey instrument. Your responses will remain completely confidential and neither you, nor your institution, will be identified in any subsequent reports. Please do not put your name anywhere on the survey instrument. I would greatly appreciate it if you would complete the survey and return it to me within the next ten days. Your participation will be invaluable in assisting me with the completion of the study and my doctoral program.

I have attached an official Participant Request Letter with the WVU letterhead. The Principal Investigator for this project is Elizabeth A. Jones, Ph.D. Professor of the College of Human Resources and Education, West Virginia University. Her contact information via email is Elizabeth.Jones@mail.wvu.edu or by telephone at (304) 293-1886.

Information and data provided will be secured accessible only by me, the researcher. Once the study is completed all of the data collected will be destroyed. West Virginia’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) has acknowledgment of this study on file.

I thank you for taking the time to complete the survey and for your cooperation and assistance. Please feel free to contact me anytime at rpagan@fairmontstate.edu or by telephone at 304.367.4087 if you have any questions or concerns. I appreciate any assistance you can provide.

Sincerely,

Richard Pagan,
Doctoral Candidate, WVU
Professor, Pierpont Community & Technical College
Fairmont, WV

Appendix F
Participants' Letter

October 19, 2010

Dear Higher Education Administrator:

As a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership Studies at West Virginia University, the College of Human Resources & Education I am currently working toward completing my dissertation. The title of my dissertation is “Leadership Frames of College Presidents, Their Executive Cabinets, and Teams in Public and Not-for-Profit Private Masters Institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Ohio, North and South Carolina, and Florida.” In order to conduct the needed research for my study I am asking for your participation in the research. The study will use a quantitative method approach consisting of one survey instrument.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary, and you do not have to respond to every item of the survey instrument. Your responses will remain confidential and neither you, nor your institution, will be identified in any subsequent reports. I would sincerely appreciate it if you would take the time to complete the Bolman & Deal Leadership (Self) Questionnaire. The survey instrument is on SurveyMonkey and should take approximately seven to ten minutes to complete. The link to SurveyMonkey is <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/QFPXZHC>. When you have completed the research instrument, please return them to me electronically. Please do not put your name anywhere on the survey instrument. I would greatly appreciate it if you would complete the survey and return it to me within the next ten days. Your participation will be invaluable in assisting me with the completion of the study and my doctoral program. I thank you for taking the time to complete the survey. You can contact me at

Educational Leadership Studies
608 Allen Hall
PO BX 6122
Morgantown, WV 26506

rpagan@fairmontstate.edu if you have any questions or concerns.

The Principal Investigator for this project is Elizabeth A. Jones, Ph.D. Professor of the College of Human Resources and Education, West Virginia University. Her contact

information via email is Elizabeth.Jones@mail.wvu.edu or by telephone at (304) 293-1886.

Information and data provided will be secured accessible only by me, the researcher. Once the study is completed all of the data collected will be destroyed. West Virginia's Institutional Review Board (IRB) has acknowledgment of this study on file. I want to thank you for your cooperation and assistance. I am very appreciative for any assistance you can provide.

Sincerely,

Richard Pagan,
Doctoral Candidate

Phone: 304-293-3707
Fax: 304-293-2279

Educational Leadership Studies
608 Allen Hall
PO BX 6122
Morgantown, WV 26506

Appendix G
Second Email Correspondence to Participants

Good Day,

Within the last two weeks I sent you an email and survey asking for your participation in my doctoral dissertation project entitled "Leadership Frames of College Presidents, Their Executive Cabinets, and Teams in Public and Not-for-Profit Private Masters Institutions in West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, North and South Carolina, and Florida." I am not quite at where I need to be as far as returned surveys in order to conduct the required analysis of the study so your participation is greatly desired and appreciated. I am requesting that you help me by completing the attached survey using the link below. Please take the time out to complete and submit the survey.

If you have already completed and submitted the survey, I would like to personally thank you for taking the time out to complete and submit the survey. I truly appreciate and value your participation.

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/QFPXZHC>

Sincerely,

Richard Pagan
Professor
Doctoral Student