To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Michael R. Herbstritt entitled "Leadership in Higher Education: A Study to Ascertain Significant Events, Experiences, and Persons in the Development of Senior Higher Education Leaders in Academic and Student Affairs." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Education.

E. Grady Bogue, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Francis M. Gross

Mary Jane Connelly

Carl E. Kaswan

Accepted for the Council:

Associate Vice Chancellor and
Dean of The Graduate School

LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A STUDY TO ASCERTAIN SIGNIFICANT EVENTS, EXPERIENCES, AND PERSONS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SENIOR HIGHER EDUCATION LEADERS IN ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Education
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Michael R. Herbstritt
August 1999

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to

my wife and children

Karen Louise Herbstritt

Christopher Reed Herbstritt

and

Matthew Reed Herbstritt

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many people to whom I am grateful for making my studies at The University of Tennessee rewarding. I have benefited greatly and have grown as a result of the guidance and interaction with the faculty and graduate students in the Department of Leadership Studies. I am particularly grateful to my major professor, Dr. E. Grady Bogue, who continually encouraged and pushed me to complete my degree and provided invaluable guidance and insight in the preparation of this document. In addition, I am also grateful to the other members of my dissertation committee: Dr. Mary Jane Connelly, Dr. Francis Gross, and Dr. Carol Kasworm, for their patience, support, comments, and encouragement.

Also I want to thank The University of Tennessee itself who, through its generous benefits package, permits employees to pursue educational opportunities while employed. Another individual who was instrumental in the completion of this document was Ms. Nancy Wexler. Without her assistance, dedication, and encouragement this would not have been possible.

Lastly, the greatest debt is owed to my wife and children: Karen, Christopher, and Matthew. Without their help, encouragement, and understanding, I never would have reached this point.

ABSTRACT

In this study, developmental events, experiences, and people that played a significant role in the development of senior higher education leaders in academic and student affairs were identified. Five themes into which these developmental events were placed were induced. The five themes were: producing results during developmental challenges; taking risks; persisting through challenging situations; dealing with subordinates and constituents; and relating to good bosses/mentors and bad bosses. From these developmental events specific lessons of experience were extracted and themetized. The five categories of lessons of experiences that the participants learned were: Knowledge of Leadership Fundamentals; Knowledge of Others; Knowledge of Role; Knowledge of Self; and Knowledge of Leadership. This study determined that the participants learned to be leaders by being leaders. They learned by watching others, by trying and failing, by accepting challenges, by taking risks. In short, they learned by doing because there was no formal program or process to train or develop them.

PREFACE

For several years prior to conducting this study, the author has been employed in higher education. It was during this time that he began to develop an interest in leadership - specifically how senior leaders learn to become leaders. Specifically, he was interested in the events, experiences, and people that played a significant role in the development of the leaders in the academic and student affairs areas. The study described in the pages that follow has allowed the author to investigate and explore the questions about leadership in a systematic fashion.

Chapter One provides an introduction to the study and to the evolution of leadership thought. In addition, it describes the statement of the problem, the study's purpose and importance, the questions to be addressed in the study, the assumptions, limitations, and delimitations, and defines the terms used in the study.

Chapter Two reviews the literature on leadership focusing on the development of the study of leadership, the study of leadership in higher education, and leadership development.

Chapter Three describes the theoretical framework, methods, and procedures used in the study.

Chapter Four presents the data that was collected in the study. However, prior to discussing the specific data, a profile of the study's participants is

presented. The developmental events and the lessons drawn from these events, experiences, and people that played a significant role in their development were identified.

Chapter Five summarizes and discusses the study's findings, examines methodological considerations, presents recommendations for future research, and finally presents conclusions drawn from this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTORY SECTION 1

A. Evolution of Leadership Thought 1
B. Statement of the Problem 9
C. The Purpose of the Study 11
D. Research Questions 11
E. Importance of the Study 11
F. Assumptions 12
G. Limitations and Delimitations 13
H. Definition of Terms 14

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 16

A. Introduction 16
B. Evolution of Leadership Studies 18
C. The Study of Leadership in Higher Education 46
D. Leadership Development 65

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, METHODS, AND PROCEDURES 73

A. Introduction 73
B. Qualitative Theoretical Approach 74
C. Methods and Procedures 84

IV. PRESENTATION OF THE DATA 89

A. Introduction 89
B. Participant Profile 89
C. Developmental Events 93
E. Lessons of Experience 125

V. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS 140

A. Introduction 140
B. Discussion of the Findings 140
C. Conclusions of Present Study as Related to The Lessons of Experience 154
D. Methodological Considerations 160
E. Recommendations for Future Research 161
F. Conclusions 165

BIBLIOGRAPHY 169

APPENDICES

A. Letter to Participants 178
B. Participant Profile Form 179
C. Consent Form 180
D. Interview Questionnaire Quide 181
E. Participant Profile 185
F. Participant Profile by Chief Academic Affairs Officers 186
G. Participant Profile by Chief Student Affairs Officers 187
H. Comparison of Lessons of Experience 188
I. Lessons of Experience 189
J. Lessons Categorized By Thematic Area 190
K. Potential Lessons of Experience Identified By McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) 192

VITA 193

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE PAGE

1. Lessons of Experience 128
2. Lessons Categorized by Thematic Area 129
3. Comparison of Lessons of Experience 158

I. INTRODUCTORY SECTION

A. EVOLUTION OF LEADERSHIP THOUGHT

> "Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (Burns, 1978, p. 2).

Leadership and the study of leadership has generated a copius amount of interest among scholars, writers, researchers, and practitioners. Bass (1990) cites over 7,500 references on leadership. Bogue (1994) believes that probably no aspect of human behavior has been subjected to such an intensive empirical and philosophical inquiry as has leadership. However, in spite of the interest it has generated, there is little agreement as to what leadership is (Rosenbach and Taylor, 1984). In fact, Bass (1990) states "There are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept" (p. 11).

Attempting to understand leadership has figured strongly in man's quest for knowledge throughout history. The study of leadership rivals in age the emergence of civilization, which shaped its leaders as much as it was shaped by them. From its infancy, the study of history has been the study of leaders - what they did and whey they did it (Bass, 1990). Written records of leadership and its development date back to 2300 B.C. in ancient Egypt. Chinese classics written in the sixth century B.C. also discuss leadership. Confucius urged leaders to set a moral example. Taoism emphasized the need for the leader to work himself

out of a job by making people believe that successes were due to their efforts (Bass, 1990).

A translation of one lesson of Tao Te Ching spells this out:

> When a master governs, the people
> are hardly aware that he exists.
> Next best is a leader who is loved.
> Next is one who is feared.
> The worst is one who is despised.
> If you don't trust the people,
> you make them untrustworthy.
> The Master doesn't talk; he acts.
> When his work is done,
> the People say "Amazing.
> We did it all by ourselves!" (Mitchell,
> 1988, p. 17).

The research over the years on leadership has centered on answering a number of questions regarding leadership: Who are the leaders? What do leaders do?; and Are leaders born or made? However, before these questions can be answered, a workable definition of leadership must be advanced. Burns (1978) describes leadership "as a structure of action that engages persons, to varying degrees, throughout the levels and among the intricacies of society" (p. 3).

Early theorists studying the phenomena of leadership looked at and studied the individual. They believed that they could understand and define leadership by looking at the traits, personality, and physical characteristics the leader possessed. In this view it was a one-way process; an individual was the leader because he or she had the necessary traits to lead. Underlying this approach was the belief that leaders were born - those that had the traits led; those that lacked the traits were followers.

In reviewing and summarizing the empirical research on this approach, Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik (1961) concluded there was no reliable evidence concerning the existence of universal leadership traits.

After it was determined that the trait theories did not fully explain what leadership was or how leaders functioned, the research turned to examining what leaders did. These studies attempted to define the behaviors that successful leaders exhibited. As with the trait theories, the behavioral approach proved to leave too many questions unanswered and too many issues unresolved.

The next line of research integrated the trait and behavioral theories. This research focused on the interaction of the leader and situation. Different situations required different styles or different actions. In short, these theories postulated that the group's performance was contingent upon the leader's style interacting with the group situation. Also, the most effective leaders were aware of the situation and would modify his or her style to fit the situation.

The multiple truths and realities vein of research on leadership combined all the aspects of the research that preceded it. These studies examine the leader, him or herself; the traits he or she brings with him or her; how he or she acts in certain situations; how he or she interacts with subordinates, superiors,, peers, clients, the environment, and others; and the values the leader espouses. A theme that is common of this line of research is that those being led choose their leader. Posner and Kouzes (1996) in an article published in The Journal of Leadership Studies state: "Constituents choose leaders; leaders cannot be appointed or anointed 'superiors.' Constituents determine whether someone is fit to lead. The trappings of power and position may give someone the right to exercise authority; but we should never, ever mistake position and authority for leadership. Only when our constituents believe that we are capable of meeting their expectations will we be able to mobilize their actions" (pp. 2-3). Followers look for and demand their leaders serve them. In addition they want leaders who are honest, forward-looking, inspiring, and competent. They also want leaders to have the ability to inspire a shared vision of the future. They want leaders that they can trust, and also they want leaders who define and share their values (Posner and Kouzes, 1996).

As the research, knowledge and understanding of leadership have evolved, it became apparent the roles and expectations of leaders were changing. Ken Blanchard (1996), writing in The Leader of the Future, says "The leader of the future, realizing that vision and implementation are both leadership

roles, will learn to care little about defending the traditional hierarchy. As a result, she or he will be willing to turn the pyramid upside down to implement a vision" (p. 85).

Early researchers and research was narrowly focused. It looked at traits, behaviors, and their interactions. It was a sterile view in which the leader led and followers followed. The more recent research has focused on the dynamics of leadership. And as a result of this approach, words such as love, synergy, heart, and soul have entered the vernacular of leadership thought and writings.

Leadership is no longer thought of as not only an affair of the head, but also as an affair of the heart. Posner and Kouzes (1996) believe

> "Leadership is emotional. Period. To lead others requires passionate commitment to a set of fundamental beliefs and principals, visions, and dreams...Leadership is an affair of the heart. Constituents will not follow unless they are persuaded that their leader passionately believes in his or her view of the future and believes in each of them" (p. 9).

Recently, leadership has also come to be viewed as an art. Funk & Wagnalls dictionary (1974) defines art as "any system of rules and principles that facilitates skilled human accomplishment" (p. 35). Modern leadership theory views the leader as a facilitator, coach, a counselor, and even a lover. But the view of leadership as an art was espoused early in the 20th century. In 1935, Ordway Tead published a book that foresaw the notion of leadership as art. His

book was titled The Art of Leadership. In his book, Tead wrote that "leadership is interested in how people can be brought to work together for a common end effectively and happily. It implies...the use and creation of power *with* people. The former (commanding) is interested solely in the result. The latter (leadership) is equally concerned about the process by which the result is attained" [p. 12 (parentheses mine)]. A more recent work on the art of leadership was written by Max DePree (1987). The book, Leadership Is An Art, discussed "the art of leadership: liberating people to do what is required of them in the most effective and humane way possible" (p. 1).

Leadership Development

Throughout the history of the study of leadership one question has continually been asked: "Are leaders born or made?" Many practitioners and scholars believe that leaders can be made, and leadership can be learned. They also believe leadership is an observable, learnable set of practices. "Leadership is definitely not a divine-like grace given to a few charismatic men and women. It is a learnable set of practices" (Posner and Kouzes, 1996, p. 9). These statements help explain why organizations spend an estimated $40 billion per year in leadership development (McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988).

However, when it comes to defining effective leaders, it is not possible to provide a comprehensive list of characteristics that makes for successful leadership (McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988). Researchers and scholars, though, have concluded that leaders do have some background experiences in

common which, in turn resulted in common characteristics such as optimism, emotional stability, and a desire for achievement and power (McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988).

Over the years volumes have been written that were devoted to efforts to predict executive effectiveness by measuring personality traits, cognitive abilities, and background experiences, all to modest avail. More important than the modest associations between these endless lists of variables and the various criteria of performance is the unassailable fact that senior executives do not emerge full blown. So the issue is not that people who emerge as candidates for executive jobs may come with a lot of givens, but what happens to them on the job matters. Knowledge of how the business works, ability to work with senior executives, learning to manage people who were once peers, negotiating, handling tense political situations, firing people - these and many others are the lessons of experience. They are taught on the firing line, by demanding assignments, by good or bad bosses, and by mistakes and setbacks and misfortune (McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988).

In The Lessons of Experience: How Successful Executives Develop on the Job (1988), McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison report on a study they undertook to determine what experiences had the greatest impact on the careers of the executives and the lessons they derived from those experiences. The thesis of the book was that during a manager's growth period the development during that time depended not just on raw talent but also on the experiences one

had and what one did with them. Specifically, not all experiences were created equal. Some experiences simply packed more developmental wallop than others. Further the lessons that these experiences taught were not random. Certain things were more likely to be learned from one kind of experience than from another.

The lessons these leaders learned from their experiences reflected the basic underlying knowledge required to succeed. The specific kinds of lessons the executives identified were summarized and categorized into five themes: agenda setting, handling relationships, basic values, executive temperament, and personal awareness or insight.

The first theme - agenda setting - included the constellation of lessons that enabled the leader to set short- and long-term agendas involving, for this study, business and technical knowledge, organizational design skills, thinking broadly, and accepting responsibility for direction, and finding alternative ways to accomplish one's end. The second theme - handling relationships - included working with and through other people. While the core ability in this theme was understanding other people's viewpoints, the variety of lessons represented suggested that different skills may be required for handling relationships with different kinds of people.

Basic values, the third theme, contained three lessons that might be viewed as guiding principles with pervasive behavioral implications. While people enter organizations with established values, these values and the new

ones formed by experience in the organization were constantly tested and shaped by the situations that played out in the organizational environment. The fourth theme - executive temperament - reflected what the leader was "made of." It captured some of the personal qualities necessary to cope with the demands and ambiguities of being in a leadership role. Finally, the fifth theme - personal awareness or insight - involved the lessons of self-awareness, whether balancing work and personal life, knowing what one wanted out of work, or recognizing one's blind spots and weaknesses.

While the work of McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) dealt with more than a dozen Fortune 500 corporations, its core was drawn from data generated in four separate studies, encompassing 191 successful executives from six major corporations. The study proposed here will employ a similar methodology - an in-depth interview regarding seminal events and experiences that shaped the lives and careers of the executives being studied. The major difference is that the subjects of the proposed study will not be employed by Fortune 500 companies, but rather will be the chief academic or student affairs officer in institutions of higher education.

B. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Leadership development has, for the most part, been an informal process in higher education. Many academic leaders - deans, vice presidents, and presidents - have generally risen through the academic ranks learning

administration as they go (Green, 1988). However, leadership development, in general, encompasses the many activities and experiences that enhance the ability of individuals to make a difference, to shape the direction of the institution, and to bring others along in sharing and implementing goals. It also includes identifying new leaders, providing individuals with opportunities to grow and learn, to affirm their beliefs and values, to expand their understanding of issues and people, and to improve their leadership skills (Green and Dade, 1991). However, even though higher education has as one of its primary missions the development of leaders for society, higher education itself, in general, pays little attention to enhancing the ability of administrators to lead our institutions; the priority is low and the investment modest (Green and Dade, 1991).

As a result, the questions to be answered still remain - how do individuals become leaders and what events, experiences, and people provide significant input and/or assistance to the developing leader? Also, how does the emerging leader learn the expectations that others have about what he or she is expected to do? The problem to be addressed by this study, is to describe significant developmental events of the eight chief academic affairs and chief student affairs officers in higher education and to identify the lessons these individuals learned from these events and determine if the developmental events identified by leaders in higher education are comparable to the developmental events identified by corporate leaders.

C. THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to describe significant developmental events of the eight chief academic affairs and chief student affairs officers in higher education and to identify the lessons these individuals learned from their events. The proposed study will describe the events, persons, and experiences that the respondents believe changed them as managers and leaders and the lessons they derived from them. The eight participants will consist of the chief academic affairs and student affairs officer in four different types of institutions.

D. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions that guided this study were as follows:

1. What significant developmental events, experiences, and persons were identified by the respondents as having a significant impact in his/her growth as a leader?
2. What were the lessons the interviewed executives derived from these developments, experiences, and persons?

E. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The importance of this study is threefold. This study is important to extend a stream of research begun by McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988). The study conducted by McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison dealt with leaders in the corporate world. The proposed study will deal with leaders in the academic

world. The second reason this study is important is to analyze the behaviors of senior leaders in higher education, below the level of president, that significantly impacted their development. By analyzing these behaviors and events, it is anticipated that the development of the next generation of leaders in higher education will be conducted in a more systematic, organized, and formal fashion. In other words, higher education will implement leadership development programs to train the leaders of the future. The final reason this study is important is that while Bensimon (1988) and Brooker (1998) examined presidential behaviors in higher education, limited work has been done on second-tier administrators.

F. ASSUMPTIONS

The basic assumptions under which this project is being undertaken are:

1. Successful executives are those individuals who have been promoted to senior level positions - either vice presidents or vice chancellors - and have held the position for a minimum of two years.
2. The respondents will be truthful and forthright in their responses.
3. The respondents have no vested interests in the results of the research.
4. Leadership skills can be learned through experience.

5. The questionnaire used to elicit responses from the executives will extract the information necessary to address the question at hand.

G. LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS

Delimitations to the study that are identified are:

1. The responses will be limited to eight participants from four different types of institutions as defined by the 1987 Carnegie classification: A research university I; a doctoral-granting college and/or university II; a comprehensive college and University II; and a two-year community, junior and technical college.
2. The sample will be a small, hand-picked group of higher education administrators immediately below the office of president or chancellor;
3. The themes that emerged and the lessons that were identified cannot be generalized to other leaders and/or situations.

The limitations or potential weaknesses of the study that may affect the utility of the results generated by this study are as follows:

1. The lack of a follow-up study to verify the initial results;
2. This was an exploratory study based on a limited and small sample of interviewees.
3. The lack of a gender or racially diverse sample. All members

of the study were male, and save for one African-American, all were Caucasian.

4. In this study the findings could be subject to other interpretations.

H. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Leadership - Leadership is characterized by commitment, a strong sense of values, a sense of self, and vision (Green and Dade, 1991). Leadership is any action that focuses resources toward a beneficial end (Rosenbaum and Taylor, 1984). Leadership is a process, a transaction between an individual leader and followers. The transaction takes place in a given context that shapes the nature of the transaction (Green, 1988). Thus, leadership is not only defined by what leaders do but also, and even more importantly, by the ways in which potential followers think about leadership, interpret a leader's behavior, and come, over time, to develop shared expectations for the causes and outcomes of ambiguous events (Birnbaum, 1992). Leadership, then, is the ability to influence others.

Leadership Development - An organization's conscious effort to provide its leaders (and potential leaders) with opportunities to learn, grow, and change in hopes of producing over the long term a core of managers with the skills necessary to function effectively in that organization (McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988). It is the process, whether formal or informal, of growing and grooming an individual to prepare him or her to accept and succeed in positions

of increasing responsibility (McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988; Green, 1988; Birnbaum, 1992; French and Koch, 1996; Bolman and Deal, 1997).

Qualitative Research - "An inquiry of understanding a social or human problem, based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants, and conducted in a natural setting" (Cresswell, 1994, pp. 1-2). "Qualitative measures describe the experiences of people in depth. The data are open-ended in order to find out what people's lives, experiences, and interactions mean to them in their own terms and in their natural setting. Qualitative measures permit the evaluation researcher to record and understand people in their own terms" (Patton, 1980, p. 22).

Naturalistic Inquiry - "Qualitative designs are naturalistic in that the researcher does not attempt to manipulate the research setting. The research setting is a naturally occurring event, program, relationship, or interaction that has no predetermined course established by and for the researcher. Rather, the point...is to understand naturally occurring phenomena in their naturally occurring state" (Patton, 1980, p.41).

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A. INTRODUCTION

According to Funk and Wagnall's Standard Desk Dictionary (1974) a leader is "one who or that which goes ahead or in advance" and "one who acts as a guiding force, commander, etc." They then define leadership as "the office, position, or capacity of a leader; guidance, and as the ability to lead, exert authority, etc." (p. 367).

That leadership has generated interest among scholars, writers, and researchers is a monumental understatement. Bass (1990) cites over 7,500 references on leadership and says, "There are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept" (p. 11). Burns (1978) says, "Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (p. 2).

Bogue (1994) believes that probably no aspect of human behavior has received the amount of attention that has been afforded to leadership. The theories that have been developed and proposed do not provide a definitive answer to the question of what leadership is or a definition of it. Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) believe each major idea about leadership is correct under certain conditions, in certain institutions, at certain times, and with certain groups.

The purpose of this review of the literature is to trace the development of the study of leadership. The evolution of leadership thought began with the trait

theories, or "great man" theories and progressed through the modern theories that examine leadership through the shared beliefs and values the leaders operate within.

The early literature on the study of leadership, while voluminous, can be categorized into three major approaches: trait theories, behavioral approach, and situational perspectives. Common to the first two approaches - trait and behavioral - is the assumption that individuals who possess the appropriate traits or display appropriate behavior will emerge as leaders in most situations they find themselves. The contingency perspective assumes that conditions determining leader effectiveness vary with the situation, with the tasks to be accomplished, and the skills and expectations of the subordinates (Stoner and Freeman, 1989; Szilagyi and Wallace,1980; Hoy and Miskel, 1987; Heifetz, 1994; Bolman and Deal, 1990).

The fourth step in the evolution of leadership research is the transactional vs transformational approaches. The final section examines the multiple theories and realities of leadership within which the leader operates (Bolman and Deal, 1990; 1997; Heifetz, 1994; McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988; Posner and Kouzes, 1996; Snyder, 1998).

After reviewing leadership thought in general, this review will narrow its focus to leadership in higher education. Finally, the review will center on leadership development, specifically a study conducted and published for the Center for Creative Leadership by McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988). The

study that is being proposed was a parallel study but was conducted within the confines of higher education.

B. EVOLUTION OF LEADERSHIP STUDIES

Trait Theories

Leadership has been an intriguing topic for many centuries. In its infancy, the research centered on the great-man theory of leadership or the trait approach. This approach attempted to identify distinctive physical or psychological characteristics of the individual that related to or explained the behavior of the leader. Psychological researchers using this approach attempted to isolate the specific traits that endowed leaders with unique qualities that differentiated them from their followers (Hoy and Miskel, 1987). The trait theorists examined the personality characteristic of "great men" and concluded their rise to power was rooted in a "heroic" set of personal talents, skills, or physical characteristics (Heifetz, 1994). The Greeks exemplified their concepts of leadership in their literature. The qualities they admired and thought were needed in heroic leaders were (1) justice and judgment; (2) wisdom and counsel; (3) shrewdness and cunning; and (4) valor and activism (Bass, 1990, p. 4). A scholarly highlight of the Renaissance was Machiavelli's The Prince. Machiavelli believed leaders needed steadiness, firmness, and concern for the maintenance of authority, power, and order in government (Meinecke, 1962). Stodgill (1948), in a review of the literature, identified a leadership classification system that was

based on six broad categories: (1) physical characteristics; (2) social background; (3) intelligence; (4) personality; (5) task-related characteristics; and (6) social characteristics. Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) supported Stodgill's conclusion when they identified four traits that the early theorists defined as follows: physical characteristics; personality; social background; and ability. Leaders as a group have been found to be brighter, more extroverted, and more self-confident than non-leaders; they also tend to be taller (Stoner and Freeman, 1989).

Bass (1990) reported that the concept of personality appealed to early theorists who sought to explain why some persons were better able than others to exercise leadership. He cited studies conducted by Bowden (1926), Bingham (1927), Bernard (1926), and Tead (1929). However, he summarizes the theories succinctly by stating: "the personality theorists tended to regard leadership as a one-way effect: Leaders possess qualities that differentiate them from followers" (Bass, 1990, p. 12).

Although the results of these trait investigations appear to be helpful in identifying certain salient characteristics of leaders, little has been provided for understanding or predicting leadership effectiveness. As a result, this approach has failed to distinguish the traits of successful leaders from unsuccessful leaders (Szilagyi and Wallace, 1980). Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik (1961), after reviewing the empirical research, concluded that there was no reliable evidence concerning the existence of universal leadership traits. They

believed it was not surprising that this approach proved sterile because leaders do not function in isolation. Additionally, focusing on individual traits did not show what the individual actually did in a leadership situation. Traits identified who the leader was - not the behavior pattern he or she exhibited in attempting to influence subordinate action. The trait approach ignored the subordinate and his or her effect on leadership. Influence is the relationship between two or more people; therefore, focusing on one part of the influence relationship provides an incomplete view of the leadership process (Szilagyi and Wallace, 1980). Finally, a fitting epitaph was sounded by Fiedler and Garcia (1987) when they summarized the trait approach. In their view, the leader's personality traits do not contribute highly to effective leadership performance.

Behavioral Theories

Once it became evident that effective leaders did not seem to have distinguishing traits or characteristics, researchers tried to isolate the behaviors characteristic of effective leaders. Rather than try to identify what effective leaders were, researchers attempted to determine what effective leaders did and what talents and styles they used. The research examined how leaders delegated tasks; how they communicated with and tried to motivate their subordinates; and how they carried out their tasks. However, what the researchers concluded was that leadership behaviors appropriate in one situation were not necessarily appropriate in another

(Stoner and Freeman, 1989). In addition, the research showed that many leaders performed marvelously in some jobs but quite poorly in others, leading to the conclusion that what an individual actually does while acting as a leader is in large part dependent upon the characteristics of the situation in which he functions (Hiefetz, 1994).

The foundation for the "style of leadership" approach was the belief that effective leaders utilized a particular style to lead individual and groups to achieving certain goals. Unlike the trait theories, the behavioral approach focused on leader effectiveness, not the emergence of an individual as a leader (Szilagyi and Wallace, 1980). Despite growing evidence that effective leadership behaviors depended at least partially on the leader's situation, some researchers reached the conclusion that certain management behaviors were more effective than others in a wide variety of circumstances. The researchers have focused on two aspects of leadership behavior: leadership functions and leadership styles (Stoner and Freeman, 1989).

This research shifted the focus from the leader to the functions leaders performed. The results showed that for a group to operate effectively, someone had to perform two major functions: "task-related" or problem-solving functions and "group-maintenance" or social functions. Task-related functions might include suggesting solutions and offering information and opinions; group-maintenance functions may include anything that helps the group operate more smoothly. Studies have shown that most effective groups have some form of

shared leadership in which one person (usually the formal leader) performs the task function while another member performs the social function (Stoner and Freeman, 1989).

Other research on leadership behavior focused on one of two styles that leaders used when dealing with subordinates: a task-oriented style and/or a relations-oriented style. Task oriented managers closely supervised subordinates to ensure the task was performed satisfactorily. A person with this leadership style was more concerned with getting the job done than with the development and growth of subordinates. The employee-oriented manager tried to motivate rather than control subordinates; he/she encouraged group members to perform tasks by allowing them to participate in decisions that affected them and by forming friendly, trusting, and respectful relationships with group members (Stoner and Freeman, 1989; Szilagyi and Wallace, 1980).

As a result of this approach to studying leadership, several landmark studies emerged. Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973) were among the first to describe various factors they believed influenced a manager's choice of a leadership style. Their studies suggested managers consider three sets of "forces" before choosing a style: forces in the manager, forces in the subordinates, and forces in the situation (Stoner and Freeman, 1989).

As a result of their findings, they developed a continuum of leadership behavior. The continuum went from boss-centered leadership which entailed the use of authority by the manager to the subordinate-centered leadership

where there was an area of freedom for the subordinates. In their model, the situation determined where on the continuum the manager fell (Tannenbaum and Schmidt, 1973).

Many of the researchers that studied the behavioral approach believed leadership was a zero-sum game: the more task-oriented a manager, the less relationship-oriented he or she could be. As a result, research was undertaken to determine which of the two leadership styles leads to better group performance. Two major research studies emerged from this approach: the Ohio State and University of Michigan studies. The Ohio State studies looked at initiating structure - the degree to which the leader organized and defined the task, made assignments, communicated with, and evaluated performance; and consideration behaviors - behaviors that involved trust, mutual respect, friendship, support, and a concern for others. The University of Michigan studies analyzed job-centered leadership styles that focused on the use of close supervision, legitimate and coercive power, meeting schedules, and evaluating work performance; and employee-centered leadership styles which were people-oriented and emphasized delegation, concern for employee welfare, need, advancement and personal growth (Szalagyi and Wallace, 1980).

The Ohio State study results showed that employee turnover was lowest and satisfaction highest under leaders rated high in consideration; conversely, leaders rated high in initiating structure and low in consideration had high grievance rates and high turnover. They also found the subordinate's ratings of

their leaders' effectiveness depended not so much on the style of the leader as on the situation in which it was used. The results of the Michigan studies were similar. The most productive work groups tended to have leaders who were employee-centered, rather than production-centered (Stoner and Freeman, 1989).

One conclusion that was drawn from these studies was that leadership style may not be unidimensional. Both task-orientation and employee-orientation can be crucial to superior performance. Using these studies as a foundation, Robert Blake and Jane Mouton (1978) developed "The Managerial Grid" to help measure a manager's relative concern for people and relative concern for tasks.

Blake and Mouton's grid postulates two fundamental dimensions of leader effectiveness: concern for task and concern for people. The model assumes that all approaches to leadership can be arrayed on a two-dimensional grid. Theoretically, the grid contains eighty-one cells, though Blake and Mouton emphasize only five possibilities:

1,1: The manager who has little concern for task or people and is simply going through the motions;

1,9: The friendly manager who is concerned about people but has little concern for tasks;

9,1: The hard-driving taskmaster;

5,5: The compromising manager who tries to balance task and people; and

9,9: The ideal manager who integrates task and people and provides outstanding performance.

Through the years and in the face of mounting criticism, Blake and Mouton have vigorously defended their conviction that a 9,9 style is the leadership approach for all situations and all seasons. One of the main drawbacks with the grid was that its approach focused almost exclusively on issues of task and human resources. It gave scant attention to constituents other than subordinates and assumed that a leader need simply to integrate concern for task and concern for people to be effective in any situation. However, if the structure becomes unwieldy, political conflicts become debilitating, or the organization's culture was empty and threadbare, the grid model had little to say (Bolman and Deal, 1997).

Another conclusion that can be drawn from the research on behavioral approaches to leadership is that a universally accepted best style was inappropriate for the complexities of modern organizations. For a manager's leadership style to be effective, other situational factors must be considered (Bolman and Deal, 1997; Stoner and Freeman, 1989; Szalagyi and Wallace, 1980).

Contingency Theories

Beginning in the 1950's, theorists began to integrate the trait approach with the behavioral approach. Empirical studies had begun to show that no single constellation of traits was associated with leadership (Heifeiz, 1994). The

dearth of attributes consistently associated with effective leadership reinforced the argument that leadership varied with the situation (Bolman and Deal, 1997).

Although these findings did not negate the idea that individuals "make" history, it did suggest that different situations demand different personalities and call for different behaviors. Primary among these integrated approaches is the contingency theory which posits that the appropriate style of leadership is contingent on the requirements of the particular situation (Heifetz, 1994), including organizational culture, the nature of the tasks, and managerial values and experience. As a result, researchers began trying to identify those factors in each situation that influenced the effectiveness of a particular leadership style. Some of the factors included the leader's personality, past experience, and expectations; the superior's expectations and behavior; the requirements of the task; the organizational culture; and the expectations of behaviors and peers (Stoner and Freeman, 1989). In addition, two other factors were considered. First was leader behavior; second, researchers studied a two-way process - that the behavior of the subordinate can influence the behavior of the leader (Szilagyi and Wallace, 1980). This was the basis of the contingency approaches to leadership.

Several writers have offered situational theories of leadership including Fiedler (1967); Fiedler and Chemers (1974); Vroom and Yetton (1973); Hersey and Blanchard (1977); Hersey (1984); and Reddin (1970), but all were limited in their conceptualization of leadership and in the strength of the empirical support.

Most failed to distinguish between leadership and management, typically restricting leadership to relationships between managers and their subordinates (Bolman and Deal, 1997).

One of the earliest of the contingency models was developed by Fiedler (1967) and his associates. The basic foundation of the theory was that the effectiveness of the leader in achieving high group performance is contingent on the need structure of the leader and the degree to which the leader had control and influence in a particular situation. Four factors served as the framework for Fiedler's model: (1) leadership style assessment; (2) task structure; (3) group atmosphere; and (4) leader's position power. The first factor identifies the motivational aspects of the leader; the others describe the situational favorableness for the leader (Szilagyi and Wallace, 1980).

The contingency model states that the group's performance will be contingent upon the appropriate matching of leadership style and the degree of favorableness of the group situation provides the leader with influence over his group members. The model further suggests that group performance can be improved either by modifying the leader's style or by modifying the group-task situation (Fiedler, 1967). Fiedler concluded leadership performance depends as much on the organization as it depends upon the leader's own attributes. Except perhaps for the unusual case, it is simply not meaningful to speak of an effective leader or an ineffective leader; one can only speak of a leader who tends to be effective in one situation and ineffective in another.

Another theory was developed by House (1971). His approach has been labeled as the path-goal theory of leader effectiveness because the foundations of the theory were based on the expectancy theory of motivation. The term path-goal referred to the expectancy theory terms of effort-to-performance and performance-to-reward expectations and valence. The theory evolved from looking at two dimensions of leader behavior - initiating structure and consideration - into the four variables that the current framework includes - instrumental behavior, supportive behavior, participating behavior, and achievement-oriented behavior. A number of research studies suggested these four styles could be exhibited by the same leader in various situations. This set of findings, however, contradicted Fiedler's notion concerning the uni-dimensionality of leader behavior and suggested more flexibility than his contingency model (House, 1971; Szilagyi and Wallace, 1980).

Hersey and Blanchard's (1982) situational leadership model used two dimensions of leadership similar to those in the Managerial Grid: task-behavior includes goal setting, organizing, setting time lines, directing, and controlling; relationship behavior includes giving support, communicating, facilitating interactions, active listening, and providing feedback. When they combined the task-behavior and relationship-behavior in a two-by-two chart, Hersey and Blanchard identified four leadership styles. The four styles they defined were telling, selling, participating, and delegating.

The theory proposed that the most effective leadership style varied with the "maturity" of subordinates or their "readiness level." The theory defined readiness in terms of subordinate attitudes (how willing they were to do a good job) and skills (how able they were to do the job well). The model distinguished four levels of subordinate readiness and argued that the different styles were appropriate for different situations (Bolman and Deal, 1997). The theory defined a leadership style that was dynamic and flexible rather than static. The motivation, ability, and experience of subordinates needed to constantly be assessed to determine which style combination would be most appropriate under flexible and changing conditions (Stoner and Freeman, 1989). Like Blake and Mouton, Hersey and Blanchard focused mostly on the relationship between managers and immediate subordinates and said little about issues of structure, politics, or symbols (Bolman and Deal, 1997).

Bochelle (1977) summarized the conclusions that were drawn from the contingency theories of leadership:

1. There is no one most effective type of managerial leadership;
2. A number of factors should be considered in applying the contingency theory to a given situation:
   (a) Leader-member relations,
   (b) Task structure,
   (c) Position power of the leader;
3. Organizations have "characters" or "climates";

4. Parts of an organization have different types of leaders;
5. Sound reasons underlie the trend towards a more participative-consultative pattern of managerial leadership; yet it is often not effective;
6. Participative-consultative leadership is potentially more potent in managerial levels than at the work level (pp. 185-87).

In summary, contingency theory, synthesizing the great-man and behavioral approaches, examined which decision-making style fits which situational contingency in order for the decision maker to maintain control of the process. Sometimes a directive, task-oriented style was the most effective, and at other times a participative, relationship-oriented style was required. Yet even in this more specific rendition of the traditional view, the mark of leadership is still influence or control (Heifetz, 1994).

Transactional vs Transformation Theories

Moving beyond the contingency or situational approaches, the field of inquiry soon expanded into the specific interactions between leaders and followers - the transactions by which an individual gains influence and sustains it over time. The process is based on reciprocity. Leaders not only influence followers but are under their influence as well (Heifeiz, 1994). According to Burns (1978), transactional leaders "approach their followers with an eye to trading one thing for another" (p. 4).

Transactional leaership has been viewed as a relationship between leaders and followers based on an exchange of valued things. The leaders and followers are seen as involved in a barganing process rather than in a relationship with an enduring purpose. The monitors of transactional leadership are values such as honesty, fairness, and honoring commitments (Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum, 1989).

In one variant of the transactional approach, the leader reaps the benefits of status and influence in exchange for reducing uncertainty and providing followers with a basis for action. In another variant, bargaining and persuasion are the essence of political power, requiring a keen understanding of the interests of various stakeholders, both professional and private. The transactional theories contributed to the basic idea that authority consists of reciprocal relationships: people in authority influence constituents, but constituents also influence them (Heifetz, 1994).

The transactional leader understands and conforms to the culture of an organization as it exists. He or she emphasizes means and attempts to meet the needs of followers. Transactional leadership depends on the exchange of desired goods between leader and follower, and the relationship continues as long as the exchange is considered satisfactory by both (Birnbaum, 1992). James MacGregor Burns (1978), writing in Leadership, describes the relationship of leader and follower in transactional theory as "bargainers seeking to maximize their political psychic profits" (p. 258). In other words, he believed

transactional leadership occurred when one person took the initiative to make contact with others for the purpose of exchanging valued things.

Transactional leaders attempt to tweak optimal performance out of an organization by participative, democratic leadership techniques that place strong emphasis upon process. These leaders typically do not advocate a strong agenda or vision and often implicitly think in terms of "maintenance management" behaviors designed to meet the needs of the day. Surviving the day (or year) and eventually being able to step down from leadership with long-term personal friendships intact often motivate the transactional leader's behavior. The prestige associated with being "in command" and ultimately being viewed as a successful, nondestructive leader who met the challenges of the day are sufficient rewards for the transactional leader (Fisher and Koch, 1996).

Transactionalists tend to shift and delegate responsibilities and sidestep difficult decisions by relying on committees or plugging contentious issues of the exiting governance structure. They administer by the book. It seldom results in major reforms and is ill-suited for difficult times. Since transactional leaders ordinarily do not carry or espouse a strong agenda or vision, and because they tend to administer by the book, they often rely on coercion and reward. This type of leadership is premised on an exchange-promise and reward for good performance, threat or discipline for poor performance. As a result, transactional leadership is unlikely to stimulate extraordinary performance from large numbers of individuals for long periods of time (Fisher and Koch, 1996). In short,

transactional leaders operate in the "quid-pro-quo" mode; they exchange "this-for-that" - a swap of goods for money, position for influence, influence for power. Each party to the bargain is conscious of the power resources and attitudes of the other. Their purposes are related, at least to the extent that the purposes stand within the bargaining process and can be advanced by maintaining that process (Burns, 1978).

On the other side of the spectrum is the transformational leader (Burns,1978; Birnbaum, 1992; Fisher and Koch, 1996; Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum, 1989). Transformational leaders believe that leaders with a vision and energy can and should make a great deal of difference. Transformational leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that the leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. Their purposes which might have started out as separate but related, become fused (Burns, 1978). Transformational leadership goes beyond meeting the basic needs of the subordinates. It engages followers in such a way as to raise them to new levels of morality and motivation. Tranformational leaders are concerned with end values such as liberty, justice, or equality (Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnhaum, 1989).

The test of transformational leadership is the capacity to conceive and espouse values or purposes in such a way that the ends and means are linked analytically and creatively, and the implications of the values are clarified for and understood by others (Burns, 1978).

Birnbaum (1992) states: "Transformational leadership emphasizes values and goals such as liberty, justice, and equality and emphasizes motivating followers to support leader-intended change. Transformational leadership introduces and advances new cultural forms. It fosters the creation of a more enduring bond between leader and follower as they move each other toward higher levels of motivation and morality" (p. 28).

The transformational leader relies primarily on positional, expert, and especially referent or charismatic power. He or she provides a vision, instills pride, inspires confidence and trust, expresses important goals in simple ways, promotes intelligence, and treats everyone individually. Transformational leaders are more likely to be seen by their colleagues and employees as more satisfying and effective leaders than are transactional leaders (Fisher and Koch, 1996).

In defining the difference between transactional and transformational leadership, Burns (1978) writes:

> I will deal with leadership as a distinct from mere power-holding and as the opposite of brute power. I will identify two basic types of leadership: the transactional and the transforming. The relations of most leaders and followers are transactional - leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another, jobs for votes,

> or subsidies for campaign contributions. Such transactions comprise the bulk of the relationships among leaders and followers, especially in groups, legislatures, and parties. Transforming leadership, while more complex, is more potent. The transforming leader recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower. But, beyond that, the transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents (p. 4).

Transformational or transforming leadership attempts to shape, alter and elevate the motives, values and goals of followers through the vital teaching role of leadership. Transformational leaders take into account the needs and wants, the aspirations and expectations, of both the leaders and the followers (Burns, 1978).

In further defining the differences, Fisher and Koch (1996) state that transactional leadership does not possess the power of substantive improvement, change, or reform. Faith in the individual is not a primary

component. Transformational leadership, on the other hand, asks for transcendence. By transcending their own particular concerns and working for the communal good, transformational leaders achieve shared faith, intellectual stimulation, or inspiration, and consideration of the individual.

In summary, transactional and transformational are two different leadership styles. A transactional leader is concerned about maintaining the status quo and does so through a series of transactions with his or her followers to ensure the individual gains and sustains influence over time. The transforming leader, on the other hand, attempts to elevate those around him or her, to create a vision for others to accept. In transforming leadership there is no coercion; employees understand the values, the ideas, and the vision the leader presents and incorporates them into themselves. Transformational leaders can enhance an organization, while transactional leaders do not alter the organization, but rather maintain it as is.

Interpreting Leadership Through Shared Beliefs and Values

Recently researchers and scholars (i.e., Snyder, 1998; Posner and Kouzes, 1996; Heifetz, 1994; Bolman and Deal, 1990, 1997; McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988) have begun examining the influence of the leader in maintaining or reinterpreting the system of shared beliefs and values. They also have examined leadership as a social attribution that permits followers to make sense of an equivocal, fluid, and complex world (Bensimon, Newmann, and Birnbaum, 1989). This research combines many of the aspects of the studies

and theories that have preceded it. It studies the leader him or herself; the traits he or she bring with him or her; how he or she acts in certain situations; how he or she interacts with subordinates, superiors, peers, clients, the environment and others; and the values he or she espouses. The researchers believe that people choose to follow those with integrity, those who are authentic, those who have a sense of purpose, those who are balanced, those who have fun doing what they do, those who allow others to succeed, and those who love. Those who have ethics, value individuals, and are comfortable with ambiguity and paradox. In other words, they are wise. Wise leaders: they do not use the techniques or fear, of manipulation, or of position or images. They move to leadership through trust and integrity; they move to leadership through vision and then end up being followed because of wisdom (Lopez, 1990).

Posner and Kouzes (1996) in "Ten Lessons for Leaders and Leadership Development" write that:

> Constituents choose leaders. Leaders cannot be appointed or anointed superiors. Constituents determine whether someone is fit to lead. The trappings of power and position may give someone the right to exercise authority but never mistake position and authority for leadership. Only when constituents believe a leader is capable of

> meeting their expectations will he or she mobilize subordinates...Leaders serve their constituents; they do not boss them around. The best leaders are the servants of others' wants and desires, hopes and dreams (pp. 3-4).

The be effective, leaders must have followers who are followers of their own free will - not followers because of fear, intimidation, concern about losing status, or concern about low performance ratings, etc. Characteristics that followers want to see in their leaders are: possessing and sharing a vision; expressing a sense of purpose and mission; possessing integrity; being competent at what they do; being authentic persons, not pretentious or false; being risk-takers by empowering associates and subordinates; dealing comfortably with change and ambiguity; praising subordinates publicly and constructively criticizing privately; focusing on doing right things as opposed to doing things right; understanding leadership as a servant relationship to those being led is important; and pointing people in the right direction and encouraging them to get moving (Snyder, 1998).

Bolman and Deal (1990; 1997) studied leaders' actions and attempted to define and describe them by looking at how the leader's view their experience through a set of preconditioned lenses and filters. They looked to see if there were common patterns in the images or lenses the leaders employed. They

looked at whether the leaders adjusted their lenses to fit the circumstances or did they shape the situation to fit their preferred conception? They also examined whether leaders with multiple frames were more effective than those with a singular focus? Lastly, they studied under what conditions leaders learned to be more flexible in defining situations accurately. The concept of frames Bolman and Deal used was based in social science literature - maps, images, schemata, frames of reference, perspectives, orientations, lenses, and mindscapes. The different labels shared an assumption that individuals see the world in different ways because they are embedded in different world views. Because the world of human experience is ambiguous, frames of reference shape how situations are defined and determine what actions are taken. The world views of leaders are formed through their heritage, early experiences, formal training and experience on the job. The mix of these influences varies from person to person and sector to sector, but learning from experience often plays a more powerful role than formal education.

Bensimon, Newmann, and Birnhaum (1989) believe that "one of the most useful organizational typologies from the perspective of leadership suggests that organizations can be looked at through four different vantage points or coherent perspectives identified as 'frames'" (p. iv). The frames they were referring to were based on the work of Bolman and Deal (1984) and updated and reprinted in 1997.

After reviewing and synthesizing the theories of organizations, Bolman and Deal (1990; 1997) distilled the information into four frames: the structural frame, the human resource frame, the political frame, and the symbolic frame. [The following descriptions were drawn from the work of Bolman and Deal (1984) Reframing Organizations and updated and reprinted in 1997.] These frames represent a distinctive cognitive lens that influence what leaders see and do (Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum, 1989). According to Bolman and Deal (1990; 1997), the structural frame derives its outlook particularly from the discipline of sociology. This frame emphasizes goals and efficiency. It posits that effective organizations define clear goals, differentiate people into specific roles, and coordinate diverse activities through policies, roles, and chain of command. Structural leaders value analysis and data, keep their eye on the bottom line, set clear directions, hold people accountable for results, and try to solve organizational problems with new policies and rules or through restructuring.

The human resource frame borrows its assumptions from the fields of psychology and organizational behavior. It focuses attention on human needs and assumes that organizations that meet basic needs will work better than those that do not. Human resource leaders value relationships and feelings and seek to lead through facilitation and empowerment. They tend to define problems in individual or interpersonal terms and look for ways to adjust the organization to fit people - or to adjust people to fit the organization.

The political frame emphasizes the individual and group interests that often displace organizational goals. Borrowing ideas from political science, this frame assumes a continuing competition among different interests for scarce resources. Conflict is seen as a normal byproduct of collective action. Political leaders are advocates and negotiators who value realism and pragmatism. They spend much of their time networking, creating coalitions, building a power base, and negotiating compromises.

Lastly, the symbolic frame synthesizes concepts and imagery from a number of disciplines - most notably the field of anthropology. It sees a chaotic world in which meaning and predictability are social creations and facts are interpretative rather than objective. Organizations develop symbols and culture that shape human behavior unobtrusively and provide a shared sense of mission and identity. Symbolic leaders instill a sense of enthusiasm and commitment through charisma and drama. They pay diligent attention to myth, ritual, ceremony, stories, and other symbolic forms. Problems are seen originating in an organization's history, existing cultural patterns, or its visions of the future.

Bolman and Deal (1990) also defined eight separate dimensions of leadership - two for each frame. The dimensions were:

1. Human Resources Dimensions
    a. Supportive - concerned about the feelings of others; supportive and responsive.

b. Participative - fosters participation and involvement; listens and is open to new ideas.

2. Structural Dimensions

   a. Analytic - thinks clearly and logically; approaches problems with facts and attends to detail.

   b. Organized - develops clear goals and policies; holds people accountable for results.

3. Political Dimensions

   a. Powerful - persuasive, high level of ability to mobilize people and resources; effective at building alliances and support.

   b. Adroit - political, sensitive and skillful; a skillful negotiator in the face of conflict and opposition.

4. Symbolic Dimensions

   a. Inspirational - inspires others to loyalty and enthusiasm; communicates a strong sense of vision.

   b. Charismatic - imaginative, emphasizes culture and values; is highly charismatic (pp. 6-7).

Bolman and Deal (1997) discuss further the distinctive image of the leadership process that each frame offers. They assert that depending upon the leader and the circumstances, each frame can lead to compelling and constructive leadership, but none is right for all times and seasons. The authors state that structural leaders do their homework; rethink the relationship of

structure, strategy, and environment, evaluate, and adapt. Human resource leaders believe in people and communicate their belief; are visible and accessible; and empower others. Successful political leaders clarify what they want and what they can get; assess the distribution of power and interests; build linkages to key stakeholders; and persuade first, negotiate second, and use coercion only if necessary. Lastly, the symbolic leader uses symbols to capture attention; frame experience; discover and communicate a vision; and they tell stories.

What Bolman and Deal (1990) concluded in the "Images of Leadership" was that leaders rarely use more than two frames, and very few used all four frames. They reported that the human resource and political frames were positively related to effectiveness as both a manager and a leader; they further reported that across sectors the political frame was usually a better predictor of both managerial and leadership effectiveness than the human resource frame. This finding runs counter to the widespread feeling that politics in organizations is an unpleasant, if unavoidable evil. Their results showed that leaders who were more adept in understanding and using the political frame were perceived by their colleagues, superiors, and subordinates as better managers and leaders. In summary, Bolman and Deal concluded leadership effectiveness was particularly associated with high scores on the symbolic dimensions, but was largely unrelated to the structural frame. On the other hand, for managerial effectiveness, the results were almost reversed: the symbolic frame was never a

significant predictor, but the structural frame always was. The other two frames - human resource and political - were both significant positive predictors of success as both leader and manager, but the political frame was consistently the more powerful of the two.

Bogue (1994) offers another analysis of Bolman and Deal's theory. He writes in Leadership By Design that effective leaders view organizations through multiple frames - structural, human resource, political and symbolic (goals, people, power, and symbols). In the more effective manifestation of these four frames, leaders are respectively social architects, servants, advocates and prophet-poets. In their least effective manifestation, leaders are tyrants, wimps, con artists and fanatics while political and symbolic frames seem particularly important in effective leadership and organizations; sensitivity to and use of all four frames are essential.

Gareth Morgan, writing in Images of Organizations (1997), analyzed organizations and leadership by using a series of metaphors. He chose to study these topics by using metaphors because "We use metaphors whenever we attempt to understand one element of experience in terms of another. Thus, metaphor proceeds through implicit or explicit assertions that A is (or is like B" (p. 4). Bogue (1999) has also employed metaphors as a method of understanding and interpreting leadership in organizations. By combining Morgan's organizational metaphors and Bogue's (1999) leadership metaphors in relation to

the organizational view posed by Bolman and Deal (1990; 1997), the following is developed:

Leadership Metaphor	Organizational View	Organizational Metaphor
Commander & Controller	Structural	Machine
Guardian & Lover	Human Relations	Organism
Guerilla	Political	Arena
Curator	Symbolic	Theatre

This approach permits the leader to become more aware of and to gain insight in the various situations and to seek solutions to problems by analyzing the specifics of the situation, determining which metaphor most closely fits the situation, then using the perspective created by that metaphor to resolve the dilemma. The utility of using this approach is that the leader is not locked into attempting to resolve every situation by using the same frame or metaphor. This approach provides the leaders options for dealing with dynamic and fluid situations.

Morgan (1997) wrote that "The challenge facing modern managers is to become accomplished in the art of using metaphor: to find appropriate ways of seeing, understanding, and shaping situations with which they have to deal" (p. 348). He then goes on to say that "When you recognize that your theories and insights are metaphorical, you have to approach the process in an open-ended

way...This results in a style of thinking that is always open and evolving and extremely well-suited for dealing with the complexity of organizational life" (p. 353).

C. THE STUDY OF LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The research on college and university leadership is sparse (Green, 1988). The most encyclopedic survey of the field of leadership research Bass (1990) cites over 7,500 studies on the topic, but only a small subset focused on higher education (Birnbaum, 1992).

Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) believe that with few exceptions, practical works on leadership in higher education tend to be guided by traditional conceptions of one-way rational leadership. The authors emphasize administrative behaviors that will enable the new leader to gain control of the campus by doing such things as setting goals and priorities, making decisions, and providing direction and a vision of the future (Bensimon, Gade, and Kauffman, 1989). Bimbaum (1992) wrote that most of the writing on leadership in higher education was descriptive or prescriptive and tended either to explicitly advocate or implicitly accept that leadership is a critical component of institutional functioning and improvement.

Even as late as 1997, within higher education, trait theories still have currency. Successful academic leaders have been described in terms of personal attributes, interpersonal abilities, and technical management skills. The

personal attributes include courage, humor, judgment, integrity, intelligence, persistence, hard work and vision. Interpersonal abilities cover such areas as being open, building teams, empathy and being compassionate, while the technical management skills include an orientation toward the achievement of goals, problem-solving, diagnostic and evaluative skills and the ability to resolve conflicts and to shape the work environment (Eggins, 1997).

However, before an understanding of leadership and leadership development in higher education can begin, one must analyze higher education itself. Higher education, as a general rule, provides a unique context for the exercise of leadership (Green, 1988). The essential purposes of colleges are to provide teachers, scholars, and students with resources, libraries, laboratories, classrooms, and an environment so that learning, the pursuit of intellectual and creative endeavors and the like can take place. Those pursuits are diverse, often individualistic, and not very amenable to coercion from management or to central control. Consequently, academic leaders must remember that no matter how concerned the governing board is with management and its tools, most of the faculty, professional staff, and students do not regard management as the principal value in the academic enterprise (Bensimon, Gade, and Kauffman, 1989).

Cohen and March (1974) wrote that the American college and university belonged to "a class of organizations that can be called *organized anarchies*. By an organized anarchy we mean any organizational setting that exhibits the

following general properties: problematic goals...unclear technology...and fluid participation." They go on to say, "The American college or university is a protype organized anarchy...Its goals are either vague or in dispute. Its technology is familiar but not understood. Its major participants wander in and out of the organization" (pp. 2-3). In a university anarchy each individual is seen as making autonomous decisions. Neither coordination nor control are practiced. The decisions of the system are a consequence produced by the system but intended by no one and decisively controlled by no one.

Green (1988), too, believes colleges and universities are "organized anarchy" (p. 13). Bennis (1976) also agrees, contending that the university "is society's closest realization to the pure model of anarchy, that is, the locus of decision-making is the individual" (p. 26).

In contrast to those scholars who believe that having the locus of the decision-making with the individual constitutes an organized anarchy, Bogue (1999) believes that individuals on the front line making the decision constitutes a system of reverse discretion. By reverse discretion he means that an individual is vested by the organization with the authority to make a decision in specific situations based on the particulars of that situation. The employee has been vested with the latitude to decide for him or herself what should be done, when it should be done, and how it should be done.

Regardles of which conceptual model is employed, the amount of authority and power attributed to institutional leaders varies with the conceptual

model of the university, few would contend that the autocratic president who can make decisions, subject to a few checks and balances, and can expect to have them carried out is the dominant model (Kerr and Gade, 1986). This view, however, is not held unanimously. Some observers and analysts emphasize a "strong leader" model, arguing for the importance of presidential behavior (Birnbaum, 1992; Green, 1988).

In spite of these calls for strengthened leadership, higher education today provides an environment that constrains the exercise of unfettered leadership, that acceptance is hard to come by in colleges. The resistance to leadership from faculties is historic, and unless conditions are truly awful, most faculty members prefer simply to be left alone by the administration. Faculty antipathy for administrators stems in part from a value system that devalues the overt exercise of power; the desire for power or its cultivation seems incompatible with academic norms (Green, 1988).

By the same token, the culture of higher education dictates that management is necessary, supporting however clumsily the true center of a college or university teaching and learning. Management connotes the mundane, the operational ability to get things done toward the accomplishment of a predetermined goal. Leadership, on the other hand, provides shape, direction, and meaning and is therefore far more intellectually respectable (Green, 1988). This distinction is especially important to higher education scholars. Management means bringing all relevant information together

concerning an issue, reflecting on it in rational ways, and making judgments and plans about issues, whereas leadership involves the presence of an enlightened vision of what an institution is and can become and the ability to persuade others to accept the vision (Mayhew, 1979).

Birnbaum (1992), building on the belief that leadership matters, examined under what conditions leaders make a difference. In response to this question he suggested viewing a college or university from a cultural and interpretive perspective. He defines culture as the "collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that guide the behavior of individuals and groups in an institution and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off campus" (pp. 9-10). Looking at leadership through the cultural lens suggests that leaders may exert influence less through planning, decision-making, and related administrative activities than through affecting others' interpretations of institutional life. An interpretive view of leadership emphasizes the importance of leaders in developing and sustaining systems of beliefs that regenerates participants' commitment. Leaders accomplish this through the use of language, symbolism, and ritual that cause others to interpret organizational actions in ways consistent with the values of the leader. In this fashion, leaders symbolically protect us from the uncertainties of an ambiguous environment.

Birnbaum (1992) in defining leadership states: "Leadership initially changes perceptions, but it also eventually evokes change in

behavior...Leadership can lead others to do different things, or to do things differently." He continues by saying "Although leadership must always be seen as eventually affecting the behavior of others, having this influence will depend on changed perceptions of reality and need not depend on changes in the objective environment. Since it is perception that defines reality, it is perception that must change. Leadership involves moving others toward a shared perception of reality, toward a common understanding of where the organization is and where it should be going, and toward an increased commitment to those ends" (p. 16).

He then discusses leaders and leadership roles in institutions of higher education. He writes that "In a college, a leadership role is a formal campus position in which the incumbent is expected to exhibit leadership. Since people's expectations often overwhelm the information with which they are presented, those in leadership roles are often believed to exhibit leadership even when there is little objective evidence to support it...Presidents are considered effective leaders to the extent that they are seen to exhibit leadership and do what others consider good presidents should do" (Birnbaum, 1992, pp. 17-18). Birnbaum's statement, then, begs the question - what distinguishes effective leaders from ineffective leaders?

Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler (1988) attempted to answer this question. They identified a cadre of effective college presidents by asking observers of and individuals familiar with higher education which presidents they believed to be

most effective. Some of those selected to identify the effective presidents were themselves college presidents. The effective presidents were selected from a group of about 2,800 college and university presidents in the United States. Approximately 15 percent of presidents were identified as being effective. Next, they asked those identified as effective and the others who were perceived as not especially effective to complete a questionnaire designed to ascertain their attitudes and behaviors concerning the presidency and their campuses (Fisher and Koch, 1996).

They found that the effective president was different from the kind of person normally appointed by a governing board to a college presidency. The effective president held a different kind of leadership philosophy. The effective president was a strong, caring, action-oriented visionary who acted out of educated intuition. He or she was transformational rather than transactional and less collegial and more willing to take risks than the usual president (Fisher and Koch, 1996).

Specifically, relative to others the effective presidents were:

* Less collegial and more distant;
* More inclined to rely upon respect than affiliation;
* More inclined to take risks;
* More committed to an ideal or a vision than to an institution;
* More inclined to support merit pay;
* More thoughtful, shrewd, and calculating than spontaneous;

* More likely to work long hours;
* More supportive of organizational flexibility;
* More experienced;
* More frequently published.

In addition, Fisher, Tack and Wheeler found that those who were more effective focused more upon higher education issues in general and less upon parochial single campus issues. This means they were more likely to discern longer term trends and less likely to be caught unawares of emerging national issues, and were more likely to be slightly ahead of the curve. Finally, effective presidents exhibited behaviors that could be learned. Even charisma can be increased by learned behaviors. This is not to say that all effective presidential behaviors can be learned or all ineffective behaviors unlearned. It does suggest, however, that an astute president is capable of improving his or her performance (Fisher and Koch, 1996).

However, in a re-examination of the same data, Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) reported that the two groups of presidents were probably more alike than different. They concluded that four of the five leadership factors derived from a factor analysis (managing style, human relations, image, and social reference) showed no significant difference between the two groups of presidents. The only factor that showed a significant difference was confidence, which consisted of items that assessed the extent to which the president believed he or she could make a difference in his or her institution.

While building on the work of other scholars, yet developing a unique perspective of leadership in higher education, Bogue (1994) presents the reader with the values he believes a successful leader should possess. The values that he believes are necessary are: honor, dignity, curiosity, candor, compassion, courage, an expectation of excellence, and being a servant exemplar. He writes that "effective leadership will be a construction of...values and ideals...Who will follow those who have no center of mind or heart?...The most urgent business for the collegiate or any leader is the construction of a philosophy. An element of that philosophy will surely be that leadership is not necessarily something that others do for or to us, not something vested in a position; rather, it is what we accomplish together in shared ventures of purpose, persistence, and pleasure - a journey of shared ideals" (p. xv).

Kerr and Gade (1986) maintain that the predominate type of president was and has been over time the individual who is concerned with the efficient pursuit of what is already being done, of what some constituency wants to have done, or of what circumstances may require to be done.

Effective management, efficiency and financial control have been variable obsessions of higher education administrators for the past fifteen years. While higher education struggles to acquire and conserve resources, good management was vital to the very existence of the institution. Academic officers and presidents were subject to the often-conflicting demands of educational leadership and resource management and found themselves disconcertingly

preoccupied with the latter. The late 1980s and the 1990s ushered in a changed environment for leadership. Good management continued to be vital, but campuses and society looked to academic leaders to clarify their institution's missions, to articulate an academic vision, and to be accountable for the quality of their programs and graduates (Green, 1988).

While identifying the tasks of leadership may not automatically elucidate the appropriate preparation of individuals for those tasks, it is a rational point of departure. The tasks of leaders do not necessarily change over time or in different circumstances, but the relative importance of the various tasks do.

Posner and Kouzes (1996) developed ten lessons that leaders should learn to succeed. The lessons were: challenges provide an opportunity for greatness; leadership is in the eye of the beholder; credibility is the foundation of leadership; sharing a vision differentiates leaders from other credible sources; leaders must be trusted; shared values are critical; leaders are role models; lasting change occurs one hop at a time; leadership development is also self-development; and leadership is not an affair of the head, but of the heart.

Green (1988) also identified five tasks she believed to be important: serving as a symbol, achieving workable unity, serving as a team leader, serving as an information executive, and serving as a future agent.

Green (1988) further expounded, defined, and described her view of the five imperative tasks. First, in discussing the symbolic leader, she believes symbolism is without a doubt an external aspect of leadership. College

presidents are the living symbol of their institutions. They embody the values and aspirations of the college and its constituents. The symbolic aspect of leadership is perhaps the most difficult to teach directly and may be the most susceptible of all leadership tasks to learning by example on the job.

Campuses are fragmented in a number of ways. Academic, administrative, and financial operations tend to work in isolation without a full understanding of, or commitment to, a larger institutional agenda. To the extent that the leader views the campus as a political community with varied interest groups and diffused power, his or her job will be to build coalitions and consensus. Coalition building requires the leader to take a low profile, work quietly to build alliances, instruct various interest groups about the vantage point of others, and serve as a conduit among the parties. The role of a leader as an arbiter and manager of conflicts, consensus builder, and orchestra leader is a non-heroic one. Articulating a vision and infusing others with enthusiasm is only one element of academic leadership. Making it happen in spite of the agendas of various factions requires a varied repertoire of leadership skills.

The third major task of a leader is to minimize the separate agendas and create a common one, raising people's sights to the institutional agenda as opposed to a departmental or narrowly administrative one. To build and nurture a team is both a management and leadership task. To put a team in place requires a realistic assessment of institutional needs, an analysis of the strengths needed to compliment the skills and style of the team leader, and a good

selection process. Another required skill is the ability to process and screen information. Academic leaders must be highly informed generalists who can elicit and integrate the relevant information about diverse segments of the institution.

The knowledge (information) executive describes effective leaders in the current information society as get-it-all-together generalists, characterized by their breadth, by their ability to see connections, and by their ability to extract and integrate relevant bits of information. The ability of the generalist to make connections is crucial to good team leadership. The team leader serves as the unifying force, as the one to educate team members about the relationship of the parts to the whole. Only the team leader has the perspective of the entire task or institution.

Finally, leaders must have an eye on the future. Higher education has undergone periods of transition in the past, and it is once again in a period of profound change. The future agent looks outward, foresees trends, anticipates issues, and when possible acts rather than reacts. Future agents are knowledge executives and coalition builders. They are intellectually curious enough to scan the horizon with interest and discrimination and sufficient risk takers that they will act on an idea without the benefit of conclusive data or a proven track record.

Green (1988) in her book, Leaders for a New Era, addresses the skills effective leaders will need to be successful in the 1990s. Birnbaum (1992) warns readers in How Academic Leadership Works to be cognizant of the myths and

mysteries of academic leadership. The first myth Birnbaum addresses is the myth of the presidential vision. The myth is not that a vision is important, but that the vision must be developed by the president as the outgrowth of his or her personal agendas. The mark of effective leadership, according to the myth, becomes getting others to buy into the leader's vision. The real purposes of articulating a vision are to give constituents confidence in the leader's competence and to convince them that the leader has listened to them and has been influenced by them.

The second myth is the myth of the president as a transformational leader. According to this myth, many of the problems of higher education could be solved if only presidents would act to transform their institutions. In reality, transformational leadership is an anomaly in higher education. Because the goals and enduring purposes of an academic institution are likely to be shaped by its history, its culture, and the socialization and training of its participants, rather than by an omnipotent leader, attempts at transformational leadership are more likely to lead to disruption and conflict than to desirable outcomes.

The myth of presidential charisma is the third myth discussed by Birnbaum. Charismatic leadership gives little attention to structure, routine, and established order, and relies instead on the magnetic personal qualities of the leader. It presumes that people want leaders they can revere, or even idolize, and that such leaders are able to motivate followers to support the leader's goals in preference to their own. In truth and practice, charismatic leaders in higher

education are rare because the training and socialization of faculty predisposes them to resist hierarchical authority of any kind. The most critical problem, however, with reliance on charisma is that it may cause an institution to ignore the processes of institutional building which may leave it unable to function effectively when the charismatic leader departs.

The fourth myth is the myth of presidential distance. This myth argues that leaders in general, and college presidents in particular, can increase their power by remaining distant from their followers and that presidential effectiveness diminishes as they increase interaction with constituents. Belief in this myth may cause presidents to avoid situations leading to close personal relationships with colleagues, and to maximize status differences, emphasize the trappings of the office, and give too much attention to ceremonial functions.

The final myth - the myth of presidential style and traits - claims there is a casual relationship between leadership styles and organizational outcomes. It was believed that once these relationships were determined, it would be possible either to select leaders who already possessed them or to train leaders who didn't. Unfortunately, the idea of style has increasingly emphasized superficial aspects of behavior and has lost sight of the deep structure of leadership, which includes elusive concepts that have no physical or behavioral counterparts.

In turning his attention to the mysteries of academic leadership, Birnbaum states that although the writing on leadership is abundant, surprisingly little research attention has been given to three mysteries whose solutions may have

important consequences for higher education. The three mysteries are: "Is academic leadership improved through the use of teams?; Does the experience with which presidents assume their positions affect their performance?; and Do men and women behave differently as presidents or have different effects on their colleges?" (p. 38).

In addressing the first mystery, Birnbaum says the organizational literature disagrees on whether institutional productivity is enhanced by teamwork or by individual entrepreneurship. However, he goes on to say that based on findings in business organizations, it is suggested that organizational success is more likely to be achieved when leaders embrace a teamwork approach. Although there is little research based on academic institutions, this view of the value of teams is clearly consistent with academic norms of collegiality and shared governance.

Birnbaum, in discussing the second mystery of leadership and experience, believes that it is more significant to have had experience in a higher education position than to point to a particular kind. When experience leads presidents to listen to others and be responsive to their concerns, it may promote more effective learning and perceptions of more effective leadership. But when it leads presidents to be more secure in their own judgment, to discount negative feedback, and to ignore the cultural differences, experiences may lead to less effective learning and consequently to failed leadership.

The final mystery concerns leadership and gender. Do men and women think or behave differently as leaders? Birnbaum's research found no apparent relationships between gender and leadership. This lack of relationship is consistent with other studies of leadership in academic settings. Diu (1984) found that the decision-making behavior of men and women was more similar than dissimilar; Van Der Veer (1991) found no difference between men and women in the cognitive complexity of mid- or upper-level academic executives; and Eggins (1997) found no difference between male and female managers who hold equivalent positions in personality, leadership style, motivation, or effectiveness.

In summarizing this section of his book, Birnbaum believed the myths are dangerous and the mysteries helpful. The myths may create significant problems for the presidents by leading them to make poor judgments and reducing their effectiveness. On the other hand, the mysteries suggest that important matters should be treated as topics for discussion and inquiry, rather than accepted as dogma. They direct our attention to things that may be important but are usually overlooked.

Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) have retitled the four frames identified by Bolman and Deal (1984; 1990; 1997) so that they were related to higher education: the university as bureaucracy (the structural frame); the university as collegium (the human resource frame); the university as political system (the resource frame); and the university as organized anarchy (the

symbolic frame). When the university was seen as a bureaucracy, the emphasis was on the leader's role in making decisions, getting results, and establishing systems of management. When the university was portrayed as a collegium, leadership was seen as participative. The leader strived to meet constituents' needs and help them realize their aspirations, and the emphasis was on the ability to manage processes of consultation and on interpersonal skills. When looking at the university as a political system, leaders were seen as influencing through persuasion and diplomacy and as being open and communicative. The leader was a mediator or negotiator between shifting power blocks. Finally, in the university as organized anarchy, leaders are constrained by existing organizational structures and processes and may make modest improvements through subtle actions and the manipulation of symbols.

Studies of leaders who incorporate elements of the four models suggested they were more likely to have more flexible responses to different administrative tasks because they noticed the multiple realities of the organization and were able to interpret events in a variety of ways. Leaders who thought and acted using more than one organizational model were able to fulfill the many and often conflicting expectations of their position more skillfully then leaders who could not differentiate among situational requirements.

Others writing about leaders in higher education have looked at the behaviors and philosophies they espoused. Walker (1979) says that ineffective collegiate leaders were occupied with status and position, regarded critics as

troublemakers, saw their role as one of having to make unpopular decisions, and were occupied with opposing laziness and inertia. By contrast, effective leaders wore the symbols of privilege and office lightly, saw their role as one of reconciling dissent, saw the university in a healthy political sense, were confident and assured, and assumed that the university as an organization was healthy rather than pathological.

Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) reported that good leadership consisted of appropriately doing those things that others expected leaders to do - attending to the routine of institutional life, repairing them as they were buffeted and challenged by internal and external forces, and maintaining organizational culture.

Gilley, Fulmer, and Reithlingshoefer (1986) studied presidents of campuses on the move. They found the incumbents liked face-to-face contact deep within the organization and were not inhibited by the confines of organizational charts. The presidents were described as conservative gamblers willing to work out front but looked to minimize risk. They created a safety zone of goodwill and trust that permitted them to occasionally behave in a unilateral and authoritarian manner.

Finally, Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler (1988) found effective presidents held a different kind of leadership philosophy than other presidents. They also found them to be a strong, caring, action-oriented visionary who acted out of education

intuition. He or she was transformational rather than transactional, was less collegial and more willing to take risks (Fisher and Koch, 1996).

To summarize the work that has been done on leadership in higher education, Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) succinctly state:

> ...In the descriptions of theories of leadership...leaders are seen in roles ranging from all-powerful hero to illusion or symbol. Leaders are described in terms of who they are, what they do, how they think, their presumed effects, and how they are seen by others. They are considered as heads of bureaucratic organizations, peer groups, political structures, and systems of myth and metaphors. Probably each major idea about leadership is correct under certain conditions, in certain situations, at certain times, and with certain groups. A research agenda for leadership in higher education must recognize that leadership...is multidimensional and that its definition and interpretation will legitimately differ among different observers with different values whose assessments may be based on conflicting criteria, units of measurement, or time horizons. For this reason, no consensus presently exists - or is even

likely to - on a grand unifying theory of academic leadership (p. 80).

D. LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

According to their catalogues and mission statements, most colleges and universities aim to develop leaders for society through the educational process. A variety of programs and co-curricular activities provide students with academic and experimental learning opportunities that are designed to expand their awareness of leadership issues and test their own leadership abilities. But what about developing leaders for higher education? Ironically, higher education pays little attention to enhancing the ability of administrators and faculty to lead their institutions; the priority is low and the investment modest. The corporate sector spends $40 billion a year on training. A campus may devote as much as 80 percent or more of its operating budget to personnel. Yet, institutions invest little in the development of these valuable human resources, and when times get tough, funds for faculty and administrative development are among the first casualties (Green and McDade, 1991).

Colleges and universities, as educational organizations and as employers, have a special role to play in fostering leadership by creating an environment that encourages its faculty, administrators, and staff to realize their potential and be active contributors to the life of the institution (Green and McDade, 1991).

Birnbaum (1989) writes that the processes by which leaders in the academy are selected make it likely that they will both understand the customs and be reasonably industrious (Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum, 1989). The major concern with Birnbaum's statement is that it leads one to the conclusion that leadership development in higher education is left to the devices of the individual, that there is no formal mechanism to identify and develop talent.

According to Green and McDade (1991), leadership development encompasses many activities and experiences that enhance the ability of individuals to make a difference, to shape the direction of their institution or unit, and to bring others along in sharing and implementing goals. It is identifying new leaders, providing people with opportunities to grow and learn, to affirm their beliefs and values, to expand their understanding of issues and people, and to improve their management skills. In summary, leadership development is a broad concept that includes but goes beyond teaching skills and enhancing career mobility. While individuals must create opportunities to develop themselves, institutions must help them do so by effectively managing human resources by establishing a climate that encourages participation and innovation, and by actively promoting leadership development.

A major responsibility of all leaders is the identification and development of other leaders. If leadership development is to be more than a random and occasional activity, it must become an institutional commitment, supported at the highest levels and embraced as part of a culture that espouses lifelong learning

by its faculty, administrators, and staff. Prior to instituting a leadership development program, there must be agreement regarding leadership and institutional functioning. The assumptions are: leadership development is a shared responsibility of the institution and the individual; leadership development is ongoing and often not deliberate; diversity strengthens institutional leadership; individual power in an institution is limited; leadership is dispersed throughout the institution; rigid career movement systems inhibit the emergence of leadership; and conventional notions of "upward mobility" have limited use in developing leadership (Green and McDade, 1991).

Leaders do make a difference. Change, innovation, and excellence are brought about by leaders throughout the institution. Because a college or university is only as good as its faculty, staff, and administrators, their development is tied closely to institutional effectiveness (Green and McDade, 1991). The fact that an institution or organization is only as good as its employees, staff, and administrators or its management team is not lost on those in the corporate sector.

A recent formula for developing leadership is to help practitioners become more effective leaders (McCall and Lombardo, 1978; McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988). Even though there is a plethora of studies describing portions of what leaders and their subordinates say they do, could do, or should do; there is a paucity of studies describing what they actually do. Real life is complex, superficial, ambiguous, and irrational; but if the knowledge of the behavioral

sciences is to be translated into usable guidelines for leaders, observational studies must compliment the controlled conditions of the laboratory (McCall and Lombardo, 1978).

In their book The Lessons of Experience, McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) analyzed the experiences of 191 successful executives from six major corporations. The authors identified successful executives by working closely with senior human resource and line management to select employees judged to have the best shot at the top jobs in each company. This success was defined in terms of each company studied and included both success to date and judgments about future potential. The answers to a series of questions yielded descriptions of 616 events and 1,547 lessons. The experiences could be broadly defined as assignments (specific jobs they were given to do), bosses (other people who had an impact in their own right), and hardships (setbacks and tough times) (p. 6). The "lessons" these executives learned seemed to represent some fundamental executive skills and ways of thinking. Five major themes emerged from the lessons the executives shared: agenda setting, handling relationships, basic values (guiding principles with persuasive behavioral implications), executive temperament, and personal awareness.

The authors concluded, however, it was one thing to make a list of lessons, but quite another to master them. These lessons were not delivered with spellbinding clarity; they had to be dug out of complex, confusing, ambiguous situations. Even when they were delivered up, they were tough to

incorporate. For the executives, learning was a murky business, occurring in fits and starts over time. Lessons accumulated, evolved, affected one another, gained potency in combination, didn't take the first time, atrophied, and were forgotten. Some were much tougher to learn than others, and the toughest part was using what one had learned to make a difference on the job.

McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) summarized the results of the study by writing that developing leadership ultimately boils down to what a person does with his or her opportunities and abilities - no guarantees, no magic, no formulas, lots of luck, good and bad. The executives' stories they studied were filled with unexpected turns, a lot of hard work, a little luck, some special talents, and a love for what they were doing.

The authors found there was no single path to success as an executive in a corporation, no secret recipes to follow or no big name schools that routinely stamped out successful executives. What did seem to characterize the successful executives was not their genetic endowment nor even their impressive array of life experience. Rather, as a group, they seemed ready to grab or create opportunities for growth, wise enough not to believe that there is nothing more to learn, and courageous enough to look inside themselves and grapple with their frailties. Not only could they do these things, they also seemed able to do them under the worst possible conditions. Thus, if there is indeed a right stuff for executives, it may be their extra-ordinary tenacity in extracting something worthwhile from their experiences and in seeking experiences rich in

opportunities for growth. In short, they made the most of their experiences. Finally, the successful executives offered the following advice to young managers who want to develop: take advantage of opportunities, aggressively search for meaning, and know yourself.

In a study build upon the work of McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988), Brooker (1998) examined the experience of five women presidents in institutions of higher education. Brooker's (1998) conclusions were similar to those drawn by McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1998). She concluded that her sample "...sort of learned by doing" (p. 103). There were some differences, however, in the results of the two studies. Brooker (1998) said her sample believed mentors played a larger role in their rise up the organization than those sampled by the authors of The Lessons of Experience. In her study, Brooker (1998) found her sample had long-term relationships (with their mentors), and they played a more important role in so far as the mentors pushed them beyond their self-imposed limits. However, she did agree with McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) when she summarized her study by stating "the experiences themselves do not guarantee growth, but rather the growth is guaranteed through self-reflection along the way from those experiences" (p. 115).

Higher education has been looking at methods of developing leaders, but as of now doesn't have a fully formed program. Organizations in other sectors, such as the military and private industry, have shown they are more concerned with leadership development. McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) report

that the annual investment in management development is in the range of $40 billion. As Green and McDade (1991) point out there is a difference in how higher education and other types of organizations view leadership development.

Unfortunately, higher education usually equates leadership development with attendance at off-campus learning events. Yet in other fields such as business, government and the military, leadership development includes a full array of on-site learning opportunities and programs, as well as on-the-job development. Higher education does not have a tradition of grooming people from within to take on jobs of greater responsibility; it is up to the individual to make the job a learning experience (Green and McDade, 1991).

It is one thing to understand that the job itself is potentially the richest source of learning and another to translate that understanding into a series of deliberate strategies and development experiences. Perhaps more organizations do not provide formalized structures for on-the-job learning because this type of learning is messy, hard to diagnose, and difficult to program. Some people are more likely to learn from their experiences than others, and different people will learn different things from the same experience; this further complicates the challenge of developing such learning experiences (Green and McDade, 1991). However, as McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) have shown, this form of leadership development can and does work. To succeed, formalized on-the-job learning raises the concept of shared responsibility between individual and institution for leadership development. It

must be remembered and understood that fostering a positive learning climate requires a partnership of individuals who want to learn and institutions that will create appropriate learning opportunities (Green and McDade, 1991).

In summary, leadership development is important and can succeed only if the institution is committed to the program and the individual is willing to devote the time and effort to make the program work.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, METHODS, AND PROCEDURES

A. INTRODUCTION

> Qualitative data consists of detailed descriptions of situations, events, people, interactions, and observed behaviors; direct quotations from people about their experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and thoughts... The data are collected as [an] open-ended narrative without attempting to fit program activities or people's experiences into predetermined, standardized categories...Qualitative measures describe the experiences of people in depth. The data are open-ended in order to find out what people's lives, experiences, and interactions mean to them in their own terms and in their natural settings (Patton, 1980, p. 22).

The methodology employed in this study was selected to permit the researcher to study selected events that were significant in the development of the interviewees during their leadership journey. This chapter discusses the guiding principles of the qualitative method and the specific methods and procedures this study employed.

B. QUALITATIVE THEORETICAL APPROACH

The qualitative approach seeks to capture what people have to say in their own words. It describes the experiences of people in depth (Patton, 1980). Qualitative methods permit the researcher to study selected issues, cases, or events in depth and detail; the fact that data collection is not constrained by predetermined categories of analysis contributes to the depth and detail of qualitative data (Patton, 1987). Qualitative techniques involve more open-ended, free-response questions based on informal, loosely-structured interviews, observation, or diaries. They are fairly time-consuming and often use smaller scale case study based research concerned with subjective experiences and social meanings (Burgess, 1982). The data collected are open-ended to find out what people's lives, experiences, and interactions mean to them in their own terms and in natural settings. The measures and protocols are designed to permit the researcher to record and understand people in their own terms (Patton, 1980).

Qualitative methods are used in research that is designed to provide an in-depth description of a specific program, practice, or setting (Mertens, 1998). To clarify qualitative research further, Denzin and Lincoln (1994) writing in Research Methods in Education and Psychology (1998), state: "Qualitative research is multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms

of meanings people bring to them. Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials - case study, personal experience, introspective, life story, interview, observational, historical, interactional, and visual texts - that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individual's lives" (pp. 159-160).

The key words associated with qualitative methods include complexity, contextural, exploration, discovery, and inductive logic. By using an inductive approach, the researcher can attempt to make sense of a situation without imposing pre-existing expectations on the phenomena under study (Mertens, 1998). Inductive reasoning involves the formulation of generalizations based on observations of a limited number of specific events (Gay, 1987). Thus, the researcher begins with specific observations and allows the categories of analysis to emerge from the data as the study progresses (Mertens, 1998).

Another reason for selecting the qualitative research design was to allow the important dimensions to emerge from analysis of the interviews without presupposing in advance what those important dimensions would be (Patton, 1980).

Data Collection

Hilary Putnam, in the Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education (1992), wrote "the data collection techniques employed should fit, or be suitable for answering, the research question entertained" (pp. 657-58). In qualitative research, the researcher is the instrument for data collection. The qualitative

researcher decides which questions to ask and in what order, what to observe, and what to write down (Mertens, 1998).

Interviews in qualitative research take the form of a dialogue or an interaction. They are a conversation with a purpose. Interviews allow the researcher and respondent to move back and forth in time; to reconstruct the past, interpret the present and predict the future (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

The purpose of interviewing is to find out what is in and on someone else's mind. The goal of open-ended interviewing is not to put things in someone's mind, but rather to access the perspective of the person being interviewed (Patton, 1980). People are interviewed to elicit information from or about them that cannot be observed directly. Interviewing is important and necessary because we cannot observe feelings, thoughts, intentions, or behaviors that took place at some earlier time, situations that preclude the presence of the observer; nor can we observe how people have organized the world and the meanings they attach to what goes on in the world. The only way to get these answers is to ask the person directly; in short, to interview them. By interviewing them, the researcher is allowed to enter into the other person's perspective. The assumption that follows, then, is that perspective is meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit (Patton, 1980).

Interviews also help the researcher to understand and put in a larger context the interpersonal, social, and cultural aspects of the environment. The interview may take a wide variety of forms, including those that are very focused

or predetermined to those that are very open-ended, and nothing is set ahead of time. Most common, however, is the semistructured interview that is guided by a set of basic questions and issues to be explored, but neither the exact wording nor the order of questions is predetermined (Erlandsen, Harris, Skipper, and Allen, 1993).

Most commonly interviews typically are of an open-ended nature in which the investigator asks respondents for the facts of a matter, as well as for the respondents' opinions about events. In some situations, the investigator may even ask the respondents to propose his or her own insights into certain occurrences and may use such propositions as the basis for further inquiry (Yin, 1984).

Once the participants have agreed to be interviewed, the researcher must prepare him/herself for the interview. This kind of preparation includes deciding on appropriate questions and their sequence, practicing or piloting the interview, and deciding on the interviewer's own role, dress, level of formality, and confirmation with the respondent of the time and place of the interview (Erlandsen, Harris, Skipper, and Allen, 1993; Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

The researcher must also prepare the respondent to put for him or her at ease as possible during the interview. Giving the interviewer pertinent information about the study, ensuring confidentiality, and explaining what will and will not be done with the data obtained in the interview will help the interviewee feel comfortable (Erlandsen, Harris, Skipper, and Allen, 1993).

Taylor and Bogdan (1984) suggest five issues that should be addressed at the beginning of every interview:

1. The investigator's motives and intentions and the inquiry's purpose;
2. The protection of respondents through use of pseudonyms;
3. Who has the final say over the study's content;
4. Payment (if any); and
5. The logistics of time and place and the number of interviews to be scheduled.

The interview typically begins with broad questions and becomes more specific as the interview progresses. Additionally, there will be times when the interviewer will probe or pursue a certain line of thought with the respondent. The interviewer should keep in mind that the person being interviewed is the expert on what he or she knows, understands and feels. The interviewer's job is to access this rich store of data from the interviewee. The interviewer should focus on obtaining the fullest picture that can be communicated of the interviewee's relevant construction of reality (Erlandsen, Harris, Skipper, and Allen, 1993).

Data derived from an interview can be recorded in any of several ways. A tape recording may be utilized, a mode that has many advantages, such as providing an unimpeachable data source; assuring completeness; providing the opportunity to review as often as necessary to assure that full understanding has been achieved; providing the opportunity for later review for non-verbal cues

such as significant pauses, raised voices, or emotional outbursts (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Patton, 1980).

The use of a tape recorder, however, does not eliminate the need for the interviewer to take notes. According to Patton (1980) notes serve at least two purposes: "(1) Notes taken during the interview can help the interviewer formulate new questions as the interview moves along, particularly where it may be appropriate to check out something that was said earlier; and (2) taking notes about what is said will facilitate later analysis, including locating important quotations from the tape itself" (p. 247).

Once the interview is completed, the tapes should be transcribed. The transcribed conversation then should be reviewed and edited by the interviewer and re-typed in a final form (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Patton, 1980).

Data Analysis

In qualitative research, the process of analyzing the data involves a constant analysis of the transcribed interviews as it is read and reread to discover relevant problems of the study. This analysis continues throughout the study and will provide an outline of many of the conclusions to be contained in the final research report (Burgess, 1985). The analysis of qualitative data is best described as a progression, not a stage; an on-going process, not a one-time event (Erlandsen, Harris, Skipper, and Allen, 1993).

Data analysis is the process of bringing order, structure, and meaning to the mass of collected data. It is a messy, ambiguous, time-consuming, creative,

and fascinating process. It does not proceed in a linear fashion; it is not neat. Qualitative data analysis is a search for general statements about relationships among categories of data (Marshall and Rossman, 1993).

The analysis of the data gathered in qualitative studies begins the first day the researcher arrives at the setting. The collection and analysis of the data obtained go hand-in-hand as ideas and themes emerge during the study (Erlandsen, Harris, Skipper, and Allen, 1993). The actual analysis of meaning involves three principal steps. The first is that of noting possible meanings and writing them within the field notes in which they occur. Second, after a number of such comments have been written alongside the field notes, the researcher will conduct another level of analysis on them to make the meanings possible. Third, the researcher will conduct yet another analysis in which speculations about the subjective states of the individuals under study are reconstructed (LeCompte, Millroy, Preissle, 1993).

"The analysis of qualitative data is a creative process. It is also a process of intellectural rigor and a great deal of hard work" (Patton, 1980, p. 299). The data set to be analyzed consists of transcribed interviews and field notes. The analysis will be inductive, which means that the patterns, themes, and categories of analysis emerge from the data as opposed to being imposed on them prior to data collection and analysis (Patton, 1980; 1987). For the researcher, then, the study of natural variation will involve attention to variations in responses and how participants respond to and are affected by various situations. Two ways of

representing the patterns emerge from this analysis. First, the analyst may use the categories developed and articulated by the respondents themselves. Second, the analyst may induce categories or patterns for which the respondents did not have labels or terms (Patton, 1980; 1987). In either situation, the analyst uses content analysis to identify, define, describe, and label the patterns or themes (Patton, 1980; 1987).

Content analysis is the process of identifying and organizing the data into topics, themes, or patterns. Labeling the data and establishing a data index is the first step in content analysis (Patton, 1980; 1987). "The content of the data is being classified. A classification system is critical; without classification there is chaos" (Patton, 1980, p. 300). Organizing and simplifying this complex data into meaningful and manageable topics, themes, or patterns is the basic purpose of content analysis (Patton, 1987). Once the data are organized, it is possible to begin describing, elaborating, and working with the data to induce the major topics, patterns, or themes (Patton, 1980).

As the events, experiences, or activities are classified, they are also compared across the participants. Thus, the discovery of the relationships, assuming they exist, will begin with the content analysis. Then throughout the remainder of the analysis, the relationships and the themes that are induced will undergo continuous review and refinement (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

As the body of data expand and the coding and category identification continues, the researcher will use a process of constant comparison to check

and recheck the categories. The themes will be sorted into comparable categories. The categories will then be compared to determine their logical properties. As the categories become clearer, they will be defined and thematized into categories that are "internally homogeneous as possible and externally heterogeneous as possible" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 349).

Trustworthiness

If intellectural inquiry is to have an impact on human knowledge, either by adding to the overall body of knowledge or by solving a particular problem, it must guarantee some measure of trustworthiness about what it has inquired, must communicate in a manner that will enable applications by its intended audience, and must enable its audience to check on its findings and the inquiry process by which the findings were obtained (Erlandsen, Harris, Skipper, and Allen, 1993).

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the basic issue in relation to trustworthiness is simple: "How can an inquirer persuade his or her audiences that the findings are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of" (p. 290)? The central issue or question for any inquiry relates to the degree of confidence in the "truth" that the findings of a particular inquiry have for the subjects with which and the context within which the inquiry was carried out (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

Since establishing trustworthiness is a major concern in interpreting the constructed realities that exist in the context being studied, attention must be

directed to gaining a comprehensive intensive interpretation of these realities. The strategies that have been developed for accomplishing this are described by both Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Erlandsen, Harris, Skipper, and Allen (1993). The steps they define are: prolonged engagement; persistent observation; triangulation, referential materials, and member checks.

Another means of establishing trustworthiness is peer debriefing (braking interviews) (Erlandsen, Harris, Skipper, and Allen, 1993; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Peer debriefing is a process of exposing oneself to a disinterested peer in a manner paralleling an analytic session and for the purpose of exploring aspects of the inquiry that might otherwise remain implicit only within the inquirer's mind. Debriefing serves multiple purposes: First, the process helps keep the inquirer "honest," exposing him or her to searching questions. The inquirer's biases are probed, meaning explored, and basis for interpretations clarified. Second, the debriefing provides an initial and searching opportunity to test working hypotheses that may be emerging in the inquirer's mind. Third, the debriefing provides the opportunity to develop test the next steps in the emerging methodological design. Finally, debriefing sessions provide the inquirer an opportunity for catharsis, thereby clearing the mind of emotions and feelings that may be clouding good judgment or preventing emergence of sensible next steps (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

Walcott (1990) believes the qualitative researcher needs to begin writing the results immediately upon the collection of the data. Also it is important to

write vividly about the specifics of the research process and the data itself (LeCompte and Preissle, 1993; Walcott, 1990). This clarity gives life to the account and helps the portrayal of the research phenomenon resonate truth to the reader.

The ultimate value of this report, then, rests in the reader's assessment of three factors: first, the plausibility of the data collection methods; second, the appropriateness of the process of data analysis; and finally, the logic of the presentation.

C. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Identification and Selection of Participants

To not only identify the types of institutions but also the actual institution to be included in the study, the researcher consulted The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1987). The four categories of institutions that were selected to be used in this study were: a research university I; a doctoral-granting university II; a comprehensive college/university II; and a two-year community, junior, and technical college.

Once the institutional categories were selected, the next step was to limit the geographic area. The researcher defined an area within a 100-mile radius of his home as the area from which the institutions would be selected. Within this area were numerous institutions that meet the Carnegie classification criteria and the other criteria for inclusion. The criteria for inclusion were, in addition to being

within the geographic area and being in an appropriate Carnegie classification, an organizational structure that had either a vice president or vice chancellor of both student affairs and academic affairs; and that the incumbent in both positions had a minimum of two years experience in his/her current position.

Two years as the vice chancellor or vice president was selected because it was assumed that an individual with this minimum tenure would be considered to be successful and effective.

One of the original four institutions selected was excluded from the final sample because it did not meet all the criteria. After reviewing its catalogue, it was discovered that in its administrative hierarchy there was not a vice president or vice chancellor for student affairs. Its top student affairs position was the dean of student affairs. Thus, another institution that met the criteria was selected.

After the four institutions were selected, the names, titles, and addressees of the individuals to be invited to participate were secured by reviewing catalogues, internet sites, and making telephone calls to the institution.

The individuals were contacted by a letter (see Appendix A) describing the scope of the study and requesting their participation. Phone calls were then made to arrange a time when the interview would take place.

Data Collection

All the interviews were scheduled and took place at the participant's institution at their convenience. The interviews lasted no longer than one hour

and fifteen minutes. After being introduced to the interviewee, the researcher explained in detail the purpose and scope of the study and requested each individual to sign and return an informed consent form which included permission to audio-tape the interviews (see Appendix C). Prior to beginning the actual interview, the researcher and the interviewee completed a participant profile form (see Appendix B) which listed their educational background and prior work experience.

After the interviews were completed, the tapes were transcribed, reviewed, edited, and put in final form. The audio-tapes were secured in a locked cabinet in the researcher's office. In addition, to ensure confidentiality, neither the names nor the institutions of the interviewees were used. In the final report, the participants were identified by the type of institution and their position. For example, the vice chancellor for academic affairs at the research university I was identified as RAA; the vice president for student affairs in the two-year community, junior and technical college was JSA.

The specific questions that the interviewees were asked were drawn from the work of McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) in Lessons of Experience (see Appendix D).

Data Analysis

The data analysis began as the researcher reviewed his field notes, listened to the tapes, and read and edited the transcribed tapes. Once the

transcription was completed, the researcher read them multiple times and reviewed the data in them along with his field notes.

Next the researcher reviewed the data to discern whether relationships among the patterns and categories existed and could be identified and defined. This was a time consuming, yet fascinating process that required the transcripts to be read and reread numerous times until the themes were induced.

Since the data collected from the eight participants was voluminous, it was necessary for the researcher to categorize the data. This step was accomplished by writing the answers to each question on a table so that the responses could be viewed simultaneously. The data analysis entailed the process of bringing order, structure, and meaning to the mass of collected data. It was a search for general statements about the relationships among categories of data (Marshall and Rossman, 1993). While analyzing the data, the researcher began with specific observations - the responses to the questions - then allowed the categories of analysis to emerge from the data (Mertens, 1998). The purpose of this analysis was to understand the construction of the respondents in their own terms (Erlandsen, Harris, Skipper, and Allen, 1993), then identify, define, and thematize the findings.

Once this aspect of the data analysis was completed, the researcher then induced the developmental events and the specific lessons that these individuals learned on their journey. The events and lessons were identified through

content analysis. The content of the transcripts was thoroughly analyzed to discern the events and lessons.

Throughout the presentation of the data and the discussion and conclusions, the researcher used direct quotes extensively. "Direct quotations are a basic source of raw data in qualitative measurement, revealing the respondents' level of emotion, the way in which they have organized their world, their thoughts about what is happening [or happened], and their basic perceptions" (Patton, 1980, p. 28 [parenthesis mine]).

IV. PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on the responses the eight individuals shared with the researcher to identify and define the significant developmental events, experiences, and persons that had an impact on their growth as a leader. In addition, lessons of experience will be derived from their responses.

The questions they were asked were drawn from McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison's (1988) book The Lessons of Experience: How Successful Leaders Develop On the Job. The questions were divided into three major categories: Rites of Passage; Rising From the Ashes; and The Role of Others (see Appendix D).

The first section of this chapter provides a profile of the participants: their institutions, their education, and experience. The second section sorts the responses of the interviewees into four thematic groupings that highlight the events, experiences, and persons that impacted their development. The final section focuses on the key lessons that the participants identified in their interviews. The lessons discussed in Chapter IV are limited to the lessons the interviewees described and identified as lessons.

B. PARTICIPANT PROFILE

The participants interviewed for this study were employed as either the Chief Academic (CAAO) or Student Affairs (CSAO) Officer in one of the four

different types of institutions of higher education. The four types of institutions of higher education included in this study were: a research university I; a doctoral-granting college or university II; a comprehensive university and college; and a two-year community, junior, and technical college (Carnegie Report, 1987).

The Chief Academic Affairs Officers interviewed for this study maintained the responsibility for the academic integrity of the institution, including the development and maintenance of academic programs and policy. The position also has the responsibility to select and recommend the appointment of department heads, deans, and other academic administrators; for oversight of the division's budget; and provide guidance and direction to the academic community.

The Chief Student Affairs Officer carried the primary responsibility for the programs and activities designed to provide services for the students. The position has the day-to-day responsibility to ensure the students are provided with a safe and stimulating environment to support the institution's mission of education.

The eight individuals interviewed for this study were all male. Seven were Caucasian, and one was an African American. All four Chief Academic Affairs Officers had doctorates: three had Phd's, and one had an EdD. Two of the Chief Student Affairs Officers had doctorates (EdD): one had an Education Specialist degree, and one had a Masters of Science. The years in their current

positions ranged from a low of 2.5 years to a high of 18 years with an average of 8.8 years.

All eight participants have spent their professional lives in some form of an educational institution. Two began as high school teachers. An interesting coincidence relating to the two individuals who began in secondary education is that they both advanced to high school principals after only a few years in the classroom; both held the elected position of county schools superintendent; and finally, both are currently employed in a two-year community college. The other six individuals have spent their entire professional careers in institutions of higher education. Two of the six have been at their current institution since the beginning of their career.

Each participant worked his way up to his current position by holding a number of positions within either the academic or student affairs side of the academy. Each of the four Chief Academic Affairs Officers either began or spent a number of years as a faculty member before beginning his climb up the administrative ladder. After teaching for a number of years, the CAAOs assumed administrative positions. Once the administrative experience was acquired, the CAAO began the climb to the position he currently holds. The common thread in the development of these four individuals is that they all rose to their position from the ranks of the faculty. One other interesting point with regard to the CAAOs is three of the four began teaching at institutions other than the one where they currently are employed. The fourth individual spent his time

in higher education at his current institution - a two-year community college. All had considerable experience as both faculty members and administrators prior to being appointed to the top position.

Three of the four CSAOs spent their professional lives in four-year institutions in student affairs areas, or at least non-academic areas. The fourth began as a high school teacher, moved to a principal, then an elected superintendent before getting into higher education where he first worked as the Director of Continuing Education, then Director of Admissions and Records prior to getting into student affairs.

Two of the CSAOs "grew up" in student affairs. One began in housing administration where he spent ten years, before moving into a position as Dean of Student Affairs prior to assuming the vice presidency. He has been employed at five different institutions, including his current one. Each time he changed institutions, however, it was for a position of greater responsibility. The other CSAO's first assignment was in student activities as a graduate student - then after he graduated, he moved to his current institution in student activities where he remained working his way up to Dean of Student Activities prior to being appointed as Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs. From the Associate Vice Chancellor it was a natural progression into the chief student affairs position. This individual has spent his entire professional career (31 years) at his current institution. He has held the vice chancellorship for the past 15 years.

The fourth CSAO not only has spent his entire working life at his current institution but has also received three degrees from the institution - bachelor's, master's, and educational specialist. However, he took a slightly different path to his current position. After graduation from this institution he spent five years in academic support positions - an admissions counselor and the coordinator of the minority engineering program. His next move was to Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs; his most recent move was to the vice presidency.

Throughout the remainder of this report, the following will be used to identify the respondents to the questions:

	Academic Affairs	Student Affairs
Research University	RAA	RSA
Doctoral-Granting University	DAA	DSA
Comprehensive College	CAA	CSA
Community, Technical, or Junior College	JAA	JSA

C. DEVELOPMENTAL EVENTS

Successful leaders have worked through and learned from numerous developmental events in their careers. This study invited eight senior leaders in various institutions of higher education to share the developmental events identified as the events, experiences, and people that they encountered on their journey that had a significant impact on their development. These experiences, events, and persons have been identified as developmental events. Five

themes were induced from these developmental events: producing results during developmental challenges; taking risks; persisting through challenging situations; dealing with subordinates and constituents; and relating to good bosses/mentors and bad bosses.

Producing results during developmental challenges deals with the aspect of their makeup that helped them become what RAA described as "a go-to-guy." They were able to finish assignments and accomplish objectives even when they were not familiar with the task. The more they produced, the more opportunities they were afforded.

Taking risks was closely related to producing results during developmental challenges. These individuals did not shy away from challenges or taking risks; on the contrary, they sought out opportunities that were fraught with risk.

Persisting through challenging situations was also related to the other two. During their careers, these leaders were in situations where they believed they were right, even as others had a different opinion. As a result, they were in a precarious situation. However, they persisted, survived, and learned from the situation.

The fourth developmental event - dealing with subordinates and constituents - gets at the heart of leadership. Relating to good bosses/mentors and bad bosses was the fifth developmental event that was identified. This event deals with the relationships between the interviewee and his superior and

mentor and the impact that it had on his development. What follows is the understanding of each developmental event as it is described in greater detail.

Producing Results During Developmental Challenges

While it may seem like a cliche, the production of results was of paramount importance to these individuals during their developmental journey. Early on in their careers these individuals were given opportunities and developmental challenges and discovered that they could produce results. Then, as a result of producing results, they were given additional opportunities. RSA summarized succinctly how he was able to produce results. He said "...there wasn't anything I wouldn't do...I never ducked a fight." He learned to deal with these situations with "a business-like detachment." By this he meant he would analyze the situation and make a decision that was in the best interest of the institution.

Early on in his career at his current institution, RSA was instrumental in the investigation and resolution of a cheating and drug scandal among the fraternities.

> The frats were involved and they thought they ruled the roost. It was shortly after we [the institution] opened up fraternity park; there were 13 houses down there. Well, what happened was we had uncovered a major organized scandal. Some of the fraternities were stealing and duplicating exams and selling them to other students.

> I was involved with investigating the case. I pursued it, I identified the people who were involved, I recommended how to resolve it. And basically what happened [was that] the fraternity was dissolved and removed from campus. How they were doing it - they had an inside person in the department take the test; they would put it in the trash can; the custodian would dump it in the dumpster; the frat kids would be there; they would get it and copy it. It was really some operation they had there, but we discovered it and shut it down.

RSA was able to produce results in spite of the challenge he faced.

Often during their development, the participants were given difficult assignments and left to their own devices as how to accomplish the end result. At times they were unfamiliar with the assignment, met obstacles in the form of resistance from others, and at times were threatened. But through it all they persevered. DSA, early in his career, was also given a diffucult assignment dealing with Greek life on his campus. He was given the task of putting an end to the keg parties the fraternities and sororities on his campus held. His charge, in essence, was to modify the culture and traditions of these organizations. It was especially difficult because he was "not a frat man. I didn't know the traditions; I didn't know what was going on, but yet I had to tackle that and undertake it."

During this process that took a number of months, he would meet with the people involved and explained to them time and time again why it was necessary to remove the kegs. One day while he was answering the students' questions he began discussing the reasons why the kegs should be removed, and "When I finished, no one said anything, and I knew I had crossed over; that I had what it takes." After that the fraternities and sororities began a dialogue about issues relative to drinking and alcohol abuse with DSA. Buth the bottom line was the keg parties were ended, and all parties accepted the change and moved on.

JAA and JSA had similar challenging events that occurred to them during their early development that were challenging. Both described the time they were newly appointed principals and had the responsibility to have his school open and ready to go in the fall when the students started back. JAA said "...[in the] summer of 1974, before I moved in as principal, I was responsible for the upcoming year - assigning teachers and classes. It was difficult because I had not had experience in this, and I had to do it alone. But we were ready to go when school opened in the fall."

JSA had an experience similar to JAA. "The summer that I was appointed principal of the high school, for the fall term I had to deal with students, fill the class schedules, do a lot of things I had never had the experience [doing]...All I could go on was what I had seen; but I didn't know the inner workings." JSA got involved and had the school ready to go when the students reported.

Another developmental challenge for JSA occurred once the students returned to school. As principal, one of his responsibilities was to deal with discipline problems. As a teacher he dealt with his own students, "But then there were teachers who had to take them to the principal, and then all of the sudden [I am] that principal." He went on to say "I could handle my students myself, and I knew exactly how to deal with them. But then you become the principal and you inherit other problems." He developed an approach "that you go in very strict, very hard, and it is easier to lighten up than it is to tighten up."

Both JAA and JSA were able to produce results even though they were charged with doing a job they literally knew nothing about. But rather than bemoaning their fate, they rolled up their sleeves, did what needed to be done, and produced tangible results.

In his development as a leader, RAA pointed to two events that had a significant impact on him. After having been on the faculty for 10 years and achieving the rank of full professor, he was given an opportunity to work with the dean of his college. The dean (whom he didn't know) sought him out and asked him if he "...would be willing to come up for one year and help me [the dean]; I need a social scientist, but more than that I need someone who has quantitative budgeting skills...." RAA initially balked at the offer because it was "...so non-academic; it is so distasteful; it is going over to the other side." In the end, however, he accepted the appointment, and as it turned out, it was his first step in his development as a leader in higher education. The assignments that he

was given have built the foundation for his future advancement and included developing an improved budgeting process for the college, establishing a quantitative system of evaluating faculty, writing grants, and working with tenure and promotion issues. He also had the opportunity to get in on the ground floor of "computerization and really using data to make academic judgements."

Another developmental event that had a significant impact on RAA came after his assignment with the dean ended. He was preparing to return to his academic unit and set up a center for survey research. But before he began, he got a call from the chancellor who asked RAA to be his associate chancellor for "a year or two...no more than three." RAA agreed. He spent 13 months in the position that he described as his "golden internship." During his time working with the chancellor, RAA saw "how all the pieces came together internally and externally."

However, about six weeks into the job the chancellor called him in and explained in detail to him what his role was to be. RAA did what he thought the chancellor wanted, but hadn't clarified it with him. RAA went on to say "That ten minutes we spent together probably was the most constructive time I spent with anybody because it taught me what you have to do when you go into a role. You have to analyze the position and change it if you think need be, but understand what that role is."

These two events laid the foundation for RAA's journey to his current position. Not only did he learn that for the academy to operate effectively and

efficiently, it requires people other than faculty; but he also learned what it takes for leaders to succeed, how to get things done, and how to deal with others.

Producing results while dealing with developmental challenges occurred at a young age for CAA. While in high school and college, his family owned and operated a number of businesses, and as a result he was required to learn how to make decisions and get things done. "I was with my family's business during my high school and college years, and many times basically I made senior managerial decisions. Many times I was left in charge of the store or would make business trips for the store and purchase merchandise." He then went on to say "...at 18 years of age I was writing checks for $15-20 thousand dollars to buy a load of carpet, a load of glassware, or something...I would write the check and be back on the road." CAA learned that to succeed, he was required to do things he hadn't been prepared for; he learned to do what he had to do and what was necessary.

As an assistant dean of students early in his career, CSA was given an opportunity to work with his institution's senior leaders to solve a problem. The problem centered around students drinking alcohol in their dorms and the problems it caused, such as vandalism and incivility among the students. One other major contributing factor in this issue was that the "dean of students was an old coach and supported drinking; in fact, he thought it was a pretty good idea." As a result, CSA was selected to assist with changing the environment. The reason CSA was chosen to work on this problem was because the "dean of

students was seen as part of the problem, not the solution to the problem." CSA was impressed by what happened, how things got done, and the situation was handled. The most important lesson he learned from his involvement in this event "was that senior administrators don't want all the details; they want results. They want to know what the problem is, what you found, and what your recommendations are." CSA said he learned early on how to do that.

Sitting down with 12 faculty members shortly after having been named department head and discussing the departmental budget with them "produced chaos" for DAA. As a new department head, DAA wanted the faculty to trust him and know he was being open and upfront with them about the budget. However, the faculty "wondered what I was up to; it took about 18 months before the faculty believed I didn't have a hidden agenda, that I was just trying to be open with them and share all the information with them." He figured by doing this he would either produce chaos or generate respect. He said it "did, in fact, move the department forward." DAA experimented with a here-to-fore unknown method of dealing with the faculty with regards to the budget. The faculty accepted and appreciated DAA's openness and honesty; everyone had the same information regarding the budget that he had. His openness paid off.

All eight of these leaders were able to produce results while working through developmental challenges. They seized opportunities, completed assignments, attained objectives; in short they succeeded. In addition, they had what it took to get things done and how to get things done.

Taking Risks

Taking risks was closely related to producing results during developmental challenges. These individuals tackled difficult tasks that could have proven to be career-ending. They embraced change and the risk involved, thrived on change and disdained the mundaneness of day-to-day maintenance.

These leaders thrived on risk and challenges, not by taking risks for the sake of taking risks but rather taking risks as a route to improve the conditions at their institution. DAA summarized it best when he said "...I must also be an anchor and have to be sure that I anchor the change to the integrity and quality. Change must be for the best, not just for change sake. It has to be able to improve the university." When they began to discuss the risks they took and challenges they faced, to a man, they stopped talking, leaned back in their chair, thought a moment, then began to talk. They began talking in slow, measured tones, but the more they talked, the more animated and excited they got. They enjoyed talking about the risks, recounting the events, reliving the excitement. Even when they were discussing challenging events that they didn't win, it was apparent that accepting the risk and taking on the challenge was what was important. Don't misunderstand; at the time the event occurred, the outcome was critically important. However, as they recounted the events, in some instances, years later, the result seemed less important. Accepting challenges, taking risks, and rising to meet the challenges played a major role in the

progression and development of these individuals to the leadership positions they currently hold.

RSA said he thrived on challenges; he liked dealing with problems head-on and resolving them. "I guess, overall, I don't have a problem [in] making decisions. I am a very decisive person, and I don't mind taking risks. My associates say I go out looking for fights; however, that is not true. I don't go out looking for them, but on the other hand, I don't go out of my way to avoid them. I would rather be in the middle of the situation and dealing with it than on the outside looking in and questioning what is happening. I enjoy challenges and love to solve problems."

It was this attitude, this willingness to attack any situation and attempt to resolve problems that got RSA involved in the middle of an NCAA investigation. He said a number of years ago, the NCAA was investigating his institution to address a number of allegations of wrong-doing against its athletic department. But as RSA said "...anytime you deal with athletics, you are in a tough situation." He was asked by not only his chancellor, but also the president to chair the internal team. He thought it was "quite amazing [that he was asked] because typically that is chaired by an attorney." He accepted the assignment, accepted the challenge and began the investigation. The investigation took about 18 months, and during that time he "had the weight of the world on my shoulders." The potential consequences were very serious. The university could have been sanctioned, it could have cost a considerable amount of money and damaged

the university's reputation and prestige. Once the investigation was completed, RSA went before the NCAA to present the findings. As it turned out, the institution was exonerated, which, as RSA said, "was quite a relief." RSA, in this situation, accepted a risky, challenging assignment that had potentially dire consequences and was able to protect his institution.

Identifying expectations and explaining them to others was a major challenge DAA tackled early on as a department chair. He took a risk by attempting something that had previously not been attempted in his department. "I took the experiment to trust the faculty; I wanted the best, the most positive results; however, that was not always successful simply because they did not always know the expectations. So I began and sat down with each faculty member and set up objectives. We looked over their progress and how the department could help them and what they could do to help the department and then to perceive what was expected. I gave them honest information and analysis of their work. They began to trust me, and I began to trust them as the whole department moved ahead." He took a risk in trying to unify the department and get it to work together and by being honest and open with them; it worked. He said he has continued to use this approach throughout his career.

JSA and JAA both took a monumental risk when they ran for public office as school superintendents. Both were elected and both faced daunting tasks in attempting to consolidate schools. Even though JAA was unsuccessful in his plan to develop and promote the idea of a comprehensive high school, he did

"accomplish the closing and consolidation of three smaller schools which, in my mind, was good for the community and good for the school district." However, even though his consolidation plan was implemented and worked, he was not re-elected to a second term as superintendent.

JAA went on to say "...the most significant thing I have learned is to take chances, experiment, do what you want to do, make your own decisions...I also think people should be willing to take chances. Risk-taking is important. Trying and failing is better than not trying at all."

JSA also took on the task to convince the people in his district that something they didn't want was good for them. He had to convince them that it was better to locate the schools - consolidated schools - at the focal point of transportation, not the population. "We [the county] got into a major building program - a consolidation program, 26 schools in the city - and fighting for the location of those schools was a real nightmare. Nobody wanted to give up their school, and everybody had their own ideas where the consolidated school ought to be." The challenge he faced was to present his point and get the community to accept his solution, which they eventually did. The school is at the same location today. The challenge faced by both JAA and JSA was daunting; it was also their choice to pursue it. They could have taken the easy way out and gone along with the popular opinion, but they chose to fight for what they believed in. They believed their solution was in the best interest of all involved. As a result of

assuming that risk, both ended up with new jobs. JAA was defeated, and JSA resigned to go to work for his current institution.

Confronting a boss who was questioning his professionalism was a risk CSA took. He was in the process of leaving one institution to take on a job with more responsibility at another institution. His supervisor, however, "took offense when she found out I was leaving; she questioned my professionalism." When CSA was made aware of the situation he had a choice to make; he could ignore what she was saying and move on or risk confronting her about the allegations and possibly "burn a bridge." He ultimately decided to take the risky approach and confront the individual. It turned out he made the correct choice. "As it ended up, she was very frustrated; she had been looking for another job too and hadn't found one." What CSA took from this situation was that there are times one must be willing to take a risk and confront a situation head on, even if the possibility of damaging a relationship exists. Certain things cannot be ignored and must be addressed. And as CSA believed, one's professional reputation must be protected.

Hiring senior-level leaders presents a risk for RAA. RAA said he doesn't play fair, he takes chances, he bullies others to get what he wants. He does it to "hire good people that will help the university, that will maintain the integrity of this institution. I do the right things, not necessarily things right."

However, RAA believes this is a dangerous and risky tack to follow "because procedure and protocol are very important, and I have got to be careful

when I do that not to go too far." RAA risks violating norms, rules and regulations with every search, but he does so to advance and better his institution.

Another situation in which RAA took a calculated risk occurred at the time he was interviewed for this study. He did not go into the specifics of the situation, but he did say he was taking a risk by "delaying action to make the situation better until certain power brokers around this university leave because I know if I raise the issue it will be turned down." Thus, rather than deal with almost certain failure, he has chosen to risk procrastinating on dealing with it in hopes that by delaying, the chances for success will increase.

CAA said a leader must be willing to take a risk for something he believes in. It is risky to challenge your boss, but if you believe your boss is wrong and you are right, it is a risk worth taking. "I think these are times when you have to hold your ground, even if you don't get your way. You can still be able to have a voice in the decision." He goes on to say "I think there are times when you go to war on some decisions and you've got to be willing to say this is absolutely a bad decision and, at that point be willing to filibuster." The challenge for him then was to risk holding up a decision or a project and possibly incurring the wrath of others, including your boss, to ensure that the decisions were made for the good of the institution.

DSA took a risk by moving into his current position as vice president. He went from having the responsibility for four areas as an assistant vice president

to twelve. He wasn't sure he was ready to move into the position. The vice president who was leaving had been his buffer. "...it was like taking a shield away from me when he left..." He was risking failure by moving into the position because he thought he had "come too far too fast." He thought he needed more time as the assistant vice president; after all, he had only been in that position for four years. He didn't think he was ready; he was scared. He said his retiring boss sat him down and told him "Look, you are smart, you know what to do, and you can do it." Thus, despite his trepidations, DSA made the move, risky as it was, and has not only survived but thrived. He has been the vice president for more than seven years.

Throughout their development and even in current situations, these individuals were willing to accept opportunities that were risky. They believed to advance, to grow, to develop, they had to challenge themselves, to take on assignments that weren't neat and clean, that were messy. Even though at times these situations seemed insurmountable, the individuals had the constitution to face the risk head on and deal with it. It was this willingness, this lack of fear of risk, that has had a significant impact on getting them to where they were.

Persisting Through Challenging Situations

The developmental events related to persistence were also an important and key element in these leaders' journey to their current positions. It goes without saying that if they hadn't persevered through the threats, the battles -

both political and philosophical - and the difficult situations they faced, they wouldn't be where they were when they were interviewed. The challenging situations they faced and overcame ranged from having an office fire-bombed, to having his life threatened, to dealing with defeat in an election, to staring down the president of the institution and living to tell about it, and more importantly learning from the situation.

Persisting through having his office fire-bombed and his family threatened was one of the more challenging and scary situations that RSA has faced. He recounted the situation. "In the mid-70s when black activism was at its pitch, my office controlled the student activities fees. There was a group of black students, I believe they were anarchists, and I got into a power struggle - they wanted student fees to support their group; I refused to give them the money because I didn't think it was in the best interest of the university." Shortly after RSA told the group of his decision, his office was fire-bombed by two of the students. In addition to fire-bombing RSA's office, "they also threatened my life and the life of my family. So we had to make arrangements for our protection. We had police to protect us." RSA persevered and came out stronger in spite of what he described as a "very difficult time."

Another incident that was a challenge for RSA occurred when he was first named as vice chancellor at his current institution. RSA was in position to be promoted because he "happened to be in the right place at the right time." The vice chancellor he worked for died suddenly at a young age. As a result, RSA

was appointed as acting vice chancellor as well as being a candidate for the position. He said "It was a very difficult situation to be in, and it was not a very good situation." However, RSA wanted to be the vice chancellor and, "after I was named vice chancellor there were a number of people on campus that weren't too thrilled about it, to say the least. The chair for the commission for women resigned in protest since a man was selected and not a woman. Other people felt strongly that it should have gone to a woman."

This situation was difficult for RSA since many students, faculty and others opposed his appointment. He worked hard over the next few years to gain the trust and respect of the campus community. Whatever he did proved to be successful because he has been in his position for over 17 years.

JAA also survived a difficult situation and grew stronger because of it. During his term as a county schools superintendent he was "...working to develop and promote the idea of a comprehensive high school. [The school district] would be combining four smaller schools into two larger ones. On that project...all the signals I was getting were in favor of the consolidation." He spent considerable time working with the school board and community leaders to sell his idea. However, not only did the idea "fail to garner enough community support or the funding from the county," he was "sent back to higher education because I was not re-elected for a second four-year term as superintendent. I was defeated at the polls."

Another challenging situation that JAA faced also occurred during his tenure as superintendent. It occurred during his second year. Late one evening he received a phone call "that an 8th grader in the school district had committed suicide." In spite of the tragic situation, he immediately went to work to assemble an action team consisting of "guidance counselors, school counselors, schools psychologists, and professionals to help the students, faculty, staff and others in the school district, but primarily in that school, to deal with the trauma." Then another student committed suicide a short time later. Again, in spite of the pain, he "called the team into action and went to the high school to do the counseling."

Budget shortfalls at two different institutions were some of the more challenging situations RAA persisted through. At the time the first event occurred, RAA was the dean of arts and sciences. When it was apparent that a budget shortfall was imminent, RAA met with the people in his unit and worked out a consensus on how to deal with it. However, when he presented the plans to the provost, "the provost rejected them. He gave me a proposal to eliminate two departments in my college. I told the provost he could do it, but I wouldn't defend it and I wouldn't resign. And I didn't think it was a very good idea. I had a real problem on who I was going to be loyal to, so I bucked the provost. I stood up to him and told him that his plan would not work. Unfortunately it ruined his career; the campus supported me." Not only did RAA persist through this situation, but he also risked his own career as a leader. He decided it was important to stand up for what he believed was best for the institution.

Another challenging situation with budgets occurred at RAA's current institution a few years ago. His institution realized it was facing a multi-million dollar shortfall. RAA said he "was dumbfounded. The atmosphere was bad; it felt like the university was falling apart, and the tension was unbearable." RAA was stunned; he was numb; he didn't know what he was going to do. "I was wallowing in self pity. I was questioning myself; I was questioning whether I should leave."

Ultimately he didn't resign, but he did work through the situation, and as he said, "something good did come out of it." He got together with his deans and got them "moving in the right direction, and we helped the campus and the university. We operated as a team, not as 13 individuals. So I guess I would say in every bad situation there is some good. And out of the...shortfall, that was good. The deans were able to look at it and came up with one idea, what direction, and work at it." Thus, rather than wallowing in self-pity and quitting, RAA marshaled his resources and worked towards achieving a solution.

Normally, challenging your boss is not the most effective method to ensure your continued employment. However, DAA did it and survived. He "asked the president of [his] university if he was setting me up for failure." The president got his staff together to deal with the concerns DAA raised. DAA said, "I was not sure, however, I would survive once I got the issue going." The group got the issue resolved, and DAA survived, but he "learned not to do that again."

In the future, if this situation occurs again, DAA said he will deal with it differently, take a more low-key, less confrontational approach.

The first time DSA suspended a student, he was frightened because the student threatened him. He dealt with the situation the way he thought was the best way, and even though he was scared, he persisted with his course of action because he believed he was right. "This student - I'm fairly big guy, and this student was bigger than I was - had a big red ponytail and was up on drug charges [in the institution's location]. I had to tell him he was suspended; it was just one of those things that you have to do, and it shocked me by saying what he said. He talked in terms as if he could really make something happen to me. That was one of those things you would never tell your wife. I never said anything about it; I just didn't sleep for a week. You actually look around when you are out."

Realizing that good, honest people can have differing opinions about how to handle a potentially explosive situation created a challenge for CSA. He expressed his view on how the situation could be resolved, but the others had a different solution that he didn't agree with. He had to make a difficult choice, either support the solution or find other employment. He ultimately got on board with the proposed solution, but it was a difficult choice. The situation concerned students stealing and using a phone card to charge thousands of dollars of phone calls to his institution. "...a number of students had gotten hold of a telephone card and made thousands of dollars worth of phone calls and charged

them to the university. Well, I had done the investigation; I found out who made the calls...and I had determined what the punishment should be. I made the recommendation to the president and his staff; however, the president and his staff decided they would not deal with it. The best way to do it was to sweep it under the rug - the reason being that a number of students that were involved were politically well-connected within the hierarchy of the university and the trustees of that organization." Even though he was uncomfortable with the solution, he accepted it. He was "told this is the way it is going to be and to get on board with it." He decided to get on board rather than leave.

CSA learned that "even though you believe in something and know you are in the right, you made a recommendation that you believe is true, fair, and accurate, it is not always going to be accepted." The most difficult part of this situation was "explain[ing] to my staff how we can get beyond this."

Leaving one job to take another and discovering the situation he moved into was not what he had anticipated created a challenging situation for JSA. "...I resigned as superintendent to come to [my current institution]...I was here probably six months until I began to question if I had made the right choice. The more I got into that relationship, the more I realized I probably didn't make the right choice...I wanted to be in a community college, but the leader [president] wasn't very good, and then it was a pretty dark situation until I finally began to open up to my peers..." The president of the institution stayed three years. JSA also was persistent and stayed, but he also had a group of peers who knew and

understood his frustrations and who would listen to his concerns, which made things more tolerable for him. He believed in what he was doing and knew the end result would be a good product, so he "played along and didn't stand up; I just accepted what was going on...I knew we were on a collision course, no question about it. And when the community got involved, we had to take a stand. It is not easy to take a stand against your boss, in any circumstances." Eventually, the president left and the president they hired is the current president, so things worked out for the best. But JSA said "...they were very dark hours. Of course [the current president] came in and almost turned it around overnight." Through his belief in himself, the institution, and others he persisted through the bad times, and as a result has been around over 30 years - long enough to see his hard work and dedication come to fruition and continue to grow and improve.

CAA said his lowest point was when others on his campus mounted a campaign "against my personnel decisions I was required to make and [to] live through the hate mail and phone calls to trustees and alumni and faculty." He made it through because he knew he made the right decision, and eventually others saw that as well.

The point to these situations was that these leaders persisted through the challenging situations and fought for what they believed in. Even though they didn't always win, they did survive and did learn from the situations. They were stronger individuals for having taken on a battle for something they believed in,

but were not sure they could or would win. They also realized that, given the jobs they had, that there would be times others would take umbrage at a decision and attack them or they would be put in a difficult situation. When this occurred, they trusted their instincts, did what they thought was best, worked hard to overcome the problems and resolve the situation, then analyzed what happened in an effort to avoid a similar problem in the future.

Dealing With Subordinates and Constituents

Another theme that emerged from the developmental events involved dealing with subordinates and constituents. It goes without saying that to be a leader, one must have followers. The eight participants in this study knew and understood the importance of this fact. They worked hard at building and maintaining relationships with their various constituencies. The constituencies they dealt with consisted of their bosses, their subordinates, students, parents, alumni, and their peers. The success that has been achieved by these individuals with regards to dealing with others can be summarized by three statements: first, a leader must be honest with those he or she deals with; second, a leader must be fair and consistent with those he or she deals with; and third, a leader must be trusting and trustworthy.

A leader who exhibits the qualities of honesty, fairness, and consistency will engender trust in others. Even though all eight expressed an individual method of dealing with others, they were effectively able to accomplish this challenge. JSA had a simple philosophy he followed when dealing with others:

"I have learned to be honest, fair, and straightforward. That is my whole outlook on life. If you don't want to hear an answer as I see it, don't ask me the question. And I don't believe in buttering people up - if a person does a good job, you compliment; they do a lousy job, you tell them. But be honest and consistent." He then went on to say "I guess there is nothing worse than being inconsistent - you don't know from one thing to the next how they are going to be...If you came in as a member of my staff and another member came in with the same question, I would give the same response."

DAA also believed that honesty was a key element in dealing with others successfully. He was taught the value and importance of honesty early on. "As I was growing up, my family stressed integrity - that your word is your contract. Honesty and integrity are paramount." He believed a leader must tell others the truth, not what they want or are expecting to hear. Telling the truth is often difficult, but it is imperative if the leader is to be trusted and respected. DSA implicitly agreed with DAA when he discussed the importance of delivering a message. He has worked hard on delivering messages, even negative messages, in a way that is straightforward, to the point, yet not mean-spirited, deflating or damaging to the receiver.

JAA espoused yet another mode of dealing with others fairly. "[I tell] young managers to deal with others with a fairness, firmness, and friendliness and that they need to operate in a servant/leadership mode. People don't work

for you, they work with you. Finally, I tell them don't ask others to do things you wouldn't do."

In their dealings with others, both RSA and RAA stressed trust as a key element of success. A leader must earn the employee's trust, just as the employee must earn the leader's trust. For RSA, trust was the number one ingredient. "I guess though you have to take time with people. You have to earn your place with them...you have to earn their trust, and they have to earn my trust. I have to trust myself to deal with these employees, and they have to trust me. But they have to earn my unconditional trust by showing they can be trusted, and the same thing is true of me; I must earn their unconditional trust."

RAA's method of dealing with others also revolved around establishing a bond of mutual trust between the leader and followers. But in a slightly different twist, he discussed how delegation and trust go hand-in-hand. "...delegation is critical. You must learn how to delegate to be successful. And you have to realize once you delegate that just because someone doesn't do it as you would have done it, it doesn't mean it hasn't been done right. It might be done better, but it has been done differently. So you have to look at the end result, not how it was done...you have to trust people. You have to be able to trust them and then you have to earn their trust." Both RAA and RSA believed it takes time to build and nurture a trusting relationship; it also takes hard work, but the results are worth the effort. They, along with JAA, believed that a leader can't do everything by him or herself; he or she must depend upon others. And when the leader

makes an assignment or delegates a responsibility, he or she trusts the employee will accept the challenge and complete the assignment correctly and expeditiously. But before the employee does the assignment, he or she must trust in the leader and what the leader has told him or her to do.

"Treat others as you want to be treated" and "...be careful about judging too quickly. Do not grow tired of forgiving," were tenets that CAA believed were important when dealing with others. CSA placed others' wants and needs before his own. "You have to learn what you can do for others - you have to serve others, not yourself. We are not here to do it for ourselves but to help others...It is important to work with and help others. Now, obviously, if you gained in that, that is fine, but you can't be self-centered." Each of the executives interviewed believed that to deal with others successfully it was necessary to understand their concerns and needs and address them; and to address them required the leader to be honest, firm, consistent, and trusting.

Relating to Good Bosses/Mentors and Bad Bosses

All the participants had dealings and a relationship with another individual during their development that played a significant role in their growth. In some instances, a boss served as the mentor, taking the individual in and helping him learn and understand the operations. In other situations the mentor was an outsider, a faculty member they worked with and respected or another employee in their institution, but not in their direct supervision. Whatever the situation was, these individuals provided invaluable assistance to the interviewees.

DAA identified his first chancellor at the first university he worked for as the person who had a major impact on him. DAA said "We did not always agree, but I got along with him very well, and I learned insight, how to find hidden agenda; I learned how to discern them." DAA also said their styles differed, but he realized differing situations call for differing responses. "He was blunt, and I was not confrontational, but I learned from him that sometimes you must be confrontational if you are the leader of the university. I learned how to view the inside of the situation; that was phenomenal and understand how to do it...This individual also made me realize that administration is much more difficult than I thought."

The dean of arts and sciences and the chancellor in [his institution] played a major role in RAA's development. "They formed me into what I am today." The dean sought RAA out and asked him to work with him for a few years; RAA agreed. And because of that initial opportunity, he has progressed to where he is today. From the dean, RAA said he "learned the academic parts of the university I didn't know...how to evaluate faculty, how to build a great university, and what is a university, being analytic and trying to make tough judgments with consistency and fairness." He also learned how important style was when dealing with others. His dean "could 'piss' people off faster than anybody I've ever met." It ultimately lead to the dean's downfall and by the time the dean left, "no one had a good word to say about him or his style; they respected him, but he couldn't lead them anywhere..."

The other individual who had a major impact on RAA was his chancellor. He worked for the man for 13 months in what RAA described as his "golden internship." As a result of working with the chancellor and his relationship with him, RAA "...was able to understand, now at a different level, how all the pieces came together internally and externally and what the role of a chancellor was at a major university." RAA also learned "...what you have to do when you go into a role. You have to analyze the position and change it if you think need be, but understand what your role is."

The chancellor at his institution was also instrumental in RSA's development. "The most influential [person] I directly learned from [was the individual] who was the chancellor at the time [and] for many years when I was here. It had to do with relationship. Before, during, and since, our relationship has been informal as much as formal. We are friends; we trust each other." During their years working together, the chancellor got RSA involved in many situations facing the campus; he gave RSA opportunities to study issues and make recommendations and acted on his recommendations. But maybe most importantly, RSA identified two things his chancellor did that had a bigger impact than the others. "He [the chancellor] listened. It was very valuable to me to be on the inside, to understand, and learn how he looked at things. I can't quantify how valuable that was, but it made me a much better manager."

While DSA's mentor was an associate vice president for academic affairs at his institution, his insight and guidance was valuable to DSA because he

learned "...a lot about dealing with people in the academic arena." He also worked with DSA to deliver messages, especially negative ones "in a way that you are almost still smiling, but you say what has to be said. And any offense taken is minimal..." He also taught him that to get a job done, a leader doesn't "have to be a stern taskmaster or hit people over the head."

The vice president who preceded DSA also shared with him some methods to help him become successful. He taught DSA the value of sitting down with others and talking and listening to them to ascertain what they were thinking and why they did what they did. He learned the importance of open and frank two-way communication.

The other four interviewees identified faculty members as the person who taught them the most during his career. JAA said the person he valued, and still does value, "was my high school principal when I was a student." Once JAA began teaching, and even up to today, he calls upon him for advice and counsel. JAA said he learned "just by watching him and being associated with him." The most important lesson JAA learned was to "treat everyone in a fair, firm, and friendly manner."

CSA couldn't identify "any one person who served as a mentor," but said the person closest to him "is my major professor," who has "provided guidance and assistance." JSA, too, said he "...didn't necessarily have a mentor in my profession; [but] without a doubt, the person I had the most respect for and probably did the most for me was my major professor. Not only was he my

professor, but he was a friend." JSA said this individual was always there for him when he needed assistance or advice, or just a friend to listen to him. JSA could call on him in any situation. "He would listen, give advice, and he realized my potential at the university and promoted that aspect of it just through conversation or something like that - as you say, 'plant the seed'."

For CAA his major professor was his role model. CAA appreciated his style, his demeanor, his way of accomplishing things, and he tries to follow his lead. "My major professor at [his university] made an incredible impression; he was a gentlemen. He carried himself with such dignity, such professionalism, and yet will call a spade a spade. He is so committed to doing it well; extremely well polished."

From the mentors and/or good bosses, these individuals learned how to do things, how not to do things, and were given opportunities to learn and make mistakes without the fear of failure. They were held accountable for what they did but did so under the guidance of another who would either keep them from failing or pick them up and dust them off when they made a mistake.

Normally individuals can identify two types of bosses - good ones and bad ones - ones they emulate and ones they cannot stand. With regard to working for someone they couldn't stand, six of the eight participants said they had never been in that situation, but if they had or it would occur, they would move on and find another job. JAA said "To be honest with you, I have never been in that situation." RAA said "I have never worked for someone I couldn't tolerate, and if

I did, I would not stay in the situation." DAA echoed RAA's sentiments: "I never had a person I worked for that I simply couldn't tolerate; if I had one, I would have to move on." CSA has not been in that situation up to this point. "I can't say that I have ever had a person that I couldn't tolerate. I don't think I could stay in that situation. If it ever occurred, I would probably have to leave." RSA's statements were similar to the others: "I have never had a situation where I've worked for someone I couldn't stand. I could not do that; if I couldn't work for or respect the individual, I would have to leave." DSA simply said "Actually, I have not."

The other two respondents - JSA and CAA - have worked for someone they couldn't stand. JSA said it was the president of his institution when he first began to work there. "Well, I couldn't say I couldn't tolerate the president; frankly, I liked him as a person. I just thought his tactics were not what we needed at this time." However, he did say he learned a valuable lesson as a result of this situation. He learned "what not to do." He also learned "how to be more positive, drawing from the negatives you found in this individual, take the negatives and go to a more positive route."

CAA also found himself in a situation where he and his boss didn't get along. "At [his institution] I held a 70 percent administrative and 30 percent teaching job. The academic dean and I didn't get along...[we] just didn't see eye-to-eye. He thought I was too pushy, and I was." CAA said the dean did not try to work with him to resolve the situation, and since "it created a distance in

the organizational situation, I wound up taking a job at another school, so it all worked out in the long run. But it was a great learning experience." Thus, both individuals who were in the situation said it proved to be valuable for them.

The lesson that was learned not only by the two who had experiences with a bad boss, but also alluded to by the others, was that when a situation is untenable, take action to resolve it. Another lesson was that problems do not solve themselves; some action must be taken to resolve them.

Through the interviews with the eight executives and the analysis of their responses, five key developmental themes emerged: producing results during developmental challenges; taking risks; persisting through challenging situations; dealing with subordinates and constituents; and relating to good bosses/mentors and bad bosses. From these developmental events, lessons were learned. They were learned by doing, by trial and error, by failure and success. As a result, these lessons were the lessons of experience.

E. LESSONS OF EXPERIENCE

Through the growth years, through the trials and tribulations, and through the good times and bad, the good bosses and bad, the individuals interviewed for this study learned a number of lessons. The lessons they learned served them well, and as a result of learning the lessons they were able to survive and succeed. The lessons they learned were learned the hard way - they were learned by doing. They learned by making mistakes, then analyzing what went

wrong and why; they learned by accepting challenges even though they were unfamiliar with the topic; they learned to make decisions by making decisions; they learned how to accomplish goals by watching and working with others; and maybe most importantly, they learned what not to do by watching others.

The lessons that were learned have been identified, synthesized, and listed in Figure 1. As can be seen by reviewing the table, 35 lessons were learned. The lessons learned covered a wide range of situations from basic skills a leader must know in dealing with others to how to deal with difficult situations. In reviewing and analyzing the lessons, they were put into five thematic areas, as shown in Figure 2. The lessons that were put in each of the areas were related to that theme and that theme only.

Knowledge of Leadership Fundamentals

Knowledge of Leadership Fundamentals dealt with the realization that success was possible and what it took to succeed. These lessons were learned early in the executives' careers. In fact, in some instances these lessons were learned prior to their first leadership role. It was important for these lessons to be learned and assimilated before the individuals could succeed as leaders. For example, one lesson they had to learn was to seek out and accept opportunities and challenges.

Throughout his career, RSA willingly accepted every challenge that was presented to him. "There wasn't anything that I wouldn't do...When I was at [his university] I never ducked a fight." By taking risks and accepting challenges,

1. Administrative work is challenging.
2. Hard work pays off.
3. Understand your role.
4. Seek and accept new opportunities and challenges.
5. Learn to collect, check, and present data.
6. Consensus-building is important.
7. Mistakes will be made; learn from them.
8. Failures will occur.
9. Success is achieved through working with others.
10. Change is a constant.
11. Know when a battle is lost.
12. Problems do not solve themselves.
13. Politics is a given.
14. Treat others with respect, fairness, and consistency.
15. Learn when to take a break and unwind.
16. Identify good people and develop them.
17. Learn to delegate responsibility.
18. Respect must be earned daily.
19. Learn your operation.
20. Get to know your employees.
21. Two-way communication is necessary.
22. Learn to communicate with multiple constituencies
23. Accept and embrace diversity.
24. Learn patience, but be persistent.
25. Do not take criticism personally.
26. Learn to function with business-like detachment.
27. Trust must be given before it is received.
28. If a recommendation is not accepted, forget about it and move on
29. Decision-making is difficult.
30. Maintenance of the institution's integrity is paramount.
31. If a situation is untenable, take action.
32. Mentors are helpful.
33. Become a "go-to" individual.
34. Priorities shift.
35. Employees don't work for you; they work with you.

Figure 1
Lessons of Experience

KNOWLEDGE OF LEADERSHIP FUNDAMENTALS

1. Administrative work is challenging
2. Hard work pays off
4. Seek and accept new opportunities and challenges
7. Mistakes will be made; learn from them
8. Failures will occur
10. Change is a constant
12. Problems do not solve themselves
13. Politics is a given

KNOWLEDGE OF OTHERS

6. Consensus-building is important
9. Success is achieved through working with others
14. Treat others with respect, fairness, and consistency
16. Identify good people and develop them
18. Respect must be earned daily
20. Get to know your employees
22. Learn to communicate with multiple constituencies
23. Accept and embrace diversity
27. Trust must be given before it is received
35. Employees don't work for you; they work with you

Figure 2

Lessons Categorized by Thematic Area

KNOWLEDGE OF ROLE

3. Understand your role
5. Learn to collect, check, and present data
17. Learn to delegate responsibility
21. Two-way communication is necessary
24. Learn patience, but be persistent
26. Learn to function with business-like detachment
31. If a situation is untenable, take action

KNOWLEDGE OF SELF

15. Learn when to take a break and unwind
25. Do not take criticism personally
32. Mentors are helpful
34. Balance education and experience

KNOWLEDGE OF LEADERSHIP

11. Know when a battle is lost
19. Learn your operation
28. If a recommendation is not accepted, forget about it and move on
29. Decision-making is difficult
30. Maintenance of the institution's integrity is paramount
33. Become a "go-to" individual
34. Priorities shift

Figure 2 (continued)

they were noticed by others and were given additional opportunities In short, opportunities begot opportunities. Two other lessons in this theme that were necessary to master were: mistakes will be made; learn from them; and problems do not solve themselves.

It was inevitable that these individuals would make mistakes; in fact, it was expected that they would. However, the value from making mistakes comes, not from the mistake itself, but by analyzing the circumstances of the situation, identifying what went wrong and why, and learning from what happened to ensure the same mistake isn't repeated. The other key lesson was that problems don't solve themselves. In fact, the opposite usually happens. If a problem wasn't dealt with and was allowed to fester, it grew into a situation that was worse than it was when it began. JAA learned this lesson the hard way. Even though he was told by a number of associates that there was a problem with one of his subordinates, he chose not to act to resolve the problem, and it got worse. "...a number of my friends and advisors had been telling me that I had a problem with this individual...However, I chose not to act on this situation, and the situation got worse." Eventually, he faced this problem head on and resolved it; but as a result of his failure to address it early on, he learned "...things do not cure themselves; they only get worse."

Thus, the lessons learned in Knowledge of Basics must be learned by the individual, by himself, either by his action or inaction.

Knowledge of Others

The second thematic area that the lessons belonged to was Knowledge of Others. Leadership by definition is the art or act of accomplishing goals by working with or through others. It is also clear that a leader needs someone to lead. Thus the lessons under this theme deal with getting other employees involved, how to deal with and treat others, and how to communicate with them. Of the lessons that were identified, the lessons in this theme might be the most important to learn and master for a successful leader.

The lessons they learned in this area were different from those in Knowledge of Leadership Fundamentals in that they could be learned from others or from watching how other leaders interact with their subordinates, superiors, and constituencies. They learned by watching successful as well as unsuccessful leaders, then taking those ideas and developing them for themselves. They learned how to relate to others and how the relationship between supervisor and subordinate should operate. JAA described it as a "servant-leader" mode. He believed that "people don't work for you; they work with you." JSA echoed his compatriot's sentiments. He stated one tenant he always followed was that "nobody works for me; they work with me; we work together as a team."

The remainder of the lessons in Knowledge of Others flow from the statements expressed by JSA and JAA. If, in fact, employees are treated as an important and in integral part of the operation, the other lessons will fall into

place. For example, the issue of trust is of utmost importance, and it must first come from the supervisor. If the supervisor does not trust an employee, then the employee will not trust the supervisor. RSA summarized it best when he said, "You have to earn [the employees] trust, and they have to trust me, but they must earn my unconditional trust by showing them they can be trusted. And the same thing is true of me; I must earn their unconditional trust."

Trust is the foundation. If there is no trust it will be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve consensus, to develop employees, to earn and maintain their respect, to know those that work with you and to communicate effectively. Thus, operating in the "servant/leader" mode and establishing a mutual bond of trust are keys to successfully working and leading others.

Knowledge of Role

The third theme that emerged from the results has been labeled Knowledge of Role. This theme relates to the knowledge necessary to be in a position to be given the opportunities to advance and succeed. The one lesson in this group that is pivotal is for an individual, whether he/she is a leader or not, to understand his/her role. The reason this is so important is that if an employee doesn't understand what it is he/she is expected to do or what his/her supervisor wants, it will be difficult to succeed. RAA said he took on a job once to work for a CEO as his executive assistant. RAA initially thought the job meant one thing, while the CEO had something else in mind. Eventually the CEO sat RAA down and explained to him just what he wanted RAA to do. RAA said "That 10

minutes we spent together probably was the most constructive time I spent with anybody because it taught me what you have to do when you go into a role is you have to analyze the position and change it if you think need be, but [you must] understand what that role is." In conjunction with knowing and understanding your role is the necessity for two-way communication. As RAA discovered, it is not only important for the supervisor to communicate with the employees, but it is also required that the employee communicate with the supervisor and for the supervisor to listen and respond.

Also, a rising young leader must know how to collect, check, and present data. Senior administrators are typically busy individuals who either don't have the time or won't take the time to listen to long rambling presentations or solutions to problems they have asked someone to investigate. They want short, concise, parsimonious reports - tell me what you looked for, what you found, and what should be done next. Early in his career, CSA was given an opportunity to work on a problem at his institution with senior administrators. After the problem was resolved, he looked back on what happened and how and "...discovered that senior administrators don't want all the details; they want results. They want to know what the problem is, what you found, and what your recommendations are."

Learning to confront situations that are untenable is also a lesson that is difficult to master. Dealing with these situations may also be unhealthy for one's administrative career because not only is the leader pushing and addressing a

problem, he/she may also be in the middle of a difficult situation that he/she may not survive. But regardless of the outcome, every respondent said he would deal with the situation because he could not tolerate the uncertainty. DAA found himself in a situation he could not tolerate and confronted the president of his institution with his concern. "...the president got everyone together - his staff - to deal with the situation. I was not sure, however, I would survive once I got the issue going. We did get the issue resolved, but the president got his point across..." DAA said he "did make his points, but I did not get what I was looking for." Even though he survived, he "learned not to do that again." But he also realized he made the right choice by confronting the issue; he just did not use the most appropriate means.

CSA also "was prepared to burn a bridge," to deal with a situation he could not tolerate. He decided to confront his supervisor over some derogatory statements she made about him. "When I confronted her about it, we worked it out, and it turned out okay. I think what I learned from this is that there are certain times when you have to deal with the situation; you must be willing to burn that bridge, if necessary." However, it is important for the leader to know when to use a different strategy. The big problem with this strategy is that when it is used, it may be perceived as a win-lose situation by the person being confronted. So, the leader must be willing to lose the point prior to taking this stand.

RSA also found that operating with a "business-like detachment" was a skill that was necessary to develop. This skill was required because there were situations where the decision may have had a negative impact on an employee or a group of employees, but in the long run was best for the institution. This was a difficult lesson to master, but an important one to assimilate. Another lesson in this section is learning to delegate responsibility. To assist in an individual's development, he/she must be given opportunities and responsibilities. If a supervisor only delegates tasks or activities or onerous jobs, an employee will have a difficult time learning how to accept and deal with responsibility. JAA summarized this point when he said, in regards to delegation to subordinates, "...don't ask others to do things that you wouldn't do."

The final lesson deals with persistence and patience. Persistence and patience are two important attributes that leaders must have to be successful. There will be times in the course of the leader's career where he or she will try to get an idea or concept accepted by others, but they won't support it. If he or she believes in the topic, he or she should continue to pursue the matter, even if it takes weeks or months. JSA espoused this point of view when discussing getting things accomplished. When asked if he was ever in a situation where he had everything ready to go, then had the "rug pulled out from under you," he said that "...when you are an administrator at this level, you have that often. And then you have to regroup and go back. You eventually get it, but you may have to regroup and go back. You eventually get it, but you may not get something

worked out on the first try." He went on to say "A good administrator, in my opinion, persistently tries, regroups, goes at it from a different angle, and eventually gets it."

Knowledge of Self

The next theme that was induced from the data has been labeled as Knowledge of Self. The lessons identified in this theme deal with issues of the individual, knowing oneself and how to respond to or deflect personal attacks.

One lesson every leader must learn and continue to remember is to avoid taking criticism personally. Even if it is meant as a personal attack, the leader must deflect the criticism. If he/she takes every negative thing said or written about him/her personally, he/she would not survive as a leader. Leaders must remember that they are seen as the embodiment of the organization, and as such, foes will attack the leader rather than the impersonal entity. To deflect the criticism, the leader must have, as CAA defines it, "...some sense of self-confidence...[a type of] arrogance...one of my former president's used the word grit; and you better have some grit." He went on to say "There is a certain amount of criticism you have to let roll off your back." This is a difficult lesson to learn, but one that is necessary to master.

Other lessons that are of a personal nature that fit under this theme include knowing when to take a break from the pressures of the job and unwind. CAA says that since administrators don't control their time and things can build up, it is necessary to know when to say "look, I've just about had it, and I'm going

to take a couple of extra days off just to get away from it." DAA says that when he gets to that point, he "take[s] a vacation so I can relax and rejuvenate myself." In other words, know when things are piling up; get away, clear the mind, relax; then when you return to work, you are ready to go.

Another lesson that emerged was that mentors were helpful, if not necessary. Mentors can help the young leader learn how things get done, how to find hidden agendas, who to visit to get things done, who the power-brokers in the institution are, and how to approach them. Mentors can teach the rising leader how to deal with administrators from the other side of the house. DSA said his mentor "taught me a lot about dealing with people in the academic arena...[how] to get your message across, even it it's a negative message - one that will probably tread on one's toes - how to do these things in a way that you are almost still smiling, but you say what has to be said." Mentors may also help the young leader avoid pitfalls that may disrupt or derail his/her career before it gets started.

Knowledge of Leadership

The final theme that was induced has been identified as Knowledge of Leadership. The lessons in this theme are focused on the skills and knowledge that are necessary to master while traversing the minefield of getting the job done while dealing with the internal strife of the institution; in short, the lessons touch on the skills a leader must learn, understand, and apply.

Two of the most important lessons that must be learned in this group are that the maintenance of institutions' integrity is paramount and that priorities shift. In fact, these two lessons are inter-related. Decisions affecting integrity may have an impact on priorities. Two other lessons in this group that are related, not only to each other, but also to the two mentioned above. The two are: knowing when the battle is lost and realizing that if a recommendation isn't accepted, move on.

With regard to the integrity of the institution, differing groups or individuals may have the same goal at heart, but a different route to get there. An example of this is illustrated by a situation CSA was involved in. He was charged with investigating a phone fraud that occurred on his campus. He did a thorough investigation, identified those involved, and made a recommendation as to how to proceed. Unfortunately, from his point of view, his recommendations were ignored, and it was decided to "sweep it under the rug." His method to maintain the school's integrity was to deal with the situation out in the open. The president and trustees decided to ask those involved to pay the money back and drop the incident. Two different solutions with the same end, but different routes to attain that end. CSA "did learn a lesson from this [incident], even though you believe in something and you know you are in the right, you made a recommendation that you believe is true, fair, and accurate, it not always is going to be accepted. You have to learn to live with the situation. I was told this is the way it is going to be and to get on board with it. So I had to make a choice to

either get on board or get out." CSA said as a result of this situation he realized: when the battle is lost; good recommendations are sometimes ignored; and well-intentioned people can aspire to the same end, with different routes to get there.

Priorities also shift, are changed, and are sometimes based on something other than justice. DAA said one of the hardest lessons he had to learn was that "decisions are not always based on justice but based on priorities. The priorities are what are important to the organization - not to the individual needs. It is important for ...young managers to learn and understand what the priorities are; they must accept the priorities."

These eight individuals identified lessons they learned from the developmental journey they took to attain their current positions. In their development, similar lessons from varying situations and different lessons from similar situations were learned. The lessons that were identified were placed into one of five thematic areas that were induced by analyzing the responses and the lessons identified.

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter will present a discussion of the findings drawn from the data collected in the eight interviews that were conducted. The main focus of this discussion is to examine how these findings relate to and/or extend the work of McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison presented in The Lessons of Experience (1988). The thesis of their book was that during a manager's (leader's) growth period, his or her development depended not just on raw talent but also on the experiences he or she had and what he or she did with them. They believed some experiences simply packed more developmental wallop than others. The current study used a methodology similar to McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison but looked at the Chief Student Affairs and Chief Academic Affairs Officers at four different types of institutions of higher education. The purpose of this study was to identify the people, experiences, and events that had a significant impact in the development of the leaders. The methods used and recommendations for future research are presented and discussed. Finally, the chapter finishes with concluding remarks.

B. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The study discussed in this report asked eight senior administrative officers in higher education about the developmental events that played a significant role in their development. The data was gathered via face-to-face

interviews using a semi-structured interview guide. The researcher asked each interviewee the same basic questions in three broad categories - The Rites of Passage, Rising From the Ashes, and The Role of Others (see Appendix D). From the data, developmental events and the lessons from experience were induced and identified, then the lessons were separated into five thematic areas.

Individuals, when moved into various situations, have with them some pre-disposing factors that are primarily genetic, or at least developed so early in life that they cannot be changed much in later life (McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988). Thus, because the world of human experience is ambiguous, an individual's frame of reference will be different, which shapes how they define and react to situations. Their world view was formed through their heritage, early experiences, formal training, and experience on the job. The mix of these influences varies from person to person and sector to sector, but learning from experiences often plays a more powerful role than formal education (Bolman and Deal, 1990; 1997).

The eight senior administrative officers were neither the chief academic affairs or chief student affairs officer when they were appointed to their current position. They all, literally, worked their way to the position they held when they were interviewed. But prior to discussing the findings, it is important to note that there were two different career paths the respondents took to get where they were. With the exception of JSA and JAA who began as high school teachers, then principals, and superintendents of schools before moving into higher

education, the others have spent virtually their entire career in higher education. The CSAOs began in and stayed in administration; the CAAOs were established academicians prior to discovering that they had a knack for, a talent for, or a desire to become a leader. Eventually the academics found that administrative work was a challenging, rewarding and worthwhile pursuit. They all believe they will end their careers back in the classroom, which was their first passion and love. The CSAOs, on the other hand, only know administration and plan, someday, to retire from it, maybe, as CSA said, to a small school to teach a few classes.

Throughout the interviews, the respondents recounted events involving bosses, failures, successes, and difficult times. From the events they learned valuable lessons - lessons that served them well through their careers, lessons that were necessary to master to survive and function at the level they were. The lessons that were synthesized from their responses were thematized into five areas: Knowledge of Leadership Fundamentals; Knowledge of Others; Knowledge of Role; Knowledge of Self; and Knowledge of Leadership (see Appendix J).

Of the lessons learned by this study's sample, the key aspect of leadership was in the lessons contained in the of Knowledge of Others. A common thread that was intertwined throughout all the lessons in this area was the boss/subordinate relationship, or as JAA described it a "servant/leader" relationship. He believed that "people don't work for you; they work with you."

JSA echoed his compatriot's sentiments. He stated one tenant he attempts to live by was that "nobody works for me; they work with me; we work together as a team." The respondents believed that the people that they worked for and those that worked for them helped make them successful. They could not have achieved what they have or be in their current position without the support of others. For some, early in their careers, the support was difficult to come by. For example, RSA said there were large groups of people opposed to his appointment as vice chancellor; in fact, the chair of the commission for women at his institution resigned in protest when his appointment was announced. He said it took him awhile to gain support, trust, and respect on campus. In another situation, DAA said that when he was first promoted to an academic department head, he wasn't the faculty's or administration's first choice, and as a result he had to struggle initially because he lacked their support. But through hard work and open communication, he soon gained their respect.

The point to this category was that these individuals had to learn to deal with their subordinates, peers, and superiors. Even though others may have explained to them or showed them how things were done, they had to learn for themselves how to do things. They learned by doing, by trial-and-error. The lessons in this category were some of the most difficult to master, yet the most important. While the literature on leadership varies on what attributes, activities, and obligations are necessary to succeed, one aspect of leadership that it does not disagree on is that a leader needs followers to be a successful leader.

Numerous authors (Heifetz, 1994; Szilagy and Wallace, 1980; Stoner and Freeman, 1989; Wills, 1994; Fiedler, 1974; Tannenbaum, Weschiller, and Massarik, 1961; Tannebaum and Schmidt, 1973; Blake and Mouton, 1969; Bolman and Deal, 1997; Bogue, 1994) have discussed the necessity of the leader-follower interaction. In general, these studies concluded that a leader cannot succeed without people who are willing to follow.

With the exception of JAA, the other CAAOs learned these lessons about dealing with people, especially subordinates, when they first headed units in higher education. These CAAOs had established academic careers prior to moving into administration. However, for the most part, they had limited exposure and experience in administration. In fact, they saw the administration as a roadblock, something to circumvent. RAA even recounted that as a faculty member "you never admit that you like administration, and you always indicate that you will always go back to the faculty, and that would be a step up." They had no real idea of how things worked, how to get things done, or more importantly how to supervise and lead others. RAA said he once complained to the dean about his ineffective secretary thinking the dean would fire her, but the dean did not. However, "The dean got fed up with me and said 'well, fire her if you don't think she is not very good'." Up to that point RAA didn't realize what was involved with supervising others. He said he did learn quickly.

The CSAOs, on the other hand, learned these lessons from the very beginnings of their careers. Again, with the exception of JSA, they all began as

administrators, admittedly low-level, but administrators none-the-less. And as administrators they learned early on that they had to depend upon others to get their job done. The CAAOs were faculty and they, for the most part, worked independently to succeed; but the CSAOs needed and depended upon others. As a result a number of the lessons were mastered early in their careers, while others were not learned until they themselves became leaders.

Thus, while they all learned the lessons, the academics who became administrators had a steeper learning curve than the administrators. They had less time to master the skills and also less guidance and/or direction at the start. Two of the three learned as department heads, which meant they "supervised" peers, which proved to be a difficult task. One advantage to this situation, though, was that they learned how to accomplish tasks by involving others rather than directing or managing them. The CSAOs had the luxury of watching and learning from others before being thrust into the fray.

The individuals interviewed for this study believed they were successful because others helped make them successful. They believed in identifying and training good people, then turning them loose to do a job. Their jobs as the leader, then, became one of providing the resources and support. CSA captured the essence of their philosophy and the theme of the Knowledge of Others when he said he enjoys "...helping to develop [others] so that they can see the big picture and not just their little corner of the world and understand how things

operate and how to get things done and work with other people. So I think watching people grow, develop, and succeed are the most fun for me."

The lessons of Knowledge of Leadership Fundamentals revolved around the realization that there were certain aspects to life as a leader that must be mastered to be successful. The lessons identified were difficult lessons to learn and assimilate; however, they were important to their success. In fact, it was implied by the respondents that if a budding leader does not accept, embrace, and incorporate these lessons, his or her career will be short-lived.

The lessons in this area, in many cases, were learned early on. It was necessary to learn these lessons before becoming a leader. The CAAOs especially, at some point, realized administrative work was a worthwhile pursuit and presented challenges and opportunities for them. The other lessons could have been learned at anytime during their life, but it carried forward to their work life. All eight were given to work hard, to doing what was necessary to succeed and to go beyond what was expected of them. They worked hard on their way up and continue to work hard now. In addition, they enjoyed what they did so they didn't view the work as difficult, even though it may have been.

They also discovered that to get ahead and advance, they had to take risks. JAA summarized it best when he said "I also think people should be willing to take chances. Risk-taking is important. Trying and failing is better than not trying at all."

Another key lesson they had to master to survive was that politics is a given. It must be acknowledged and dealt with; it can't be ignored. Politics must be factored into every decision that is made. This lesson relates to findings that Bolman and Deal (1990) found. In their writings they state that leaders who were adept in understanding and using politics were perceived by their colleagues, superiors, and subordinates as better managers and leaders. They identified successful political leaders as individuals who clarify what they want and what they can get; assess the distribution of power and interests; build linkages to key stakeholders; and persuade first, negotiate second, and use coercion only if necessary. These individuals interviewed for this study knew and understood the power of politics and how to use it to their advantage. While they downplayed its role in their success, it was apparent they knew how the game was played.

One characteristic that came to the front time and time again through the course of the interviews was the lack of a fear of failure. These individuals were put in situations that were fraught with danger and a potential to fail, yet they worked through the situations and not only survived, but prospered. They also learned that in these situations that mistakes would be made, but rather than dwelling on the mistakes, they needed to ascertain what went wrong, analyze the causes, and learn from it. They turned potentially negative situations into positive learning opportunities. They also had enough faith in themselves and

their ability to accept these challenges, complete the tasks, and continue to perform their day-to-day activities.

The theme of Knowledge of Leadership was closely aligned to Knowledge of Leadership Fundamentals. This was especially true for the CAAOs because they learned leadership skills once they were in the job and were expected to produce. These skills were necessary to be assimilated to successfully traverse the leadership minefield. Probably the most important and necessary lesson to learn and skill to master was to learn the operation. By learning the operation, they meant learning not just one's functional unit but rather the overall operation of the institution. It was necessary to see and understand how the different units were integrated into the whole. Without this information and/or knowledge, success was, at best, unlikely.

Another important aspect that was difficult to learn and accept was addressed by two lessons: know when a battle is lost and if a recommendation is not accepted, forget about it and move on. These two were especially difficult for CSA with regard to his investigation of his campus' phone scandal. He investigated a situation, identified the perpetrators, and recommended a course of action. His recommendation was ignored due to political connections of those involved, and the incident was "swept under the rug." He said he had a hard time coming to grips with the situation, but finally he decided to "accept the situation and live with the decision."

These leaders also realized that the lesson about maintaining the institution's integrity was at the very heart of leadership. Thus, the decisions these leaders made, all the programs they implemented, all the actions they took had the institution's integrity as a foundation. The former chancellor at Louisiana State University in Shreveport has developed a litmus test for leaders to follow in determining if their decisions are in the best interest of the institution. To paraphrase his test, a leader should ask him or herself how the decision will look as a headline on the evening newscast or in the morning paper (extracted from a lecture delivered by Dr. Grady Bogue, 1992).

While the respondents didn't specifically repeat Dr. Bogue's test, they did implicitly accept it. They believed in the institution because they were the institution. Thus, if the institution's integrity suffered, their integrity suffered. Bad decisions hurt everyone, including themselves. They believed the institution's integrity must be protected at all costs. An incident related by RAA illustrated this point. As a dean, he developed a plan to deal with an impending budget cut. His provost also developed a plan; however, in RAA's opinion, the provost's plan would have harmed the institution. As a result, he challenged the provost. "I told the provost he could do it, but I wouldn't defend it, and I wouldn't resign." RAA drew a line in the sand. RAA believed his solution maintained the institution's integrity, while the provost's compromised it.

This situation, or similar ones described by the others, also addressed the lessons of maintaining the institution's integrity. CSA believed the best way to

maintain his institution's integrity was to address and deal with the situation out in the open; others thought by keeping the incident from the public, the integrity would be maintained. The result is that two camps can both be striving for the same goal but have almost diametrically opposing methods to attain the goal. Another lesson learned as a result of this incident is that politics play a major role in decision-making. The point to this theme is successful leaders must be willing to accept decisions counter to their recommendations and be willing to support the decision. However, if there comes a time when they cannot accept and support a decision, then, as CSA says, "...to make a choice to either get on board or get out."

The final two categories were Knowledge of Role and Knowledge of Self. The lessons identified in Knowledge of Self were the initial or rudimentary lessons that must be learned by any leader. An important lesson in this theme was that two-way communication was necessary; this included learning to listen. Even though this lesson sounds simplistic and almost a given, communication surfaced repeatedly in the responses. This lesson is driven home by an incident related by DAA. A lack of communication nearly cost him a job one time. He and his president were having a disagreement regarding the resolution of a situation. When they finally discussed the issue, they determined neither one had listened to the other. In short, there was a total lack of communication. It turned out the president's solution was implemented, but DAA's points had been heard and considered.

Another lesson that was critical to the leader's development was learning patience and being persistent. As Bennis (1976) stated that the university "is society's closest realization to the pure model of anarchy, that is, the locus of decision-making is the individual" (p. 26). Assuming this statement to be consistent with how institutions of higher education actually operate, it was readily apparent that patience and persistence were indispensable qualities. If the leader was impetuous, consistently "wanted things yesterday," or gave up easily, he or she would be frustrated and unable to function effectively in higher education. The statement by Bennis and others (Green, 1988; Cohen and March, 1974; and Bensimon, Gade, and Kauffman, 1989) implies that universities are tradition-bound institutions that do not rush head-long into making changes or implementing a new course of action. Leaders, therefore, must be aware of this fact and learn to operate within these parameters. JSA summarized the importance of patience and persistence. "A good administrator, in my opinion, persistently tries, regroups, goes at it from a different angle, and eventually gets it."

The remainder of the lessons in this unit also dealt with individual decision-making. For example, with regards to the lesson if a situation is untenable, take action, only the individual involved can make that assessment. He or she can seek advice from others, but the bottom line is the individual and only the individual can decide what to do and when to do it. But before the decision can be made, the individual must weigh all the options and then choose

a course of action. As CSA said, "there comes a point where one must be willing to 'burn a bridge' if necessary, but it is a difficult decision to make."

Another important lesson in Knowledge of Role was learning to function with a business-like detachment. This lesson was related to not taking criticism personally. RSA said this lesson has served him well. By a business-like detachment he meant that personal feelings and personalities must be factored out of the equation, if at all possible, when making a decision. Decisions must be made for the good of the unit, the program, or the institution, not the individual. This may be one of the most difficult lesson of all to learn and practice.

Another important lesson in this theme was to not take criticism personally. As a leader and a decision-maker, these individuals were open to criticism from anyone who knew, or thought they knew, about a situation and did not agree with how the leader dealt with the situation. Regardless of what decision the leader made, some one or group would not agree with it and would make their displeasure known, even, at times personally attacking the decision-maker. The fire-bombing RSA endured and the threat of violence received by DSA are prime examples that were discussed earlier. In both instances, the attacks or threats were against the institution, but since the individual represented the institution, in fact was the institution, they were targeted. Both individuals were scared and upset but realized that if they were going to be

successful, they would have to learn to deflect personal criticisms and/or attacks and continue to do what they believed in.

To deal with these types of situations required the leader to "have some sense of self-confidence," as CAA says. He went on to say that the leader had to have the strength or constitution to make the difficult decision and live through the consequences. He said "I don't want to call it arrogance, but you've got to have...grit, and you better have some grit...yet at the same time be willing to say no."

The lessons from Knowledge of Self dealt with merging the private and work life. The underlying theme is that the leader must know how to strike a balance to survive. If he or she ignored his or her private life, it would be reflected in his or her work life, and conversely, if he or she ignored his or her work life, he or she may not have one which would definitely affect his or her private life.

Also the issue of mentors is a major lesson for rising leaders to learn. Mentors can prove to be helpful. Brooker (1998), in her study of female presidents in higher education, concluded that for her group mentors were an important part of their success. The individuals in this study also felt mentors were important, especially in helping them learn how to do things. Mentors also provided assistance in opening doors and providing guidance and counsel. DSA said his mentor helped him learn how the academic side functioned. DSA's statement fairly summed up the group's feelings on mentors. They are

important, to a point, but beyond that the individual will be judged by his or her body of work.

Even though the lessons of experience identified by the eight senior officers were categorized thematically, they were not learned in a vacuum, nor could they be mastered individually. In other words, for a leader to succeed he or she must be familiar with all the lessons, not just those categorized under Individual Knowledge, for example. All the lessons must be assimilated in some form or fashion into the leader's daily life for him or her to be successful.

C. CONCLUSIONS OF PRESENT STUDY AS RELATED TO "THE LESSONS OF EXPERIENCE"

> The essence of development is that diversity and adversity beat repetition every time. The more dramatic the change in skill demands, the more severe the personnel problems, the more the bottom-line pressure, the more sinuous and unexpected the turns in the road, the move opportunity there is for learning" (McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988 (p. 58).

The above statement is found in a chapter aptly named "Trial by Fire" because as McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison discovered, learning by doing was the most effective method of teaching executives how to manage and lead. Brooker

(1998) found that her group of female presidents also learned by doing. The sample of higher education administrators used for this study also identified being thrown into the fray as an effective way to learn to lead.

In general, adults learn when they need to or have to, and these administrators were no exception. Because of the demanding nature of the assignments, learning was not something to be done out of interest or because it might be helpful. Learning was something these leaders did because they had little choice but to take action - stab at problems even if they weren't sure what they were doing. They did quick studies on unfamiliar topics, tried something, and learned from how it came out. They learned where they could, when they could, from whom they could. The lessons were learned because they were the result of things these managers did, not things they watched other do (McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988).

The leaders in this study learned because they had to. They were given assignments and expected to complete them. As McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) put it: "These executives were playing for keeps, and that was critical to the learning process" (p. 63).

From the data collected in the present study, five thematic areas were induced. The lessons, then, were placed into one of these areas. McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) in The Lessons of Experience also identified five areas that their lessons were divided into. The five themes that McCall, et. al, induced were: Setting and Implementing Agendas; Handling Relationships;

Basic Values; Executive Temperament; and Personal Awareness. A side-by-side comparison of the lessons learned by the current sample of higher education leaders and those of the executives interviewed for The Lessons of Experience is shown in Figure 3.

The two groups learned similar lessons even though they came from markedly different backgrounds, had different types of experiences, and came from different work environments. It appears the lessons transcend the environment. Booker (1998) also concluded from her study of women presidents of institutions of higher education that the lessons her sample learned were comparable to those identified in The Lessons of Experience.

From analyzing the results of The Lessons of Experience and this study, a number of conclusions can be drawn regarding the growth and development of leadership talent. McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison concluded there was "no single path to success..no secret recipes" (p. 122).

The current study also found the individual's interviewed took many different paths to achieve the success that they did. The interviewees came from a variety of backgrounds - faculty ranks, high school teachers, and low-level administrators - yet, through hard work, dedication, taking risks, and seizing opportunities, they survived and succeeded.

A second conclusion drawn from The Lessons of Experience was that successful executives seemed ready to grab or create opportunities for growth. The sample in the present study looked for and grabbed opportunities when they

SETTING AND IMPLEMENTING AGENDAS
1. Technical and professional skills
2. All about the business one is in
3. Strategic thinking
4. Building and using structure and control systems
5. Innovative problem-solving methods

HANDLING RELATIONSHIPS
1. Handling political situations
2. Getting people to implement solutions
3. What executives are like
4. Strategies of negotiation
5. Dealing with people over whom you have no authority
6. Understanding other people's perspectives
7. Dealing with conflict
8. Developing other people
9. Confronting subordinate performance problems
10. Managing former boses and peers

BASIC VALUES
1. You can't manage everything all alone
2. Sensitivity to the human side of management
3. Basic management values

EXECUTIVE TEMPERAMENT
1. Being tough when necessary
2. Self-confidence
3. Coping with situations beyond your control
4. Persevering through adversity
5. Coping with ambiguous situations
6. Use (and abuse) of power

PERSONAL AWARENESS
1. The balance between work and personal life
2. Knowing what really excites you about work
3. Personal limits and blind spots
4. Taking charge of your career
5. Recognizing and seizing opportunities

McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (Fig. 1-2, p. 7)

KNOWLEDGE OF LEADERSHIP FUNDAMENTALS
1. Administrative work is challenging
2. Hard work pays off
3. Risk-taking is necessary
4. Seek and accept new opportunities and challenges
7. Mistakes will be made; learn from them
8. Failures will occur
10. Change is a constant
12. Problems do not solve themselves
13. Politics is a given

KNOWLEDGE OF OTHERS
6. Consensus-building is important
9. Success is achieved through working with others
14. Treat others with respect, fairness, consistency
16. Identify good people and develop them
18. Respect must be earned daily
20. Get to know your employees
22. Learn to communicate with multiple constituencies
23. Accept and embrace diversity
27. Trust must be given before it is received
35. Employees don't work for you; they work with you

KNOWLEDGE OF ROLE
3. Understand your role
5. Learn to collect, check and present data
17. Learn to delegate responsibility
21. Two-way communication is necessary
24. Learn patience, but be persistent
26. Learn to function with business-like detachment
31. If a situation is untenable, take action

KNOWLEDGE OF SELF
15. Learn when to take a break and unwind
25. Do not take criticism personally
32. Mentors are helpful

KNOWLEDGE OF LEADERSHIP
11. Know when a battle is lost
19. Learn your operation
28. If a recommendation is not accepted, forget about it and move on
29. Decision-making is difficult
30. Maintenance of the institution's integrity is paramount
33. Become a "go-to" individual
34. Priorities shift

Figure 3
Comparison of Lessons of Experience

presented themselves. They were willing to take risks, to take chances, and create opportunities for growth and advancement. As RSA said, "There wasn't anything he wouldn't do." While the others didn't exactly mimic his statement, they implied they would take on assignments even if they were unfamiliar with the territory being explored. They made themselves needed by becoming as RAA describes it as a "go-to-guy" - someone who will get the job done, give good advice, make the boss look good, and take an occasional 'bullet' for the boss. Yet, they realized they weren't indispensable. Realizing this fact kept them grounded. If they ever had an occasion to glow in their self-importance, they brought themselves back to earth by remembering they could be gone the next day.

The third conclusion from The Lessons of Experience was that the executives had an extraordinary tenacity for extracting something worthwhile from their experiences and in seeking experiences rich in opportunities for growth. The higher education leaders also sought to squeeze every ounce of learning out of their experiences. They examined why certain approaches worked and others didn't. They were reinforced by their successes but not discouraged by their failures. They learned by doing, by taking risks, by not backing down from challenges, and by pressing ahead even if they had doubts. This pre-disposition was summarized by DSA. He said the night before assuming the vice presidency, he thought he "came too far too fast." RSA found himself in a similar situation prior to ascending to the vice chancellorship. "I was

named the acting vice chancellor and had the task of being the acting vice chancellor and candidate at the same time. It was a very difficult situation to be in..." However, they both went to work in their new positions, continued to take on the challenges, and continued to succeed. Each realized he was ready and knew he could do the job. The others had similar epipanies. They realized their education, training, and experiences had prepared them to assume the job they were advancing to. They had doubts, but they also were self-assured because they had succeeded before, and they knew they would succeed again. The three aforementioned conclusions can be boiled down into three basic themes: take advantage of opportunities; aggressively search for meaning; and know yourself (McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988).

To summarize, the executives interviewed by McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) stated they grew into their positions and developed as leaders by learning, accepting challenges, and learning from them. They continually reflected on what happened and made adjustments. The small group of higher education leaders interviewed for this study came to similar conclusions. They learned by doing; they accepted challenges; they took risks; they grabbed opportunities; they survived difficult situations; they learned how to work with, for, and through others, and maybe more importantly, they were able to get things done. As with the executives from private industry, this group, too, practiced self-reflection, learned by their mistakes, and advanced.

McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) encapsulate this belief succinctly by stating "Careers aren't laying on the ground waiting for you to pick them up...[the individual has] to take [the] initiative and make things happen." They followed that statement by concluding "the correlation between years of experience and effectiveness as a manager is virtually zero, meaning that just living a long life doesn't guarantee growth" (p. 123). What does guarantee growth and success is knowing yourself, accepting challenges and as learning by reflecting on these experiences.

D. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The scope of this study was limited to eight individuals - four chief student affairs officers and four chief academic affairs officers. The group that was chosen came from four different types of institutions. Its purpose was to ascertain whether the findings McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) discussed in The Lessons of Experience extend to individuals in higher education interviewed for this study.

However, because of the nature of this study which employed a qualitative design methodology, the results not only will be difficult to replicate, but they cannot be generalized to others in similar positions. Mertens (1998) stated that qualitative methods were used in research that was designed to provide an in-depth description of a specific program, practice, or setting. Thus, the very definition of qualitative research dictates that the study cannot be replicated

exactly. In fact, Creswell (1994) said, "The uniqueness of a study within a specific context mitigates against replicating it exactly in another context" (p. 159). Consequently, even though this study employed a methology comparable to the one used in the study that The Lessons of Experience was based upon, it could not, nor did not, replicate its conditions. This study was designed to elicit responses to the same questions used in the McCall, et. al. study, but it provided a separate presentation of the responses of these participants.

The results of the present study cannot be compared directly with the results McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) outlined in The Lessons of Experience because the two studies used two different groups of leaders who identified different developmental events. But, none-the-less, identified some common experiences. The current study, by design, used a smaller more narrowly defined sample to determine what learning experiences and the meaning that was drawn from those experiences. However, one can accept the results of the current study as an extension of the results of the original study. It provides information regarding the lessons the higher education leaders learned while they worked their way into senior-level positions within their institutions in ways similar to those interviewed for The Lessons of Experience.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The intent of this study was to examine seminal events in the growth and development of the chief academic affairs and chief student affairs officers in

four different classifications of institutions of higher education. That all the participants were male and seven of the eight were white is a reflection of both the environment and the social climate of the geographic area where the institutions are located. To extend the research begun by this study could, in this researcher's opinion, be a fruitful enterprise. However, to ensure broader results, institutions in other parts of the United States should be included. Also, the next study should not only include other geographic regions but also a wider variety of jobs.

Rather than just focusing on academic and student affairs, another study should include the chief financial officer, the chief data processing officer, the chief research officer, and the chief institutional advancement officer. By expanding the potential pool of subjects and locations, it is believed that a more diverse group of respondents would be included.

Another suggestion for additional research would be to categorize the institutions by Carnegie classification. In other words, study a cohort comprised of senior-level administrators in research universities, doctorate-granting universities, or use a sample that consists of only comprehensive universities and colleges, or one that is made up of two-year community, junior, and technical colleges. Since the institutions are classified by type of institution and mission, it seems appropriate to study the experiences by classification. The different classifications have different requirements and possibly are looking for different experiences and types or individuals to lead them. Additionally, a

comparison from the leaders from the different classifications could be compared and contrasted.

Assuming that a large study would produce a more diverse population of potential subjects, it would be interesting to look at the experiences of women vs men or majority vs minority as a subset of the larger study. An especially interesting side-bar to this option would be to look at a "first generation" employee in the position. In other words, interview the first woman, the first Hispanic, or the first African-American in the particular position and examine how their growth and development into a senior leadership position differed from that of a white male, if at all.

Another potentially valuable study might consider generational differences among leaders. It would be interesting to examine the responses of a group made up of the World War II generation compared to a group of "baby boomers."

Implications for Policy and Practice

Michael Lombardo, writing in Contemporary Issues in Leadership (1984), says that "if having skills and capabilities to become a leader is not as important as the opportunity to develop and demonstrate them, then many managers never have a chance" (p. 281). The problem or concern, then, is to identify those individuals who have the skills and capabilities and give them a chance to be developed. Future study on leadership in higher education should focus on how it develops its talent.

Institutions of higher education need to develop a method of promoting on-the-job development that is a dynamic process that evaluates the needs of the institution and the needs of the talent pool, encouraging growth and learning, and teaching self-reflection on the part of aspiring leaders and on the part of the development program itself.

These programs can provide important and valuable assistance to the development of leaders because, as Green and Dade (1991) state: "Even though higher education has as one of its primary missions the development of leaders for society, it pays little attention to enhancing the ability of [its] administrators to lead our institutions" (p. 3).

The challenge that is faced by organizations and especially higher education, is to develop leaders. As Green (1988) notes, while higher education literature is rich in discussion of leadership, it has paid little attention to leadership development. As a result, an effective program to assist in the development of leaders should have multiple goals: the identification of new leaders, the development of management skills, the enhancement of leadership abilities, and the promotion of leadership vitality.

In addition, higher education must take the lead to identify individuals who may have the right stuff but may not have the background experiences and skills that will enable them to show it. Minorities, women, and "late-bloomers" are frequently mentioned as three talent pools who may have had inadequate opportunities to develop (Rosenbach & Taylor, 1984).

The challenge for an all encompassing developmental policy is to ensure any and all employees to be given the opportunity. Identifying potential talent, especially those who have been excluded in the past, should become part of the mission of higher education. In addition, institutions of higher education need to commit themselves to develop a diverse pool of leadership talent through identifying potential leaders, identifying the skills and lessons to be learned, and identifying developmental jobs.

F. CONCLUSION

Eight senior-level administrators in higher education were interviewed for this study. The interviewees held the position of either vice chancellor or vice president for academic affairs or student affairs. From the data collected via in-depth interviews, developmental events, and lessons were drawn from responses supplied by the interviewees. The lessons were put into five groupings reflecting similarities among the lessons. The five thematic areas were: Knowledge of Leadership Fundamentals, Knowledge of Others, Knowledge of Role, Knowledge of Self, and Knowledge of Leadership (see Appendix J). This study confirmed that leadership development occurs on the job, and lessons associated with this development can be identified and defined. In addition, each lesson may be associated with more than one event, experience, or person discussed by the respondents.

The responses of those interviewed for this study supported and furthered the findings that McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) chronicled in The Lessons of Experience. They concluded that during an executive's growth period, the development during that time depended not just on raw talent but also on the experiences one had and what one did with them. Their study examined the responses from hundreds of managers and executives and identified three key events (assignments, bosses, and hardships) and 32 lessons divided into five thematic areas (see Appendix J).

While McCall, et. al., used executives from private industry and this study used a sample of senior leaders from higher education, the events, experiences, and persons identified in this study are more similar than dissimilar to comparable events, experiences, and persons identified in the original study, even though the samples were markedly different.

To conclude, it appears that leadership skills transcend occupations. Fisher & Koch (1996) state it succinctly when they say "In general, a leader is a leader is a leader. All leaders, then, play off the same general themes, even though their personal styles and mannerisms may differ" (p. 19). Thus, regardless of the setting, leadership skills are applicable and can fit in any situation (Brooker, 1998; Fisher & Koch, 1996; McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988; Green, 1988; Posner & Kouzes, 1996). The one common denominator that has been continually manifested through the literally thousands of published works on leadership is that leadership has always been and will continue to be

about people. Numerous theorists and students of leadership (i.e., Wills, 1994; Heifetz, 1994; Stoner and Freeman, 1989; Fiedler, 1974) have all identified people, the ability to work with people, to motivate people, to groom people, and to understand people as basic tenet of success for leadership. Wills (1994) goes so far as to say, "A leader whose qualities do not match those of [his/her] potential followers is simply irrelevant" (p. 15). McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) agree with Wills by saying that learning to deal with people is at the heart of leadership. This study also reached the conclusion that people and the ability to work with, through, and for others is a key element for successful leadership.

To summarize, the results of the study presented in this paper extend the pioneering work begun by McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) and furthered by Brooker (1998) to identify and define lessons learned and assimilated by successful leaders during their growth and development process. While McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison's (1988) work was based on a sample of managers in private industry and Brooker's (1998) targeted women presidents in higher education, and this study used senior-level administrators in Academic and Student Affairs, the results complement one another. All three studies identified people as the pivotal aspect of leadership. A leader without someone to lead, by definition, cannot be a leader.

It is the contention of this researcher that the research conducted and presented here provides additional insight and expands the knowledge, however slight, in the art of leadership. It is further hoped that the lessons of experience

identified and defined by this study will prove useful to those who aspire to design and implement a program to assist in the development of our future leaders.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argyris, C. and Cyert, R. Leadership in the 1980's. Cambridge: Institute for Educational Management, 1980. (Quoted in Green, 1988.)

Baldridge, J. V., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G., and Riley, G. L. "Alternative Models of Governance in Higher Education." In Governing Academic Organizations: New Problems, New Perspectives, edited by Riley, G. L. and Baldridge, J. V. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1977.

Bass, B. M. Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research & Managerial Applications, (3rd Edition). New York: The Free Press, 1990.

Bennis, Warren. Why Leaders Can't Lead: The Unconscious Conspiracy Continues. San Franscisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1989.

Bensimon, E. M. "The Meaning of 'Good Presidential Leadership': A Frame Analysis." Review of Higher Education, 1989, 12, 107-123. (Quoted in Bolman and Deal, 1997.)

Bensimon, E. M., Gade, M. L., and Kauffman, J. F. On Assuming a College or University Presidency. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1989.

Bensimon, E., Neumann, A. and Birnbaum R. Making Sense of Administrative Leadership: The 'L' Word in Higher Education. Washington, D.C., ASHE/ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 1, 1989.

Bergquist, W. H. The Four Cultures of the Academy: Insights and Strategies for Improving Leadership in Collegiate Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1992).

Bernard, L. L. An Introduction to Social Psychology. New York: Holt, 1926. (Quoted in Bass, 1990.)

Bingham, W. V. "Leadership." In H. C. Metcalf, The Psychological Foundations of Management. New York: Shaw, 1927. (Quoted in Bass, 1990.)

Birnbaum, R. How Academic Leadership Works: Understanding Success and Failure in the College Presidency. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1992.

Birnbaum, R. How Colleges Work: The Cybernetics of Academic Organization and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1988.

Birnbaum, R. "Responsibility Without Authority: The Impossible Job of the College President." in Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, vol. 5, edited by Smart, J. New York: Agathon Press, 1989.

Blake, R. R. and Mouton, J. S. The New Managerial Grid. Houston: Gulf Publishing, 1978.

Blanchard, K. "Turning the Organizational Pyramid Upside Down" (pp. 81-86). In Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M., and Beckhard, R. (Eds.). The Leader of the Future: New Visions, Strategies, and Practices for the Next Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

Bogue, E. G. Leadership By Design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1994.

Bogue, E. G. and Saunders, Robert L. The Education Manager: Artist and Practitioner. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1976.

Bogue, E. G. Conversations Between the Researcher and Dr. E. G. Bogue, 1999.

Bolman, L. G. and Deal, T. E. "Images of Leadership" Presented at the American Educational Research Association, April 1990.

Bolman, L. G. and Deal, T. E. Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1997.

Bowden, A. O. "A Study of the Personality of Student Leaders in the United States." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1926, 21, 149-160. (Quoted in Bass, 1990.)

Brooker, J. Significant Leadership Developmental Experiences of Five Pioneering Women Executives in Higher Education. Knoxville, Tennessee: Doctoral Dissertation, 1998

Buchele, R. The Management of Business and Public Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1977.

Burgess, R. G. (Editor) Field Research: A Source Book and Field Manual. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982.

Burgess, R. G. (Editor) Field Methods in the Study of Education. London: The Falmer Press, 1985.

Burns, J. M. Leadership. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1978.

Cohen, M. D. and March, J. G. Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1974.

Creswell, J. W. Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1994.

Deal, T. E., and Peterson, K. D. The Leadership Paradox. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. Handbook of Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publicatins, 1994 (Quoted in Mertens, 1998)

DePree, M. Leadership Is An Art. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1987.

Eggins, Heather, Editor. Women as Leaders and Managers in Higher Education. Bristol, PA: Shire and Open University Press, 1997.

Erlandsen, D. A., Harris, E. L., Skipper, B. L., and Allen, S. D. Doing Naturalistic Inquiry: A Guide to Methods. New Bury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1993.

Fiedler, F. E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Fiedler, F. E., and Chemers, M. Leadership and Effective Management. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1974.

Fiedler, F. E. and Garcia, J. E. New Approaches to Effective Leadership. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1987. (Quoted in Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum, 1989.)

Fisher, J. L. and Koch, V. Presidential Leadership: Making a Difference. Phoenix: The ORYX Press, 1996.

Fisher, J., Tack, M., and Wheeler, K. The Effective College President. New York: American Council on Education/MacMillan, 1988. (Quoted in Fisher and Koch, 1996.)

Gay, L. R. Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (3rd. Ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company, 1987.

Gilley, J., Fulmer, K., and Reithlingshoefer, S. Searching for Academic Excellence. New York: ACE/MacMillian, 1986.

Green, Madeleine, Editor. Leaders for a New Era: Strategies for Higher Education. New York: Ace/Macmillan Publishing Company, 1988.

Green, M. and McDade, S. Investing in Higher Education: A Handbook of Leadership Development. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1991.

Hayes, J. L. Memos for Management: Leadership. New York: American Management Association, 1983.

Heifetz, R. A. Leadership Without Easy Answers. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1994.

Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources, 4th Edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982

House, R. J. "A Path-Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness." Administrative Science Quarterly, 1971, pp. 31-32. (Quoted in Szilagyi and Wallace, 1980.)

Hoy, W. K. and Miskel, C. G. Educational Administration Theory, Research and Practice, 3rd Edition. New York: Random House, 1987.

Hyman, H. H. Interviewing in Social Research. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Keller, G. Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Kerr, C. and Gade, M. The Many Lives of Academic Presidents. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. ED 267 704. 267. 1986.

LeCompte, M. D., Millroy, W. L., and Preissle, J. The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education. San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.; Harcourt Brace Jouanovich, Publishers, 1992.

LeCompte, M. D. and Preissle, J. Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research, 2nd Edition. San Diego: Academic Press, Inc., 1993.

Lincoln, Y. S. and Guba, E. G. Naturalistic Inquiry. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1985.

Lopez, I. O. "Leadership Defined." Reprint from Colorado Business Magazine, June 1990.

Marshall, C. and Rossman, G. B. Designing Qualitative Research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1989 (Quoted in Erlandsen, Harris, Skipper, and Allen, 1993.)

Maxwell, A. E. Analyzing Qualitative Data. London: Chapman and Hall; New York: Distributed by Halstead Press, 1975.

Mayhew, L. Surviving the Eighties: Strategies and Procedures for Solving Fiscal and Enrollment Problems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1980.

McCall, Jr., M. W., Lombardo, M. M. (Editors). Leadership: Where Else Can We Go? Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1978.

McCall, Jr., M. W., Lombardo, M. M. and Morrison, A. M. The Lessons of Experience: How Successful Executives Develop on the Job. New York: The Free Press, 1988.

McCauley, C. D. Developmental Experiences in Managerial Work: A Literature Review (Technical Report No. 26). Greensboro, North Carolina: Center for Creative Leadership, 1986. (Quoted in McCall, Jr., Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988.)

Meinecke, F. Machiavellism: The Doctorine of Raison D'Etat and Its Place in Modern History. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1962.

Merriam, S. B. Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers,1988.

Mitchell, Stephen. Tao Te Ching: A New English Version. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1988.

Mertens, D. M. Research Methods in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1998.

Miller, B. W., Hotes, R. W., and Terry, Jr., J. D., Editors. Leadership in Higher Education: A Handbook for Practicing Administrators. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1983.

Morgan, G. Images of Organization. Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage Publications, 1997.

Patton, M. Q. How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluations. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1987.

Patton, M. Q. Qualitative Evaluation Methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1980.

Peskin, A. "In Search of Subjectivity - One's Own." Educational Researcher, October 1988: pp. 17-21.

Posner, B. Z., and Kouzes, J. M. "Ten Lessons for Leaders and Leadership Developers." The Journal of Leadership Studies, 1996, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 3-10.

Reddin, W. J. Managerial Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Rosenbach, William E. and Taylor, Robert L. (Editors). Contemporary Issues In Leadership. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1984.

Snyder, W. T. "Perspectives on Leadership." Comments made to the Human Resource Management Staff, The University of Tennessee, February 1998.

Stogdill, R. M. Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research. New York: The Free Press, 1974.

Stogdill, R. M. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature." Journal of Psychology, 25, No. 1 (January 1948): pp. 35-71. (Quoted in Stoner and Freeman, 1989).

Stoner, J. A. and Freeman, R. E. Management, 4th Edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1989.

Szilagyi, Jr., A. D. and Wallace, Jr., M. A. Organizatinal Behavior and Performance. Santa Monica, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1980.

Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, I. R., and Massarik, F. Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.

Tannenbaum, R. and Schmidt, W. H. "How to Choose a Leadership Pattern." Harvard Business Review 51, No. 3 (May-June 1973): pp. 162-164.

Taylor, S. J. and Bogdan R. Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: The Search for Meanings. New York: John Wiley, 1984.

Tierney, W. G. "Cultural Leadership and the Search for Community." Liberal Education, Vol. 78, No. 5 (November/December 1992), pp. 16-21.

Tead, O. The Art of Leadership. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1935.

Tead, O. "The Technique of Creative Leadership." In Human Nature and Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1929. (Quoted in Bass, 1990.)

Vroom, V. H. and Yetton, P. W. Leadership and Decision-Making. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburg Press, 1973.

Walcott, H. R. Writing Up Qualitative Research. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1990.

Walker, D. The Effective Administrator: A Practical Approach to Problem Solving, Decision Making, and Campus Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1979.

Wills, G. Certain Trumpets: The Call of Leaders. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994.

Yin, R. K. Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Applied Social Research Methods Series, Vol. 5. Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage,1984.

_____. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.

_____. Funk Wagnalls Standard Desk Dictionary. New York: Funk Wagnalls, Inc., 1974.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

Date

Name
Title
Address

Dear:

My name is Michael R. Herbstritt, and I am a doctoral student at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. My doctoral dissertation pursues a line of inquiry originally set in motion at the Center for Creative Leadership, research designed to identify significant developmental events and experiences in the lives of corporate executives. I am exploring this question for administrators at the vice presidential level in academic and student affairs for four different Carnegie class institutions.

The purpose of this letter is to ask whether you might be willing to be one of the participants in my study. Your participation would require approximately an hour to an hour and a half of your time, to be scheduled at a time of your convenience. Confidentiality of interview responses will be guaranteed in the study. Interview materials will be kept in secure conditions, and no subject will be identified in the final study.

I hope that you might be willing to participate, and I will be calling your office in the near future to see if you would be willing and to identify a time convenient to your calendar. My dissertation advisor for this study is Dr. E. Grady Bogue, Professor of Educational Leadership. Should you need to contact Dr. Bogue, he may be reached at (423) 974-6140. My phone number is (423) 974-2456.

Sincerely,

Michael Herbstritt

Dr. E. Grady Bogue

Appendix B

PARTICIPANT PROFILE FORM

LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A STUDY TO ASCERTAIN SIGNIFICANT EVENTS AND EXPERIENCES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS

NAME _____

NUMBER OF YEARS IN CURRENT POSITION _____

Colleges Attended and Degrees Received (If more convenient, please attach a current vita to provide the following information.)

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

History of Employment and/or Positions Held

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

List Other Positions of Leadership Held - Professional and in the Community

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

Appendix C

CONSENT FORM

LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A STUDY TO ASCERTAIN SIGNIFICANT EVENTS AND EXPERIENCES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS

The purpose of this study is to identify and describe the significant experiences, events, and persons that have played a significant role in the development of the chief academic and chief administrative officers in higher education and to explain the lessons the executives have learned from these experiences.

You will be asked to participate in an informal interview that will last approximately one hour. The interview will be audiotaped and the tapes transcribed to capture your exact words. Your identity will be kept completely confidential through the use of pseudonyms, and only I will have access to the consent form, tapes, and transcripts. These tapes will be erased upon transcription, and the transcripts, notes, etc. will be locked in a filing cabinet in my office and destroyed after the study is completed. The consent forms will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in my office and will be destroyed after three years.

There are no foreseeable risks involved in your participation in this project. Participation will provide you with the benefit of reflecting on your own experience and will provide me, as the principal investigator, the opportunity to understand and describe more completely some of your developmental experiences. Also, you may indirectly benefit from the knowledge gained from the project findings.

Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may refuse to participate, refuse to answer any specific question, or withdraw at any time without penalty. You may contact me at any time if you have further questions or concerns about the project or your participation in it. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, contact the Compliance Section of the Office of Research at The University of Tennessee at (423) 974-3466.

Principal Investigator: Michael R. Herbstritt
Suite 231, Conference Center Building
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-4125
(423) 974-2456

I fully understand the explanation of the project and I agree to participate.

Name:_____ Date:_____

Signature:_____

Appendix D

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE GUIDE

This questionnaire is drawn from a study conducted by McCall, Jr., Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) to determine the events and people that had a significant impact on the executive-participant's development as a leader. The questionnaire was reproduced from The Lessons of Experience: How Successful Executives Develop on the Job, pp. 191-94.

INTERVIEW FORMAT

PREPARATION FOR SECTION I

When you think about your career as a manager, certain events or episodes probably stand out in your mind - things that led to a lasting change in your approach to management. Please jot down some notes for yourself identifying at least three "key events" in your career: things that made a difference in the way you manage now. When I meet with you, I'll ask you about each event:

1. What happened?
2. What did you learn from it (for better or worse)?

SECTION II: KEY EVENTS

Having talked about key events that really stood out for you, we will now address some things that may or may not have had a lasting effect on you. Because our time is limited, I need your help in controlling it. As you look over the questions, some are no doubt more meaningful to you than others. Please be prepared to go into some depth on the important ones and comment briefly on the others. Still other questions may have been answered in the first section.

A. Rites of Passage

1. What was your first managerial job? Was there anything special about it? About your first boss?
2. What was your first "quantum leap" - movement to a job with significantly more responsibility/challenge/pressure than prior jobs?
3. What was your first important exposure to high-level executives? Have there been others that stand out for you?
4. What was your "organizational first date" - like your first real date - a time when you were all alone and had to take complete responsibility for something you had never done before?
5. What was the biggest challenge you ever faced?
6. What was your most frightening first - something you did for the first time that had you really worried?
7. What event (or events made you realize you were going to be successful as a manager? In this organization?

B. Rising From the Ashes

1. What was your darkest hour?
2. What was a significant near miss - a time when you tried something and failed?
3. Describe a time when you pushed things to the brink - that is, a time when you stretched the system by coming perilously close to violating rules, norms, or authority?
4. What was your most significant act of procrastination? By this I mean

a time when you didn't face up to a situation that got steadily worse, resulting in a mess.

5. Do you recall a time when you had the rug pulled out from under you - A situation when you had everything ready to go and the door was slammed shut?
6. Were you ever worn out or fed up but managed to restart?
7. Did you ever learn a great truth that turned out to be a falsehood? That is, was there ever a case where you thought you had learned something significant but later found out it wasn't so?
8. Was there a situation you took very seriously at the time but were able to laugh about it months (or years) later?

C. <u>The Role of Other People</u>

1. Please describe the person who taught you the most during your career. What did that person do that made him or her so special?
2. Most of us have worked for a person we simply couldn't tolerate for one reason or another. What did you learn from such an experience?
3. What part have events in your personal life played in your growth as a manager?
4. What about being a manager has been fun for you? What are some examples of situations or events you particularly enjoyed? That were the most fun?
5. What advice would you give a young manager about managing his or her career? What do you need to do for yourself? How much should you let others do for you (or to you)?

6. What is the most significant thing you have learned as an adult - the one thing you would pass on to someone if you could?
7. What is next? Are you facing a situation now from which you expect to learn something new?

PARTICIPANT PROFILE

Participant[1]	Degree	Highest Position	Years in Position	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth	Seventh
RU1	PhD	Chief Academic Affairs Officer	6.0	Faculty Member	Interim Depart. Head	Associate Dean	Associate Chancellor	Dean, Arts & Sciences	Vice Chancellor	
RU2	MS	Chief Student	15.0	Assistant Dean	Director, Student Activities	Dean, Student Activities	Associate Vice, Chancellor, Student Activities	Vice Chancellor		
DGU1	PhD	Chief Academic Affairs Officer	8.5	Faculty Member	Department Head	Dean, Arts & Sciences	Vice President			
DGU2	EdS	Chief Student Affairs Officer	7.0	Admissions Counselor	Coord., Minority Engineering	Assistant Vice President, Student Affairs	Vice President			
CCU1	PhD	Chief Academic Affairs Officer	9.0	Depart. Chair/ Faculty Member	Graduate Assistant	Faculty Member	Department Chair	Associate Dean Arts & Sciences	Vice President/ Provost	
CCU2	EdD	Chief Student Affairs Officer	4.0	Residence Hall Director / Director of Intramurals	Residence Life Director	Assistant Dean of Students	Residence Life Coordinator	Coordinator of Residence	Dean of Student Affairs	Vice President
TICC1	EdD	Chief Academic Affairs Officer	2.5	High School Teacher	High School Principal	Associate Dean, Evening School & Distance Ed.	School Super-intendent (Elected)	Faculty Member	Division Chair, Behavioral Sciences	Vice President
TI CC2	EdD	Chief StudentH Affairs Officer	18.0	High School Teacher	High School Principal	School Superin-tendent (Elected)	Director, Continuing Education	Director, Admissions & Records	Dean, Student Affairs	Vice President

[1]Definition of abbreviations: (Carnegie Classifications, 1987):

RU	Research University I
DGU	Doctoral-Granting University II
CCU	Comprehensive College/University II
TYCC	Two-Year Community, Junior & Technical College

Appendix F

PARTICIPANT PROFILE BY CHIEF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS OFFICERS
RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

Institution	Education	Years in Position	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth	Seventh
RU1	PhD	6	Faculty Member	Interim Dept. Head	Associate Dean	Associate Chancellor	Dean	Vice Chancellor*	
DGU1	PhD	8.5	Faculty Member	Department Head	Dean*	Vice President*			
CCU1	PhD	9	Department Chair/ Faculty Member	Graduate Assistant*	Faculty Member	Department Chair	Associate Dean	Vice President/ Provost	
TYCC1	PhD	2.5	High School Teacher	High School Principal	Associate Dean*	School Super-intendent (Elected)	Faculty Member	Division Chair	Vice President

*Changed institutions

Appendix G

PARTICIPANT PROFILE BY CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS
RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

Institution	Education	Years in Position	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth	Seventh
RU2	MS	15	Assistant Dean of Students	Director, Student Activities	Dean, Student Activities	Associate Vice Chan. Student Activities	Vice Chanclellor		
DGU2	EdS	7	Admissions Counselor	Coordinator, Minority Engineering	Assistant Vice President, Student Affairs	Vice President			
CCU2	EdD	4	Residence Hall Director	Residence Life Director*	Assistant Dean of Students	Residence Life Coord.*	Coordinator Residence Halls*	Dean for Student Affairs	Vice President
TYCC2	EdD	18	High School Teacher	High School Principal	School Superinten- (Elected)	Director, Continuing Education	Director, Admissions & Records	Dean for Student Affairs	Vice President

*Changed Institutions

COMPARISON OF LESSONS OF EXPERIENCE

SETTING AND IMPLEMENTING AGENDAS
1. Technical and professional skills
2. All about the business one is in
3. Strategic thinking
4. Building and using structure and control systems
5. Innovative problem-solving methods

HANDLING RELATIONSHIPS
1. Handling political situations
2. Getting people to implement solutions
3. What executives are like
4. Strategies of negotiation
5. Dealing with people over whom you have no authority
6. Understanding other people's perspectives
7. Dealing with conflict
8. Developing other people
9. Confronting subordinate performance problems
10. Managing former boses and peers

BASIC VALUES
1. You can't manage everything all alone
2. Sensitivity to the human side of management
3. Basic management values

EXECUTIVE TEMPERAMENT
1. Being tough when necessary
2. Self-confidence
3. Coping with situations beyond your control
4. Persevering through adversity
5. Coping with ambiguous situations
6. Use (and abuse) of power

PERSONAL AWARENESS
1. The balance between work and personal life
2. Knowing what really excites you about work
3. Personal limits and blind spots
4. Taking charge of your career
5. Recognizing and seizing opportunities

McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (Fig. 1-2, p. 7)

KNOWLEDGE OF LEADERSHIP FUNDAMENTALS
1. Administrative work is challenging
2. Hard work pays off
3. Risk-taking is necessary
4. Seek and accept new opportunities and challenges
7. Mistakes will be made; learn from them
8. Failures will occur
10. Change is a constant
12. Problems do not solve themselves
13. Politics is a given

KNOWLEDGE OF OTHERS
6. Consensus-building is important
9. Success is achieved through working with others
14. Treat others with respect, fairness, consistency
16. Identify good people and develop them
18. Respect must be earned daily
20. Get to know your employees
22. Learn to communicate with multiple constituencies
23. Accept and embrace diversity
27. Trust must be given before it is received
35. Employees don't work for you; they work with you

KNOWLEDGE OF ROLE
3. Understand your role
5. Learn to collect, check and present data
17. Learn to delegate responsibility
21. Two-way communication is necessary
24. Learn patience, but be persistent
26. Learn to function with business-like detachment
31. If a situation is untenable, take action

KNOWLEDGE OF SELF
15. Learn when to take a break and unwind
25. Do not take criticism personally
32. Mentors are helpful

KNOWLEDGE OF LEADERSHIP
11. Know when a battle is lost
19. Learn your operation
28. If a recommendation is not accepted, forget about it and move on
29. Decision-making is difficult
30. Maintenance of the institution's integrity is paramount
33. Become a "go-to" individual
34. Priorities shift

LESSONS OF EXPERIENCE

1. Administrative work is challenging.
2. Hard work pays off.
3. Understand your role.
4. Seek and accept new opportunities and challenges.
5. Learn to collect, check, and present data.
6. Consensus-building is important.
7. Mistakes will be made; learn from them.
8. Failures will occur.
9. Success is achieved through working with others.
10. Change is a constant.
11. Know when a battle is lost.
12. Problems do not solve themselves.
13. Politics is a given.
14. Treat others with respect, fairness, and consistency.
15. Learn when to take a break and unwind.
16. Identify good people and develop them.
17. Learn to delegate responsibility.
18. Respect must be earned daily.
19. Learn your operation.
20. Get to know your employees.
21. Two-work communication is necessary.
22. Learn to communicate with multiple constituencies
23. Accept and embrace diversity.
24. Learn patience, but be persistent.
25. Do not take criticism personally.
26. Learn to function with business-like detachment.
27. Trust must be given before it is received.
28. If a recommendation is not accepted, forget about it and move on.
29. Decision-making is difficult.
30. Maintenance of the institution's integrity is paramount.
31. If a situation is untenable, take action.
32. Mentors are helpful.
33. Become a "go-to" individual.
34. Priorities shift.
35. Employees don't work for you; they work with you.

LESSONS CATEGORIZED BY THEMATIC AREA

KNOWLEDGE OF LEADERSHIP FUNDAMENTALS

1. Administrative work is challenging
2. Hard work pays off
4. Seek and accept new opportunities and challenges
7. Mistakes will be made; learn from them
8. Failures will occur
10. Change is a constant
12. Problems do not solve themselves
13. Politics is a given

KNOWLEDGE OF OTHERS

6. Consensus-building is important
9. Success is achieved through working with others
14. Treat others with respect, fairness, and consistency
16. Identify good people and develop them
18. Respect must be earned daily
20. Get to know your employees
22. Learn to communicate with multiple constituencies
23. Accept and embrace diversity
34. Trust must be given before it is received
35. Employees don't work for you; they work with you

KNOWLEDGE OF ROLE

3. Understand your role
5. Learn to collect, check, and present data
17. Learn to delegate responsibility
21. Two-way communication is necessary
24. Learn patience, but be persistent
26. Learn to function with business-like detachment
31. If a situation is untenable, take action

KNOWLEDGE OF SELF

15. Learn when to take a break and unwind
25. Do not take criticism personally
32. Mentors are helpful

KNOWLEDGE OF LEADERSHIP

11. Know when a battle is lost
19. Learn your operation
28. If a recommendation is not accepted, forget about it and move on
29. Decision-making is difficult
30. Maintenance of the institution's integrity is paramount
33. Become a "go-to" individual
34. Priorities shift

Appendix K

POTENTIAL LESSONS OF EXPERIENCE IDENTIFIED BY MCCALL, LOMBARDO, AND MORRISON (1988)

SETTING AND IMPLEMENTING AGENDAS

1. Technical and professional skills
2. All about the business one is in
3. Strategic thinking
4. Building and using structure and control systems
5. Innovative problem-solving methods

HANDLING RELATIONSHIPS

1. Handling political situations
2. Getting people to implement solutions
3. What executives are like
4. Strategies of negotiation
5. Dealing with people over whom you have no authority
6. Understanding other people's perspectives
7. Dealing with conflict
8. Developing other people
9. Confronting subordinate performance problems
10. Managing former bosses and peers

BASIC VALUES

1. You can't manage everything all along
2. Sensitivity to the human side of management
3. Basic management values

EXECUTIVE TEMPERAMENT

1. Being tough when necessary
2. Self confidence
3. Coping with situations beyond your control
4. Persevering through adversity
5. Coping with ambiguous situations
6. Use (and abuse) of power

PERSONAL AWARENESS

1. The balance between work and personal life
2. Knowing what really excites you about work
3. Personal limits and blind spots
4. Taking charge of your career
5. Recognizing and seizing opportunities

McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (Fig. 1-2, p. 7)

VITA

Michael R. Herbstritt was born in Erie, Pennsylvania on July 4, 1952. He attended parochial schools in the Erie dioceses and graduated from a private, catholic preparatory school in June, 1970. He entered Gannon University in Erie, Pennsylvania in September of 1970, and in May of 1975 he received his Bachelor of Arts in Psychology. In the Fall of 1975 he entered the Master's program in Industrial/Organization Psychology at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. During his studies towards his Master's degree, he accepted a position in the campus' Personnel Office. However, in March of 1979, he relocated to Denver, Colorado to accept an offer of employment, and as a result did not complete his studies for a Master's degree. During his tenure in Denver, he began attending the University of Phoenix, Denver Branch, in August of 1982 to pursue a Master of Arts degree in Human Resource Management, which was awarded in October of 1983. In November of 1983 he relocated to Knoxville, Tennessee to accept a position in Human Resources for the Knoxville campus. In August of 1988 he began his studies to pursue the Doctorate of Education in Leadership Studies and continued to work for the University. The doctoral degree was received August of 1999.

He is presently working for the Knoxville campus of The University of Tennessee as an Assistant Director of Human Resources where he has the responsibility to oversee the campus' cash compensation, employment and recruitment, and employee relations programs.