

University of Missouri, St. Louis

IRL @ UMSL

---

Dissertations

UMSL Graduate Works

---

12-14-2011

## LEADERSHIP STYLES OF FEMALE SENIOR STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS

Montague Theresa Orinthia

*University of Missouri-St. Louis*, [drmontague1@gmail.com](mailto:drmontague1@gmail.com)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://irl.umsl.edu/dissertation>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Orinthia, Montague Theresa, "LEADERSHIP STYLES OF FEMALE SENIOR STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS" (2011). *Dissertations*. 393.

<https://irl.umsl.edu/dissertation/393>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the UMSL Graduate Works at IRL @ UMSL. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of IRL @ UMSL. For more information, please contact [marvinh@umsl.edu](mailto:marvinh@umsl.edu).

# LEADERSHIP STYLES OF FEMALE SENIOR STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS

by

Orinthia T. Montague

M.A., Counseling, Lindenwood University, 1998

B.A., Interpersonal Communication, Truman State University, 1990

A Dissertation submitted to The Graduate School at the University of Missouri – St. Louis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

March 2011

## Advisory Committee

Patricia Boyer, Ph.D.  
Chairperson

Shawn Woodhouse, Ph.D.

Sheilah-Clarke-Ekong, Ph.D.

Dwayne Smith, Ph.D.

Copyright, Orinthia T. Montague, 2011

LEADERSHIP STYLES OF FEMALE SENIOR STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS

BY

ORINTHIA THERESA MONTAGUE

B.A., Truman State University, 1990.

M.A., Lindenwood University, 1998.

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Education  
In the Graduate School of the  
University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2010

St. Louis, Missouri

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the self-reported leadership styles of female Senior Student Affairs Officers at public and private 4-year institutions. This study sought to determine if (a) there is a dominant leadership frame usage among female SSAO's, (b) determine if leadership style varies significantly among females with less than 5 years of experience in the profession as compared to those with 5 or more years of experience in the profession and (c) identify whether multi-frame leadership style usage differs between female SSAOs at public and private 4-year institutions.

This study employed a cross-sectional research design through the use of a structured response survey, Bolman and Deal's Leadership Orientation Survey (LOS). The LOS assists individuals in determining the degree to which they utilize each of the four leadership frames. The sample consisted of 347 SSAOs who responded to the *Leadership Orientation – Self* survey.

The findings revealed that leadership frame usage among SSAOs at public and private 4-year institutions had similar response patterns with human resources being the primary frame identified. Findings of this study demonstrating a preference for a human resources approach by the SSAOs is consistent with prior research conducted using Bolman and Deal's leadership frames. The respondents also scored similarly on the four leadership frames indicating no statistical multi-frame leadership dominance. This finding was in contradiction to previous research which utilized Bolman and Deal's frame theory. Finally, SSAOs scored similarly on the LOS regardless of the number of years of experience in the profession.

## DEDICATION

This dissertation is in dedicated to my parents

Aubrey G. and Linda M. Montague

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is hard to believe that the time has arrived. First, I would like to thank my committee members Dr. Sheilah Clarke Ekong, Dr. Dwyane Smith and Dr. Shawn Woodhouse. There is a saying about standing on the shoulders of giants. I appreciate everything you all have done to elevate me. I hope to continue making you proud. To my chairperson Dr. Patricia Boyer, so many times I felt as if I could not go on. And yet here I am because of your words of encouragement and nurturing.

Second, this is not a personal accomplishment but rather a group achievement. I have had so much assistance and support in this pursuit and I am afraid to list everyone lest I forget someone. However, here goes – sisters and brothers, Aunt Pat & Pappa Dennis, Joan, Sandy, Mark, and Sharon & Calvin. My nieces (Jennifer, Jada & Aubrey Lin), nephews (Nigel, Christopher, Edward, Alex & Alan) and cousin (Sherifa). Uncle Doc, Uncle Owen and Aunty Daisy. My kids, Brian, Martise, Analise & Chris. My wonderful mother-in-law, Patricia McGhee and my brother-in-law, Manfred McGhee. My other sisters & brother – Natissia, Tanisha, Helen, & Bernard . My other mothers (Mrs. Linda Royal and Mrs. Mertha). And a host of friends – Gloria Schultz, Tony Georges, Olivia, Toby, Sharon, Sherrone, Heather, Tina, Jeri, Niecy, Regina, Mark and many, many others.

Last but not least, THANK YOU to my loving husband Michael. Your belief in me has been unwavering. You patiently supported me in this pursuit with many kind words and massages to relieve the stress. You are one awesome “Honey Bunny”.

## Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: Introduction.....	1
Student Affairs.....	1
Background of Study.....	3
Problem Statement.....	6
Research Questions.....	7
Purpose of Study.....	7
Significance of Study.....	8
Definition of Terms.....	8
Organization of Study.....	10
CHAPTER 2: Review of Literature.....	11
Introduction.....	12
Leadership Overview.....	14
Length of Time in Position.....	15
Women in Leadership.....	16
Perspectives on women's leadership.....	16
Theoretical Framework.....	22
Bolman and Deal's Organizational Frames.....	22
Four Leadership Frames.....	22
Higher education leadership and multiple frames.....	28
Conclusion.....	32
CHAPTER 3: Methodology.....	34
Introduction.....	34
Research Design.....	35
Instrumentation.....	35
Questionnaire.....	37
Research population and sample.....	39

IRB approval and participant consent.....	40
Data collection.....	40
Data Analysis.....	42
Limitations.....	43
Summary.....	43
CHAPTER 4: Results.....	44
Sample Description.....	45
Leadership Style.....	47
Research Question 1.....	49
Research Question 2.....	52
Research Question 3.....	54
Summary.....	57
CHAPTER 5: Conclusion.....	59
Introduction.....	59
Summary of Study.....	61
Discussion of Results.....	63
Implications and Recommendations.....	66
Conclusion.....	69
References.....	71
Appendix A: Survey Instrument.....	82
Appendix C: University of Missouri –St. Louis IRB.....	83
Appendix D: Permission to Use Survey.....	85



## Chapter 1

### Introduction

#### **Student Affairs**

The concept of student affairs first began during the 17th century in early American colleges. The early model for American universities and colleges was based upon the English model of higher education that emphasized a residential approach (Rudolph, 1962). The English model adopted an approach to educating the entire student that emphasized the intellectual, moral, spiritual, and social development of students (Rudolph, 1962). The term for this approach is *in loco parentis*, which means “in place of the parent.” With this approach, faculty members were primarily responsible for the well-being of the students.

The use of *in loco parentis* continued until the late 19th century (Fenske, 1989). After the Civil War, however, when the Germanic research model of higher education became more widespread, faculty members who were first responsible for the well-being of students began to engage in scholarship and research (Delworth & Hanson, 1989). During this transition, the first dean of students position was developed (Delworth & Hanson, 1989). As this position continued to evolve in the early 1900s, the dean of women position was introduced (Mathews, 1915). Professionals who assumed the role of dean of women were responsible for the collegiate women’s physical, moral, social, and sexual lives on campus (Schwartz, 1997; Tuttle, 1996). The dean of women position also allowed for the initial entry of women into administration within the academy (Mathews, 1915).

The organizational leaders in the dean of women positions were able to view their work environment through a lens that was just as unique as the various women for whom they had the responsibility to lead (Mathew, 1915). These female deans were leaders within the field of student affairs for more than a century, but there is limited research on the leadership framework they utilized (Benjamin, 1997; Fleming, 1983).

Rosener (1990) argued that the leadership styles of women are vastly different from those of men. As an example, Helgesen (1990) stated that women are likely to emphasize frequent contact and information sharing, whereas men typically lead from a hierarchical approach. In essence, women generally lead using a multiple frame approach. According to Lombard (1971), organizational leaders—including higher education professionals—should employ multiple lenses to view situations from different perspectives. Lombard's research further indicated that diverse approaches to leadership will benefit higher education institutions by providing the opportunity for greater understanding and appreciation of differences. Wong (1991) stated that these differences should be seen as an “intriguing variation we seek to understand” (p. 59). Leaders who apply a multiframe perspective in an organizational setting are characterized as leaders who recognize and promote diversity among various groups within the organization.

In a study conducted by West (1993), the researcher compared different styles of leadership among individuals in a corporate setting. That research study was one of the first to compare leadership styles using race and ethnicity, but few studies have examined how women lead within educational institutions. The available research suggests that women in higher education may utilize different leadership styles than men, as identified previously in the research conducted by Rosener (1990) and Helgeson (1990).

## **Background of Study**

Higher education leaders will face many challenges in the 21st century (Sandeem, 1991), especially as the American student population continues to grow rapidly in regard to diversity in age, race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, and academic interests. Currently more than 18 million individuals are seeking undergraduate and graduate degrees at public and private U.S. postsecondary institutions, and more than 5 million additional students are enrolled in noncredit courses (ACE, 2009). The demographics of the college population have also shifted; the majority of undergraduate students are now women and one third represent racial or ethnic minorities (ACE, 2009). According to the Center for Education Statistics (2010), women comprised 57% of all degree seeking undergraduate students in 2008. These changes in the demographics of students attending college are not reflected in the administrative leadership of colleges.

Historically, males have been overrepresented in the leadership of higher education. Administrative leadership has reflected an era during which the majority of individuals attending college were predominantly White and male (Sullivan, 2001). According to Wheeler and Tack (1989), most top academic positions are occupied by men because of negative perceptions of women and their perceived lack of capacity for effective leadership. Gender-based concepts of leadership indicate that characteristics stereotypically assigned to men—such as being aggressive, highly self-confident, task oriented and assertive—have been associated with male leaders. In contrast, female leaders are identified as exhibiting characteristics such as kindness, human relation skills, and nurturing (Stodgill & Coons, 1973). The stereotypical assignment of such leadership

characteristics to women may explain why females do not occupy college and university leadership positions.

Prior research on student affairs has revealed a gender gap among persons in the position of senior student affairs officers (SSAOs) (Bashaw, 1999). SSAOs play important roles in the institutions they represent and in the lives of the students (Astin, 1973; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). The responsibilities of these individuals include assisting student in their adjustment to college by providing opportunities for continued developmental growth experiences external to the classroom. SSAOs are the members of educational institutions' executive administration who are responsible for everything pertaining to the general welfare of the student body (Boland 1994; Rooney & Shaw, 1996). Their views of students, their educational knowledge, and their social expectations of individuals are often varied and can be influenced by factors such as the number of years in the profession and how leadership theory influences their beliefs and practices.

Research by Rickard (1985) and Howard-Hamilton and Williams (1992) indicated that males more often than females are promoted to senior leadership positions. Tull and Freeman (2008) reported that males held 55% of SSAO positions, in comparison to females who held 45% of those positions. This finding represented a significant increase from 22% in 1984 to 45% in 2006 in female SSAO leaders (ACE, 2007). Administrative leadership on college and university campuses should ideally reflect the demographic changes, especially gender, in college enrollment. Wong (1991) suggested the following:

We need to create an academic community where people with different backgrounds view each other as having similar needs, similar aspirations, and similar problems but with different ways of manifesting them. In this kind of community . . . differences are viewed with interest and curiosity rather than hostility and suspicion. In such a community, cultural differences are regarded not as a dehumanizing stereotype but as an intriguing variation that we seek to understand. In doing so, we enlarge both our understanding and our humanity. (p. 53)

While males of various backgrounds are disproportionately represented in the exclusive inner circle of upper leadership, women have found acceptance at more than 4,000 public and private colleges and universities across the United States. Less than half of these institutions have employed females to occupy the role of SSAO (HED, 2009). Given that more females are enrolled in higher education institutions and potentially earn degrees at a pace exceeding that of men, there is a need to examine the reasons why greater numbers of women are not employed in senior leadership roles. One assumption might be that women are not employed at the same level because of how they are viewed as leaders. Chliwniak (1997) contended that women's leadership styles create collegial, process-oriented environments, and men's leadership styles focus on hierarchy and outcomes. Chliwniak's view was consistent with Bolman and Deal's theory regarding leadership styles.

Bolman and Deal (1991, 2003) formulated their theory of organizational frames by drawing upon leadership approaches derived from various disciplines. Educational leaders represented an important segment of their work, which spanned various

organizational sectors. Several sources consider Bolman and Deal's theory an excellent paradigm for exploring leadership in higher education (Bentley, Zhao, Reames, & Reed, 2004; Monahan, 2004; Mosser & Walls, 2002; Sullivan, 2001; Thompson, 2000, 2005; Yerkes, Cuellar, & Cuellar, 1992; Zhang, DeMichele, & Connaughton, 2004).

### **Problem Statement**

Women hold fewer senior student affairs leadership positions than men (Howard-Hamilton & Williams, 1992; Rickard, 1985). Research on leadership suggests this is due to how they lead. Previous research indicated that females tend to lead using the human resource frame as a management philosophy while men tend to lead using the political frame (Weddle, 1992); however, it is unclear in the literature how women lead, especially those who are SSAOs. Also, existing research does not address whether the number of years in the profession impacts how women SSAOs lead. Therefore, research is needed to better understand this phenomenon. The presence of females occupying SSAO positions should be sizeable in number in order to promote balanced leadership between genders (Glazer-Raymo-1999; Morley, 1999) and to provide an ideal model with which women who aspire to senior leadership positions can identify. Institutions must utilize this balance as a tool to provide mentors and role models for females who will become the leaders of tomorrow. Research is limited on the leadership styles of women who currently occupy senior leadership positions in student affairs.

### **Research Questions**

Bolman and Deal's Leadership Orientation Inventory (LOS) will be used to determine the self-reported leadership styles of female SSAOs. This tool can aid in

identifying which of the four leadership styles (structural, political, symbolic, and human resources) an individual is more predisposed to utilize in working with students and managing individuals within student affairs. This study will aim to answer the following questions utilizing Bolman and Deal's LOS self-report instrument:

RQ1: Is there a dominant leadership frame among females who are SSAOs employed at 4-year public and private institutions?

RQ2: Is there a statistically significant difference between female SSAOs who have adopted a multiframe leadership style at 4-year public institutions compared to SSAOs at 4-year private institutions?

RQ3: Is there a statistically significant difference in frame usage among females SSAOs with less than 5 years of experience in the profession compared to those with five years or more of experience in the profession at 4-year public and private institutions?

### **Purpose of Study**

Bolman and Deal's four-frame theory of leadership will be used in this study to examine the self-reported leadership styles of female SSAOs at public and private 4-year institutions. The purpose of this examination will be to (a) determine if there is a dominant leadership frame, (b) determine if leadership styles vary between females with 5 or more years experience as SSAOs and those with fewer years of experience, and (c) identify whether multiframe leadership style usage differs between those individuals at public and private institutions.

## **Significance of Study**

College and university administrators who are responsible for providing leadership for and managing students must be aware of how their own perceptions or biases may influence their leadership styles. Having insight regarding their leadership styles allows leaders to exercise flexibility based upon the needs of the individual or group. An understanding of gender differences could improve the advancement of women in organizational leadership (Freedman & Phillips, 1988). This is increasingly important as more women assume leadership positions in student affairs administration. McDade (1989) stated that as the number of women in institutions of higher education continues to increase, “these women must take their rightful place in higher education leadership” (p. 39).

As the number of women who pursue a postsecondary education continually increases, it is only natural to expect that SSAO leaders would adopt the leadership styles necessary to manage the very segment of the population they represent. According to Tucker (1980), the lack of women administrators must change if institutions expect to serve their diverse constituents. The results of this study can provide college administrators, especially those within student affairs, with critical information to assist them in utilizing leadership styles that are crucial in addressing the needs of diverse, complex, and ever-evolving campus populations.

## **Definition of Terms**

The terms identified below are used throughout this study. The definitions provided are standard and basic.



*Ethnicity* is defined as those human groups that entertain a subjective belief in their common descent because of similarities of physical type or of customs or both, or because of memories of colonization and migration. This belief must be important for group formation. It does not matter whether an objective blood relationship exists (Weber, 1978).

*Human resource frame* is an approach based particularly on ideas from psychology. This approach sees an organization as much like an extended family, inhabited by individuals who have needs, feelings, prejudices, skills, and limitations (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

*Leadership style* describes the behaviors exhibited by an individual who is in charge. Multiple behaviors may be exhibited, which would indicate multiframe usage.

*Multiframe leadership* is based on the assumption that an individual is not predisposed to utilizing one frame over another in his or her leadership style.

*Political frame* is based on the assumption that organizations are coalitions of diverse individuals with values, beliefs, and perceptions of reality that differ. They make important decisions that allocate scarce resources. The allocation of resources and the diverse differences cause conflict and define power as an important asset. Coalition members use bargaining and negotiation to define goals and decisions (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

*SSAOs* are individuals in executive leadership positions of the functional areas that comprise a student affairs division or department. These individuals are generally

members of the chancellor's or president's cabinet, with responsibilities for advocating policies and procedures on behalf of students.

*Structural frame* is based on the assumption that leaders of an organization emphasize goals, specialized roles, and formal relationships. Organizations divide tasks among members and create rules, policies, procedures, and hierarchies to unify the work and support the mission (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

*Symbolic frame* draws on social and cultural anthropology and treats organizations as tribes, theaters, or carnivals. This approach sees organizations as cultures, propelled more by rituals, ceremonies, stories, heroes, and myths than by rules, policies, and managerial authority (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

### **Organization of Study**

This dissertation is organized as follows: Chapter 1 provides an introduction and identifies the need for the research, background of the study, problem statement, purpose of the study, research questions, and definition of terms. Chapter 2 provides a review of literature and serves as a contextual foundation for this study. Chapter 3 identifies the methodology utilized for the study, including a descriptive review of the survey instrument. Chapter 4 presents data findings. Chapter 5 addresses the implications and limitations of the study, as well as recommendations for additional research.

## **Chapter 2**

### **Literature Review**

#### **Introduction**

Historically, leadership in higher education has been overwhelmingly male (June, 2007; Sullivan, 2001). Since the 1980s, however, women have made significant inroads into higher levels of leadership. While the figures show definite room for improvement at the uppermost levels, there is a clear and positive upward trend. In 1986, women comprised less than 10% of all college presidents, increasing to 23% in 2006 (Jaschik, 2008). Among senior administrators, women represent 31% of executive vice presidents, 38% of provosts or chief academic officers, 35.5% of academic deans, 49.1% of senior external affairs officers, 45.4% of chief student affairs officers, and 55.6% of chief diversity officers, for an overall total of 44.6%.

For women who aspire to senior leadership, the most notable feature of the new demographics is the age of the current incumbents. Today's college leaders are older than those of any prior generation, thus signaling an approaching wave of retirements (Jaschik, 2008; June, 2008). While some observers worry about a shrinking pipeline in higher education leadership, others see unprecedented opportunities for women to rise to the top (Jaschik, 2008; June, 2008; Sullivan, 2001). These new leaders must be able to utilize a broad array of leadership skills and to demonstrate their ability through years of experience.

Rosser (2004) describes women, who are largely concentrated in positions as midlevel administrators, as "the unsung professionals of the academy" (p. 317).

Elaborating on that statement, Rosser declared they are “unsung because their contributions to the academic enterprise are rarely recognized, and professional because of their commitment, training, and adherence to high standards of performance and excellence in their areas of expertise” (p. 317). According to Hamilton (2004), student affairs administrators tend to agree with Rosser’s (2004) portrayal of this group, citing that these administrators are often overlooked and little research exists documenting the careers of these individuals. Although student affairs officers have distinctive positions, they serve in boundary-spanning capacities with multiple roles, responsibilities, and constituents. Student affairs administrators, in particular SSAOs, are the focus of the present study.

There is general consensus among student affairs professionals that their work is indispensable to the operations of academic institutions because they are the front-line leaders in colleges and universities. Student affairs professionals spend 80% of their time interacting with students and assisting them with virtually all aspects of personal and academic development (Hamilton, 2004, p. 38). Executing the demands of the multiple roles requires a good understanding of the complexities of campus leadership and a broad repertoire of leadership and managerial skills. The most successful leaders are adept at synthesizing best practices of various models of leadership. The integration of elements from different leadership perspectives is central to the organizational frames developed by Bolman and Deal (2003).

## **Leadership Overview**

Since antiquity, individuals have researched the character and behaviors of leaders. The formal study of leadership as a social scientific discipline dates back to the early 1930s (House & Aditya, 1997). Since then, the topic has generated an immense body of literature, but oddly enough no agreed-upon definition of leadership (Vroom & Jago, 2007). According to Bass (as cited in Vroom & Jago, 2007), “there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept” (p. 17).

As more women began entering the business world in the 1970s, researchers began to explore whether gender differences existed in leadership styles and leadership effectiveness (Aldoory & Toth, 2004). Some feminist scholars have contended that there is a female advantage or feminine leadership style that contrasts with traditional masculine notions of power and hierarchy (Billing & Alvesson, 2000; Eagly, 2007; Sullivan, 2001). There is little empirical support, however, and the idea that there is a distinct female or feminine leadership style has been harshly criticized for reinforcing stereotypes while ignoring the numerous individual differences in the experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of women and men in positions of leadership (Billing & Alvesson, 2000; Parker, 2005). Additionally, no existing research addresses whether the type of institution, such as public versus private, plays a role in the determination of leadership style usage.

The idea that there are feminine and masculine leadership styles is one more illustration of the dualism that has historically pervaded the study of leadership.

Common examples include the juxtaposition of “task-oriented versus relationship-oriented leadership, autocratic versus participative leadership, leadership versus management, transformational versus transactional leadership, and charismatic versus non-charismatic leadership” (Yukl, 1999, p. 34).

Task-oriented leadership stresses structure and tasks at hand, whereas relationship-oriented leadership emphasizes consideration of the opinion of subordinates (Maitra, 2007). Autocratic leadership discourages the participation of subordinates, in contrast to participative leadership that allows participation in organizational decision making. Transactional leaders attempt to create a balance between the needs of the organization and those of the individuals within the institution (Gardner, 1990). On the other hand, transformational leaders emphasize justice, equality, and values as a method of empowering their followers (Yukl, 1981). Charismatic leadership emphasizes personal characteristics an individual uses to influence others. In leadership versus management, leaders utilize multidirectional influence in relationships and managers typically utilize unidirectional authority (Ricketts, 2009).

According to Yukl (1981), “these dichotomies provide some insights, but they also oversimplify a complex phenomenon and encourage stereotyping of individual leaders” (p. 34). A major shift in conceptualizations of leadership occurred following the publication of Burns’ 1978 book, *Leadership*, which outlined the principles of transformational leadership and contrasted them with transactional leadership. Transactional leadership emphasizes honest bargaining for valued things (Yukl, 1981). A leader utilizing this style is able to balance the demands of the organization and the needs of the individuals within that organization (Gardner, 1990). Transformational leadership

emphasizes a shared vision between the leader and the followers (Gardner, 1990; Yukl, 1984). Transformational leadership has four elements: individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence. Individualized consideration allows leaders to attend to each follower's needs while serving in the role of a coach or mentor (Barbuto, 2005). Leaders utilizing intellectual stimulation encourage creativity and seek input and ideas from followers (Barbuto, 2005). Inspirational motivation leaders are able to inspire and challenge followers with their articulation of a vision (Barbuto, 2005). Idealized influence style leaders model behaviors that inspire others to follow (Barbuto, 2005).

Bass and Avolio (1994) operationalized the components of transformational and transactional leadership for the purpose of analyzing leadership style. The authors recognized that good leadership has both transformational and transactional components. Bass' full range model captures the full spectrum of transformational and transactional leadership behaviors (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999).

### **Length of Time in Position**

There is an absence of existing literature on SSAOs that discusses length of time in a position and its impact on leadership style. Existing research that addresses length of time and leadership style in higher education focuses primarily on those within academic administration.

According to Wolverton et al. (1999), men and women spend an average of 6 and 5 years, respectively, in their positions. Simon (1987) contended that leaders with experience have more information with which to make leadership decisions. Birnbaum

(1992) stated that “leaders with many years of professional experience can be assumed to utilize multiple approaches to leadership” (p.261).

## **Women in Leadership**

### *Perspectives on women’s leadership.*

Within the past 20 years, women’s leadership has been portrayed from the paradoxical perspective of a presumed feminine advantage and a practical disadvantage of having to overcome obstacles to occupying positions of leadership (Eagly, 2007). Sullivan’s (2001) vision of the future of college leadership was based on the premise that as more women rise to positions of executive leadership, there will be a shift toward nurturing and collaborative modes of leadership. Amey (2006) envisioned the same transition but from the cognitive standpoint of altering mental models. Kanter (1977) contended that when women were mentored by men, the managers tended to promote those who resembled themselves in manner and style. Therefore, women who attained SSAO positions may have displayed more traditional masculine leadership.

Parker (2005) disputed feminist scholars who presented a model of feminine leadership in opposition to traditional masculine leadership, arguing that the model does nothing more than perpetuate dualistic thinking and ignores “the diversity among women’s (or men’s) experiences that shape leadership knowledge” (p. 8). From Parker’s perspective, the idea of a feminine leadership style that eschews power and promotes interdependence is a reflection of the socialization experiences of a select group of predominately White, middle-class women that ignores the experiences of women of color and of different social classes. Ironically, the feminine leadership paradigm is often



presented as a vehicle for increasing the presence of women of color in college leadership (Sullivan, 2001).

The scholarly concept of feminine leadership is based on the idea that women favor transformational leadership. Eagly (2007) viewed transformational leadership as a way that women could resolve any perceived incongruity between the traditional female gender role and the exercise of leadership authority. She pointed out that feminist scholars stress the communal and collaborative aspect of transformational leadership. It is a misconception, however, to equate transformational leadership with participative or collaborative leadership (Bass, 1999). In reality, transformational leaders can be directive as well as participative. Emphasizing any one dimension of leadership over another ignores the practical need to adapt one's leadership style to the demands of the situation (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Upon completing a critical and comprehensive review of the literature, Billing and Alvesson (2000) concluded that there are several problems with the concept of feminine leadership. First and most important, the idea lacks empirical support. There is no evidence that most women in positions of authority lead in a manner distinct from that of men. Second, the concept is based on traditional gender divisions of labor where women and men exercise authority in different settings (i.e., family and workplace). Third, the concept simply reinforces gender stereotypes. Fourth, the concept overgeneralizes the value and relevance of skills for managing in the home to managing in an organizational setting. Fifth, the concept sets a standard for female managers that might have some positive features but in reality constrains how they should act. Sixth, the concept defines women mainly as managers of emotions and relationships.

Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) explored gender differences in leadership styles by reviewing and analyzing the existing research. In an extensive research review, the authors concluded that the empirical literature “yields a pattern of findings that is more complex than is generally acknowledged by social scientists or writers of popular books on management” (p. 794). Their most intriguing finding was that the magnitude of the difference depended upon whether the study involved *real* leaders. The most gender-stereotyped behaviors were observed in experimental studies. A lesser effect appeared in assessment studies where participants who were not in leadership positions completed questionnaires assessing their leadership style. Finally, the smallest differences were found in studies of organizational managers.

At the same time, even the organizational studies showed evidence that women displayed more democratic leadership styles than men did (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). A possible explanation was that women were more likely to meet with resistance if they were overtly directive. There was also evidence that women outscored men on the transformational leadership dimension of individualized consideration, which is consistent with traditional feminine gender role socialization. Women also scored higher on intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation, as well as transactional contingent reward leadership. Factor analysis of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) revealed a distinct association between individualized consideration and contingent reward leadership (Avolio et al., 1999).

Building on the findings of Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001), Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of research comparing women and men on the full range of transformational and transactional

leadership qualities. In total, 45 studies were included in the analysis. The results showed significant gender differences “in most aspects of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles” (p. 583). Women scored significantly higher than men did on contingent reward leadership and three of the four dimensions of transformational leadership, with idealized influence the one exception. Conversely, men scored significantly higher than women did on active management by exception, passive management by exception, and laissez-faire leadership (which is virtually no leadership); however, these three leadership styles were equally uncommon for both men and women (a positive finding since they are the least effective forms of leadership).

Eagly et al. (2007) acknowledged that overall, the gender differences were small. Approximately 52.5% of female managers scored above average on transformational leadership behaviors, compared to 47.5% of male managers. Nonetheless, Eagly et al. (2007) emphasized that the behaviors on which women surpassed men were the most effective types of leadership. Bass (1999) proposed that, paradoxically, gender bias might make women more effective leaders. Knowing that they are subject to scrutiny, women may be more conscientious about selecting behaviors that will accomplish the intended goals. Additionally, women are frequently more highly qualified for their positions than men are. Eagly (2007) recognized that these factors might play a role in women’s choice of leadership behaviors.

Barbuto, Fritz, Matkin, and Marx (2007) examined the relationships between gender, age, and education and leadership styles and leaders’ influence tactics in a sample of 56 leaders and 234 subordinates from a wide range of organizations. The researchers used the MLQ to assess leadership style and Yukl’s Influence Behavior Questionnaire to

assess influence tactics. Results showed that gender per se was not associated with transformational and transactional leadership. Gender differences were found only in managers who did not have a college degree. In terms of influence tactics, women were perceived to use pressure more than men did. This might have reflected gender bias in how women's authority was perceived more than an actual difference in influence tactics (Eagly, 2007). For both leadership style and influence tactics, gender differences were nil for participants with bachelor's or graduate degrees (Barbuto et al., 2007).

Leadership studies have shown an evolution in leadership styles since the 1980s (Bass, 1999; Sullivan, 2001; Yukl, 1999). Robinson and Lipman-Blumen (2003) used the connective leadership model, which divides leadership into relational, instrumental, and direct behaviors, as a framework for examining the behavior of male and female managers from 1984 to 2002. Their analysis revealed that contrary to common assumptions, men surpassed women on vicarious behaviors, denoting the indirect promotion of the success of others, while women scored higher than men did on task orientation. The gender gap in competitive behavior narrowed over time; however, this yielded another intriguing pattern. The gender convergence on competitiveness was due to a decrease in competitiveness by male managers rather than an increase by women, whose competitiveness remained fairly stable. Another interesting finding was that men became significantly less collaborative over time, a phenomenon that ran counter to the general direction of leadership for the same time frame (Bass, 1999).

In effect, Robinson and Lipman-Blumen (2003) disclosed a series of unexpected patterns in the leadership behaviors of male and female managers over roughly 20 years. Their findings highlighted Eagly's (2007) description of gender differences in leadership

as being more complex than often presented in the general reading public or professional literature. Eagly (2007), emphasized that even when women display exemplary leadership behavior, they can still be disadvantaged if they are perceived through biases. Powell, Butterfield, Alves, and Bartol (2004) focused on gender effects in the evaluation of male and female transformational and transactional leaders. Their study participants included 363 students enrolled in an introductory undergraduate management course. The students were asked to read a scenario describing a manager's actions in a specific situation and then rate the manager. There were four different forms portraying a female transactional leader, a male transactional leader, a female transformational leader, and a male transformational leader. The MLQ was used to assess the leaders' behavior.

The responses revealed definite evidence of gender bias in appraising leadership behavior (Powell et al., 2004). Male leaders who were assessed and displayed a transformational leadership style elicited more positive responses from subordinates than female leaders who displayed exactly the same behaviors. At the same time, male leaders who indicated that they preferred to engage in more transactional leadership behaviors were not rated as positive by subordinates. Thus the appraisals of transformational leadership style of men were favored over the leadership style of women.

Interestingly, the female participants appraised the leaders as engaging in more transformational and less transactional behaviors than male participants (Powell et al., 2004). The women's appraisals might have been influenced by the literature on the so-called feminine advantage. In view of Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt's (2001) finding that gender effects were more pronounced in experimental studies, the biases in the leadership assessments reported by Powell et al. (2004) might not have reflected the way

male and female leaders were perceived in actual workplace settings. Nonetheless, experimental studies have revealed how cultural biases influence the way leader behaviors are interpreted. Influences of this type are included among the situational factors illustrating that leader effectiveness is influenced by conditions that are not necessarily under the leader's control (Vroom & Jago, 2007).

### **Theoretical Framework**

#### **Bolman and Deal's organizational frames.**

According to Bolman and Deal (2003), individuals view their experiences through preconceived lenses and filters that can keep them imprisoned in familiar but often inefficient or dysfunctional behavior patterns. This preference prevents many leaders from exploring new or recurring problems from alternative perspectives. If the frame through which they are accustomed to operating fits the situation confronting them, they are able to comprehend it and respond effectively. If it does not, they often view the situation through a distorted lens that produces counterproductive results. The same filter that precluded an effective response also keeps leaders from recognizing that the problem lies in their inability to question their frame of reference and examine the situation from multiple angles.

There is a compelling body of evidence documenting that leadership skills can be successfully taught and learned (Bass, 1999; Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004). According to Bolman and Deal (1991), leadership training will fall short of the desired outcomes unless more attention is paid to how leaders perceive and characterize situations. Case study analysis is a common teaching strategy in management training. Bolman and Deal's (2003) illustrations of the four frames and how they can be integrated to advantage

provide rich material for the analysis of leadership processes. Traditionally, leadership studies have focused on the behaviors of leaders (Yukl, 1999). Frame analysis focuses on the cognitive processes that underlie the choice of behaviors, thereby providing leaders with multiple lenses through which to view issues and helping them develop a varied and expanded repertoire of tools for action (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

*The four leadership frames.*

Bolman and Deal (2003) developed their model of organizational leadership by synthesizing elements of organizational theories into four paradigms or frames: the structural frame, the human resource frame, the political frame, and the symbolic frame. Derived primarily from sociology, the structural frame typifies the traditional bureaucracy and is designed for efficiency, productivity, and results. The structural frame operates on the basis of clearly defined goals, clear job and role demarcations, and the coordination of different activities through policies, protocols, and a linear chain of authority. Structural leadership is typically task-oriented, data-driven, and directive (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

With its roots in psychology and organizational behavior, the human resource frame is grounded in the assumption that the strength of the organization lies in the development and fulfillment of the individuals within it (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Human resource leaders emphasize the importance of interpersonal relationships, commitment, motivation, and empowerment. A leader who adeptly uses the human resource frame can be an excellent catalyst for change (Kanter, 1982, 2004).

The political frame is attuned to the internal and external environment of the organization, with particular attention to the competing interests of divergent stakeholder groups (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Political leaders view dealing with conflict and competing for limited resources as inevitable elements of collective endeavors. Pragmatic and persuasive, they are adept at negotiation, advocacy, and coalition building, which enable them to build a strong power base.

Drawing heavily from anthropology, the symbolic frame capitalizes on the values and culture of the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Symbolic leaders are generally charismatic and inspire enthusiasm, trust, and commitment by calling on traditions, rituals, ceremonies, and narratives. Culture and vision are hallmarks of symbolic leadership.

Each of the four frames is valuable under different conditions (Bolman & Deal, 2003). The most effective leaders utilize a multiframe approach, adapting elements of each frame to the demands of the situation. The structural frame endures when the goal is stability and preservation of the status quo but is criticized for restricting innovation and change (Sullivan, 2001). In addition, the structural frame includes managerial competencies that are important for maintaining organizational efficiency and effectiveness (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004).

The human resource frame reflects the transformational leadership principles of intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Leaders engage in intellectual stimulation by soliciting ideas, opinions, and input from constituents to foster creative thinking and innovation. They create an atmosphere where



individuals feel free to express new ideas and experiment with creative problem solving. Leaders display individualized consideration through active listening and being attuned to each person's needs for growth and recognition. Individualized consideration means respecting and valuing individual differences, as well as providing novel and challenging experiences that promote personal and professional growth.

Transformational individualized consideration is linked with transactional contingent reward leadership, the most effective form of transactional leadership (Avolio et al., 1999). From a humanistic perspective, there is a distinction between the two. Individual consideration is the degree to which leaders address the needs of others (Bass, 1999). Contingent reward leadership is geared toward fulfilling the lower levels of Maslow's hierarchy, whereas transformational leaders encourage their followers toward self-actualization (Bass, 1999). Humanistic psychology forms part of the foundation of the human resource frame (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Human resource leaders may also be well suited to the transformational leadership behavior of inspirational motivation, which Bass and Avolio (1994) defined as the ability to communicate a compelling vision that drives action toward individual and collective goals. Inspirational leaders generate optimism, enthusiasm, and confidence at the individual and team levels and—in the case of higher education administration—at the departmental level.

Of the four leadership frames, the political and symbolic are the least utilized (Bolman & Deal, 2003). The underutilization of the political frame may result in part from the absence of a theory of political leadership in complex organizations (House &

Aditya, 1997). House and Aditya (1997) found this underutilization noteworthy in light of the long history of social psychologists studying power and influence in organizations. According to House and Aditya (1997), it is generally acknowledged that politics and political behaviors are part of organizational life and are frequently necessary for achieving organizational goals. There is no coherent framework, however, for understanding the nature of political behavior in organizations, the forces that either facilitate or inhibit the exercise of political behavior, the influence of behaviors and tactics classified as political behavior, and ultimately, the impact of politically motivated behavior on organizational performance.

For some leaders, political leadership may carry a tricky connotation. A dishonest or selfishly motivated political leader is a con artist at worst (Bolman & Deal, 2003). On the other hand, a politically sophisticated leader acting in the best interests of the organization and its stakeholders is a powerful and positive advocate. The most important aspect of leadership is not the type of leadership behavior but whether the leadership behavior is authentic, meaning for the good of the organization and not for self-gain (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999).

Symbolic leadership is valuable for advancing the mission and values of the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2003). According to Monahan (2004), each type of postsecondary institution has a unique mission that could be enhanced by the display of symbolic leadership, but symbolic leadership may be the most difficult to master. Charismatic leaders may be the most confident in exercising symbolic leadership. The term *charismatic leadership* is sometimes confused with transformational leadership but the two are not interchangeable (Yukl, 1999). Bass and Avolio (as cited in Avolio et al.,

1999) originally included charisma as one of the dimensions of transformational leadership, but factor analysis disclosed too much overlap between idealized influence and transformational leadership. Idealized influence refers to behaviors that prompt admiration, respect, and trust from followers. Leadership by example falls under this heading. Leaders who are high in idealized influence or charisma may be the most successful at using the symbolic frame.

According to Bess and Goldman (2001), charismatic leadership is unusual in higher education, particularly at the departmental level. Furthermore, it may not be effective even if it is used. Faculty members prize their autonomy. Departments tend to be composed of individuals who have little in common and who engage in minimal interaction. In their own research, the authors found negligible evidence supporting the effectiveness of charismatic leadership in higher education.

At the same time, there are disciplines in which symbolic or charismatic leadership may be well suited. Department heads in disciplines such as nursing (Mosser & Walls, 2002) and the arts (Knapp, 2009), which communicate shared values and symbols, tend to make greater use of the symbolic frame. The symbolic frame may be especially well suited for leaders of artistic disciplines. Sullivan (2001) viewed symbolic leadership as primarily the domain of veteran leaders, who have developed confidence and poise through years of experience.

According to Bolman and Deal (2003), most leaders have a primary frame from which they operate. To be most effective, however, the authors contended that leaders should utilize a multiframe approach. Being able to integrate the frames entails being

attuned to the nuances of a given problem or situation and applying elements of the frames that are best suited to producing the desired results.

*Higher education leadership and multiple frames.*

In their exploration of the leadership frames of college executives, Bolman and Deal (1991) included data from Bensimon's (1987) qualitative study of 32 college presidents. Bolman and Deal (1991) augmented Bensimon's 1987 data with an analysis of 75 senior higher education administrators recruited from the Institute for Educational Management. The senior executives represented a range of institutional types and geographic locales (Bolman & Deal, 1991). The predominant positions were president, vice president, or dean. A third sample was composed of 15 central office administrators recruited from school districts in the Midwest.

The composite results confirmed Bensimon's (1987) finding that the use of all four frames was rare. Less than 1% of the educational leaders drew upon all four frames (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Furthermore, less than one quarter of the leaders in each group utilized more than two frames. Comprehensively, college presidents were distinguished from the other two groups by a decisive preference for the human resource frame and disinclination toward the structural frame. In addition, nearly half the presidents employed the symbolic frame, as opposed to approximately 11% of other higher education executives and only approximately 5% of school administrators (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

Across the three groups included in the analysis, the college presidents surveyed by Bensimon (1987), the senior administrators recruited from the Institute for

Educational Management, and the K-12 central office administrators, the human resource and political frames were positively linked with effective leadership and effective management (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Yukl and Lepsinger (2004) emphasized that the realities of leading a complex organization demanded attention to the prosaic details of management as well as the leadership skills exalted in theories of charismatic and transformational leadership. Bolman and Deal (1991) noted that their findings refuted the negative connotation that had been associated with organizational politics. Their analysis showed that leaders who were more proficient in deploying the political frame were viewed by their colleagues, subordinates, and superiors as more competent leaders and managers. An international sample of corporate executives yielded comparable results.

Women were only a significant presence in the sample of college administrators, accounting for roughly 40% of the 190 senior and midlevel administrators (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Reflecting the prevailing cultural stereotype, Sullivan (2001) perceived that the human resource frame, with its emphasis on “participation, win-win negotiation, consensus building, caring, and nurturing,” was the ideal frame for women in leadership (p. 563). In contrast, Bolman and Deal (1991) found no support for that assumption or for the idea that women would reject the rather tricky political frame. No significant gender differences emerged on any measure, although women were rated slightly more effective as managers and leaders by their colleagues (Bolman & Deal, 1991). There was some evidence that women surpassed men in the use of the more effective forms of leadership, most notably transformational leadership and transactional contingent reward leadership

(Eagly et al., 2003). Rosser, Johnsrud, and Heck (2000) found that female deans were appraised as more effective leaders than their male colleagues.

Thompson (2000) used Bolman and Deal's (2003) leadership frames to study educational leadership with a focus on gender. Central to the study was a comparison between a "balanced" and "unbalanced" leadership orientation, that is, the use of a single frame versus multiple frames. In his exploration of gender, leadership preference, and effectiveness, Thompson (2000) included Quinn's theory of competing values as well as organizational frames. Quinn's model consisted of four key elements: human relations, internal process, rational goal, and open systems. From these four elements arise four competing demands that all organizational leaders encounter: innovation, commitment, efficacy, and performance. Each demand has a corresponding role in which the leader is either characterized as a "vision setter, motivator, analyzer, or task master, respectively" (Thompson, 2000, p. 970). According to Quinn's theory, the perceived effectiveness of a leader is contingent on the degree to which he or she can balance all four leadership roles in the face of contradictory demands.

The sample in Thompson's 2000 study consisted of 57 educational leaders (31 men and 26 women), along with their subordinates (265 men and 270 women) who rated the leaders on leadership orientation and effectiveness (Thompson, 2000). The leaders spanned the spectrum of educational institutions, from elementary through postsecondary education, with an average of close to 11 years of experience. Most were in middle or executive management. In terms of ethnicity, roughly two thirds of the leaders were White and one third were African American.

Using both the structural frames and competing values models, the findings demonstrated that the most effective leaders employed varied or balanced approaches to leadership (Thompson, 2000). In the context of structural frames, Thompson's research showed that 35.6% of the subordinate sample rated their leaders as being "fully balanced," or utilizing all four frames; 13.3% viewed their leaders as "moderately balanced," relying on three frames; and 51.1% perceived their leaders as "unbalanced," denoting a propensity for one or two frames. Based on Bolman and Deal's (1991) findings, it was not surprising that half the leaders relied on only one or two frames. Rather, the relatively high proportion of subordinates who believed that their leaders used all four frames was unexpected. Educational leaders who utilized all four frames earned the highest ratings of effectiveness from their subordinates (Thompson, 2000). An intriguing finding, according to Thompson, was that fully balanced leaders were perceived as more effective than moderately balanced leaders on the internal process dimension, which corresponds to the managerial tasks of the structural frame. This pattern supports the multidimensional approach to leadership advocated by Yukl and Lepsinger (2004).

There were no gender differences regarding the perceived effectiveness of educational leaders among the three categories of fully balanced, moderately balanced, or unbalanced approaches to leadership, or in actual effectiveness as assessed by the ability to use multiple frames (Thompson, 2000). This finding concurred with the research of Bolman and Deal (1991) and Monahan (2004).

Bolman and Deal (1991, 2003) formulated their theory of organizational frames by drawing upon leadership approaches derived from various disciplines. Educational

leaders represented an important segment of their work, which spanned organizational sectors. Several authors have indicated they considered Bolman and Deal's theory an excellent paradigm for exploring leadership in higher education (Bentley et al., 2004; Knapp, 2009; Kotti, 2009; Maitra, 2007; Monahan, 2004; Mosser & Walls, 2002; Sullivan, 2001; Thompson, 2000; Yerkes et al., 1992). Bensimon's (1987) in-depth exploration of the leadership preferences of college presidents was incorporated into Bolman and Deal's (1991) later work.

Leadership research in higher education has been dominated by studies of college presidents. Keim and Murray (2008) observed that relatively little is known about other college senior administrators despite their positions as successors for the presidency. The lack of attention to other administrators, lamented by Rosser (2004), is especially glaring in terms of knowledge of how other higher education administrators exercise leadership. Existing research on women and how they lead is also miniscule, in particular women who govern campus student affairs.

## **Conclusion**

Since the 1980s, women have made substantial inroads into higher education leadership (Jaschik, 2008). A majority of women employed within higher education are concentrated in midlevel management positions, with a sizable proportion leading student affairs. There is limited available research on how these women lead.

Bolman and Deal (1991, 2003) conducted much of their research on educational leadership. They found that the most effective leaders, regardless of organizational sector, employed a multiframe approach. There has been a notable shift away from the structural frame in favor of the human resource frame, which has been conceptualized as



a leadership style consistent with the preferences of female leaders (Sullivan, 2001). In general, the human resource frame is the dominant frame, regardless of gender (Knapp, 2009; Kotti, 2009; Maitra, 2007; Monahan, 2004). This trend corresponds to the preference for transformational leadership (Bass, 1999). According to Bolman and Deal (2003), there is evidence that many leaders neglect the political and symbolic frames, which can be highly effective.

Bolman and Deal (2003) found that there were no gender differences regarding the use of the four frames by leaders in education. The body of research does not support the concept of a feminine leadership style (Billing & Alvesson, 2000). There is evidence, however, that women are more inclined to display transformational leadership and contingent reward leadership, the most effective forms of leadership (Eagly et al., 2003). Examining factors related to leadership, such as number of years in the profession and type of institution, will possibly provide additional ways to analyze research of women and their leadership styles.

## **Chapter 3**

### **Methodology**

#### **Introduction**

The shifting demographics of colleges and universities across the nation include an increase in the number of female attendees. These women have a natural desire to see identifiable figures in leadership roles; therefore it is important to understand women and how they lead. Few studies have been conducted on the leadership frame usage of female SSAOs. The purpose of this study will be to examine how women in SSAO positions determine their particular leadership frames. The study will utilize Bolman and Deal's (1990) LOS self-report (see Appendix A), which—as previously discussed—asks individuals to identify their leadership frame. This chapter explains the research questions, research design, instrumentation, questionnaire, sample population, institutional review board process, data collection procedure, limitations, and data analysis, and the chapter concludes with a summary of the methodology.

The objective of this study is to provide research on the leadership styles of women in student affairs in higher education leadership positions. Through self-reporting, the LOS identifies which of the four leadership styles (i.e., structural, political, symbolic, and human resources) an individual is more predisposed to and utilizes in working with students and managing individuals within student affairs. This study will aim to answer the following questions utilizing Bolman and Deal's LOS:

RQ1: Is there a dominant leadership frame among females who are SSAOs employed at 4-year public and private institutions?

RQ2: Is there a statistically significant difference between female SSAOs who have adopted a multiframe leadership style at 4-year public institutions compared to SSAOs at 4-year private institutions?

RQ3: Is there a statistically significant difference in frame usage among females SSAOs with less than 5 years of experience in the profession compared to those with five years or more of experience in the profession at 4-year public and private institutions?

### **Research Design**

Research for this study will utilize a survey instrument distributed through the Internet. The survey will be e-mailed to a random sampling of female SSAOs at public and private 4-year institutions in order to answer the questions proposed in this study. Both descriptive statistics and analysis of variance (ANOVA) will be used to analyze the data. This section will describe the instrumentation, questionnaire, research population and sample, and IRB approval and participant consent.

#### **Instrumentation.**

In the late 1970s, Lee Bolman and Terry Deal developed the theory of leadership orientation frames, which defined leadership categorically as structural, human resource, political, or symbolic (Bolman & Deal, 1976). The authors created this theory as a way to merge other recognized theories on leadership. Bolman and Deal (1984) chose the label “frames” (p. 4) because they believed frames filters things out and in. Ideally, managers who utilize multiple vantage points increase effectiveness. In subsequent research, Bolman and Deal created the LOS survey instrument, which measures an individual’s orientation toward leading with one or more of the frames (Bolman & Deal, 1990).

Since its development, this instrument has been used by researchers such as Cantu (1997) and Mosser (2000) as a tool to measure an individual's orientation to one or more of the four frames identified by Bolman and Deal (1984) in their research on leadership. The validity of the instrument was deemed reliable by Bolman and Deal (1990) based upon responses by approximately 1,300 colleagues representing a multisector sample of managers in business and education. The overall coefficient of alpha score on the LOS for each frame ranged between .79 and .920, which indicated a high level of consistency and reliability (Bolman & Deal, 1990). Other researchers (Birnbaum, 1992; Cantu, 1997; Harrell, 2006) who used Bolman and Deal's LOS self-report have also found the instrument valid.

Bolman and Deal's (1984) frames theory assumes that "every manager uses a personal frame or multiple frames to gather information, make judgments and get things done" (p. 5). According to the authors, the structural frame emphasizes efficiency and effectiveness. Leaders who use the structural frame make the rational decision over the personal one, and they strive to achieve organizational goals and objectives through coordination and control. These individuals value accountability and critical analysis. They believe specialization and division of labor can be used to increase performance levels. The overall alpha for the structural frame is .90 (Bolman & Deal, 1990).

Another frame, the human resource frame, focuses on the needs of the individual. Human resource leaders value camaraderie and harmony within the work environment, and they strive to achieve organizational goals through meaningful and satisfying work. Leaders who utilize the human resource frame recognize human needs and the

importance of congruence between the individual and the organization. The coefficient alpha for the human resource frame is .93 (Bolman & Deal, 1990).

The political frame emphasizes competition. Political leaders value practicality and authenticity, and they strive to achieve organizational goals through negotiation and compromise. Leaders utilizing the political frame recognize the diversity of individuals and interests, and they compete for scarce resources regardless of conflict. Power is perceived as an important resource. The coefficient alpha for the political frame is .89 (Bolman & Deal, 1990).

The symbolic frame emphasizes meaning. Symbolic leaders value the subjective, and they strive to achieve organizational goals through interpretative rituals and ceremonies. Leaders utilizing the symbolic frame recognize that symbols give individuals meaning and provide direction toward achieving organizational purpose. Symbolic leaders also recognize unity and a strong culture and mission. The coefficient alpha for the symbolic frame is .91 (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

### **Questionnaire**

Bolman and Deal's LOS self-report measures self-perceived leadership characteristics. The inventory consists of four parts. Section I evaluates leadership behaviors, Section II deals with leadership styles, and Section III asks individuals to provide an overall rating of themselves as managers and leaders. Section IV pertains to background information (Bolman & Deal, 1990).

Section I of the LOS self-report will be used to link the four frames of leadership behavior identified by Bolman and Deal and the behaviors the individuals perceive they

exhibit. Section I consists of 32 questions with a Likert-type scale response. Each of the 32 questions has eight measures associated with it that link it to a particular frame.

Respondents must rate the level to which they believe they exhibit the 32 behaviors by rating themselves on a 5-point Likert-type scale with 1 meaning the behavior is never exhibited and 5 meaning the behavior is always exhibited (Bolman & Deal, 1990). Other researchers (Birnbaum, 1992; Cantu, 1997; Harrell, 2006) who used Bolman and Deal's LOS self-report have also found the instrument valid.

Questions 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, and 29 of the LOS represent the structural frame. The human resource frame on the LOS consists of questions 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, and 30. The political frame consists of questions 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, and 31. The symbolic frame on the LOS consists of questions 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, and 32. All the scores of the eight frame-oriented questions are added together and then divided by 8 to find the mean of the each frame. The scores are then ranked numerically with the highest mean score of all the frames determining the primary leadership frame. Each frame has a possible total score of 40. Janz (2005) determined that a score of 32 or higher indicates frame usage. A score of 31 or lower indicates nonusage. If the scores of each frame are significantly close, then multiframe usage may be assumed.

Section II of the LOS consists of six questions designed to perform force rank indication of a particular frame. Choice "a" indicates the structural frame, "b" the human resource frame, "c" the political frame, and "d" the symbolic frame. Bolman and Deal (1990) identified the internal consistency of Section II of the LOS as high, with the coefficient alpha ranging between .79 and .84.

Section III of the LOS consists of two questions focused on leadership and management. Participants are asked to indicate their overall effectiveness on both questions using a 5-point Likert-type scale. Scores range from 5, which is associated with the top 20% of effectiveness, down to 1, which is associated with the bottom 20% of effectiveness (Bolman & Deal, 1990).

Section IV of the LOS asks background demographic questions of the participants. This section will be modified to also ask participants whether they work at a public or a private institution. Sections I and IV of the survey will be utilized for this study.

### **Research population and sample**

The population for this study will be selected from institutions identified from the membership of the Higher Education Directory (HED) annual report. HED is an organization that collects information from accredited, degree-granting institutions regarding their academic and administrative personnel. The participants selected from HED membership will be SSAOs at public and private 4-year, baccalaureate-degree-granting or higher level institutions. HED will provide the name of the individual, name and state of the institution, administrative title, and e-mail address. From that listing, a random sample will be chosen for the distribution of the survey. The researcher is only interested in female SSAOs. The roster provided by HED will be reviewed to attempt determination of gender based upon name. The gender of individuals with gender-neutral names or names that are not readily identifiable as female will be determined by the completion of the demographic questionnaire.

### **IRB approval and participant consent**

The researcher will request approval from the Institutional Review Board at the University of Missouri–St. Louis to conduct the study for this dissertation. This research will utilize a survey method in which participants will not be able to be identified or placed at risk. Thus the researcher will request an exempt status from the IRB.

The survey will be electronically mailed to a random selection of female SSAOs whose information provided by HED appears to meet the criteria for requesting their participation. Individuals who choose to return the survey instrument will imply consent. Participants may choose not to answer any question on the survey instrument. The anonymity of all participants will be safeguarded by utilizing restricted access software measures on the researcher's computer. The researcher's computer as well as the participant data list will both be password protected.

### **Data Collection**

Permission to use the LOS was received from Lee Bolman (see Appendix D). Once the participant list serve has been created, an e-mail will be sent introducing the researcher. The body of the e-mail will explain the purpose of the research, ask individuals to participate in the study, and thank them for their participation. The e-mail will contain an active hyperlink that will allow the participants access to a secure website.

When participants click on the hyperlink in the e-mail they will be directed to a website hosted on the University of Missouri–St. Louis server. The participants will then find instructions on how to access the password-protected survey. Additionally, potential study participants will be able to read the informed consent form. Study participants will be advised that they may withdraw from the study at any time and may contact the



researcher with the contact information listed if they have any questions. By completing and submitting the survey instrument electronically, the respondents' acceptance of the informed consent form will be assumed.

Section IV of the LOS (see Appendix A) asks the demographic questions of age, gender, and years in the profession. This section of the instrument will be modified to ask the additional question of title. Participants will be asked to complete the survey within 2 weeks from the original date the survey is distributed. A second e-mail encouraging completion will be sent to all nonrespondents 10 days after the first e-mail is distributed. A third and final e-mail encouraging completion will be sent to nonrespondents 7 days after the second reminder e-mail. Data collection will stop 7 days after the final e-mail is sent.

Anonymity of participants will be preserved by utilizing identity protection measures offered through Qualtrics, which is an online survey design software program. Qualtrics software will allow the researcher to assign each e-mail address contained in the list serve a unique username and password to access the study. The software will also allow the researcher to identify which individuals have not completed the survey instrument so that all of the potential participants do not receive duplicate requests. Only the researcher and the faculty advisor overseeing the study will have access to URL coding that could be used to identify participants. Once participants access the link and complete the survey instrument, their assigned usernames and passwords will no longer be valid, to prevent duplicate entries.

## **Data Analysis**

Research question 1 will be answered through descriptive statistics by tabulating the responses of the study participants identifying their frame usage. Research question 2 and research question 3 (which will collect demographic information regarding gender, institution type, and number of years in the profession) will be answered using ANOVA.

After the quantitative data results are collected through Qualtrics and the survey period has closed, the information will be transferred into the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS, Version 16.0) software analysis program to answer the research questions. Through SPSS, descriptive statistics will be used to analyze the frequency distribution, mean, mode, and standard deviation of responses regarding the four frames. Additionally, one-way and two-way ANOVA will be used to explore the relationships between the variables. ANOVA is a statistical procedure that tests for the differences between means of independent variables (Leedy & Ormord, 2005). The dependent variables for this research are the four self-identified leadership frames: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. The independent variables are race, title, age, and years in the profession as they relate to the frame usage.

The mean of each frame will be determined by adding the responses from the LOS frames together and dividing by 8. Each frame has a possible total score of 8. Research by Beck-Frazier (2005) and Harrell (2006) indicated that a score of 4 or higher indicates frame usage. A score of 3 or lower indicates nonusage. This researcher will follow the same assumption of frame usage indication as established by Beck-Frazier (2005) and Harrell (2006) in their research.

**Limitations**

This research will be limited only to females who hold job titles of Assistant Vice President or Assistant Chancellor or Assistant Dean of Students or higher in student affairs at institutions of higher education. The identified sample population may be restricted based upon the willingness of the identified individuals to participate in the survey.

**Summary**

This research study will utilize Bolman and Deal's LOS self-report questionnaire to determine the dominant or multiple leadership frame usage of women SSAOs. The researcher will utilize information provided by the HED, which maintains academic and administrative information of accredited, degree-granting colleges and universities. The study will be administered via the Internet using Qualtrics survey software, and interpretation of the data will be conducted through SPSS. The purpose of this study is to determine if there is any statistically significant difference among female SSAOs in relation to their preferred leadership style, paying particular attention to African American women. Most research of SSAOs has focused on White males or on females as a whole. This study will add to the body of research literature that can be further utilized to advance the number of women—especially African American women—in administrative leadership positions in higher education.

## **Chapter 4**

### **Results**

The leadership styles of women are vastly different from those of men (Rosener, 1990). One argument to support this difference is that women are likely to emphasize frequent contact and information sharing, whereas men typically lead from a hierarchical approach (Helgesen, 1990). The purpose of this study was to examine the self-reported leadership styles of female Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs) at public and private four-year institutions to (a) determine if there is a dominant leadership frame, (b) determine if leadership styles vary between females with less than five years of experience compared to those with five or more years experience as senior student affairs officers, and (c) identify whether multi frame leadership style usage differed between those individuals at public and private institutions.

Bolman and Deal's four-frame theory of leadership was used in this study to examine the self-reported leadership styles of Senior Student Affairs Officers at public and private 4-year institutions. The first objective of this research project was to determine if there was a dominant leadership frame utilized among females who are Senior Student Affairs Officers employed at four-year public and private institutions. SSAOs for this study are defined as individuals in executive leadership positions of the functional areas that comprise a student affairs division or department. These individuals are generally members of the chancellor's or president's cabinet with responsibilities for advocating for policies on behalf of students. Dominant leadership frame refers to the leadership style an individual is more predisposed to utilizing. The second objective was to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between female Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs) who have adopted a multi-frame leadership style at

four-year public institutions compared to SSAOs at four-year private institutions. The third and final objective was to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in frame usage among females who are Senior Student Affairs Officers with less than five years of experience in the profession as compared to those with more than five years of experience in the profession at four year public and private institutions. This chapter discusses and summarizes the results of the study.

### **Sample Description**

Three-hundred and sixty individuals responded to Bolman and Deal's four-frame theory of leadership survey. Bolman and Deal's Leadership Orientation Survey (LOS) self-report measures self-perceived leadership. The survey consists of four sections. Section I evaluates leadership behaviors, Section II deals with leadership styles, and Section III asks individuals to provide an overall rating of themselves as managers and leaders. Section IV pertains to background information (Bolman & Deal, 1990). For this study, Sections I and IV of the LOS were utilized.

Prior to analysis, the data were examined to determine if there were missing data and to ensure that only female respondents were included. The data were also examined for missing values. Given that the rate of missing responses was extremely low (less than 1% of values), a mean replacement strategy was utilized for missing values. This was necessary in order to not distort the analysis of the other responses. Thirteen male respondents completed the online survey but their data was purged from the final data set used for analysis since this study only focused on female SSAOs. Of the 347 female participants who responded to the survey, the majority (80.1%) were Caucasian. Less than one-third of the participants identified themselves as having the title of Dean

(31.1%) and 21.9% identified as having the title of Vice Chancellor/President/Provost. Of the respondents, 48.4% had attained a doctoral degree and 47.3% attained a Master's degree. Respondents were also asked about the length of time they served in their current position based on less than five years or greater than five years. Approximately 53.9% have served in their current position for five years or more and 45.8% have served in their current position for less than five years. The majority of participants (63.1%) were employed at private universities. Frequency counts and percentages are provided in Table 1.

Table 1 Frequency Counts and Percentages on Female SSAOs' Characteristics

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
Ethnicity		
African American	40	11.5
Caucasian	278	80.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	5	1.4
Latino/Hispanic	14	4.0
Other	10	3.0
Current Title		
Vice Chancellor/Provost/President	76	21.9
Dean	108	31.1
Associate Vice	53	15.3
Assistant Vice	13	3.7
Other	97	28.0
Highest degree attained		
Doctorate	168	48.4
Masters	165	47.6
Bachelor	12	3.5
Associate	2	0.5
Number of years in current position		
Less than five years	159	46.0
Five years or more	188	54.0

Table 1 cont.

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
University Type		
Public	128	36.9
Private	219	63.1

*Note.* Only female SSAOs were included in the analysis.

### **Leadership Style**

Section I of the survey asked participants to describe their leadership behavior (See Appendix A). The section was comprised of thirty-two questions which asked participants to rank on a Likert-like scale the frequency which they engage in certain behaviors. The participants answered all the questions using the following scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Occasionally, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, and 5= Always. The thirty-two questions in section I pertain to each of the four frames - structural, human resource, political, and symbolic for possible sum total score of forty. There were four dimensions in Section I and each dimension contained eight questions. The following is the frame sequence and corresponding questions for Section I: the structural items are included in questions 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21,25, and 29; the human resource items are included in questions 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30; the political items are included in questions 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31; and the symbolic items are included in questions 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32. Table 2 presents frequency counts and percentages of female SSAO responses by institution type for the 32 leadership items in the overall sample.

Table 2

*Frequency Counts and Percentages of Female SSAO Responses by Institution Type for the 32 Leadership Items*

	Leadership Frame Scores (32 item scale)									
	1-7		8-15		16-24		25-31		32-40	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Structural Overall	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	4.3	169	48.7	163	53.0
Public	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	3.1	59	46.1	65	50.8
Private	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	5.0	110	50.2	98	44.7
Human Resource Overall	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.6	84	24.2	261	75.2
Public	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	31	24.2	97	75.8
Private	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.6	53	24.2	164	74.9
Political Overall	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	2.0	210	60.5	130	37.5
Public	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8	78	60.9	49	38.3
Private	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	2.7	132	60.3	81	37.0
Symbolic Overall	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	4.6	199	57.3	132	38.0
Public	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	3.9	77	60.2	46	35.9
Private	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	5.0	122	55.7	86	29.3



Overall, 53% (public = 50.8%; private = 44.7%) of the sample respondents scored above 32 on the structural leadership frame, with 48.7 (public = 46.1%; private = 50.2%) scoring between 25 and 31, while the remaining 4.3% (public = 3.1%; private = 5.0%) scored between 16 and 24. In terms of the human resource leadership frame 75.2% of sample respondents (public = 75.8%; private 74.9%) scored above 32, with 24.2% (public = 24.2%; private = 24.2%) of sample respondents scoring between 25 and 31, while the remaining 0.6% (public = 0.0%; private = 0.6%) scored between 16 and 24. Overall, 37.5% (public = 38.3%; private = 37.8%) of sample respondents scored above 32 on the political frame, with 60.5% (public = 60.9%; private = 60.3%) scoring between 25 and 31, while the remaining respondents, 2% (public = 0.8%; private = 2.7%) scored between 16 and 24. The symbolic frame closely mirrored the results of the political frame with 38% (public = 38.0%; private = 35.9%) of sample respondents scoring above 32, with 57.3% (public = 60.2%; private = 55.7%) of respondents scoring between 25 and 31, while the remaining 4.6% (public = 3.9%; and private = 5.0%) scored between 16 and 24.

### **Research Question 1**

Research Question 1 asked female SSAOs at public four-year and private four-year institutions to answer 32 leadership items to determine if they utilize a dominant leadership frame. Each of the thirty two questions has eight measures associated with it which links it to a particular frame. The respondents were instructed to answer each of the 32 *Leadership Orientation (Self)* questions using a scale that described *how often* the statement was true about them, 1 = *never*; 2 = *occasionally*; 3 = *sometimes*; 4 = *often*; and 5 = *always*. The participant scores were summed for each scale. When a participant scored 32 or more points for a given scale (a leadership frame), it was noted that the

frame was *dominant* for that individual. When a participant scored 32 or more points on two or more leadership frames, they were considered to be in the *multi-frame category*.

For those participants who scored below 32 points on all scales there was not a dominant leadership frame (no dominance) that was associated with their leadership style.

Descriptive statistics were conducted to answer the first research question regarding dominant leadership frames. Summed frequency counts and percentages for the leadership frame categories among female SSAOs (broken down by institution type) are presented in Table 3. The values are presented based on the order of response frequency, beginning with participants who provided multi-frame responses.

Table 3

*Frequency Counts and Percentages on Female SSAO Leadership Dominance for Public and Private Universities*

Leadership Frame Dominance (32 item scale)	Public		Private		Overall	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Multi-frame (scores of 32-40 in two or more frames)	81	63.3	120	54.8	201	57.9
Human Resources frame	23	18.0	51	23.3	74	21.3
No dominant leadership frame (all scores < 32)	13	10.2	30	13.7	43	12.4
Structural frame	7	5.5	10	4.6	17	4.9
Political frame	2	1.6	6	2.7	8	2.3
Symbolic frame	2	1.6	2	0.9	4	1.4

Overall, most respondents qualified to be placed in the multi-frame category (57.9%), followed by the Human Resources (21.3%), no dominance (12.4%), Structural (4.9%), Political (2.3%) and Symbolic (1.4%) frames. An analysis of percentage breakdowns among public and private university groups yielded similar response patterns. More than half of the participants utilized multiple leadership frames in both

the public (63.3%) and private (52.5%) institutions, meaning they scored 32 or more points on two or more leadership frames. For participants that utilized a single leadership frame, 18.0% of the public university respondents and 23.3% of the private university respondents identified the Human Resources as their primary frame. With respect to having no frame dominance, 13 (10.2%) public university respondents and 30 (13.7%) private university respondents scored below 32 points on each of the leadership frames. Few public and private university employees showed dominance in utilizing the structural (public = 5.5%; private = 4.9%), political (public = 1.6 %; private = 2.3%), or symbolic (public = 1.6%; private = 1.4%) leadership frames.

## **Research Question 2**

Research question 2 examined if there is a statistically significant difference between female Senior Student Affairs Officers who have adopted a multi-frame leadership style at four-year public and four-year private institutions. Only participants who utilized multi-frame leadership styles were examined in this analysis (n = 201). Among public university respondents, 81 (63.3%) used a multi-frame leadership style while 47 did not (36.7%). Among private university respondents, 120 (54.8%) used a multi-frame leadership style while 99 (45.3%) did not. Overall, there was no significant difference between SSAOs at public and private universities. Table 4 presents the means and standard deviations of each leadership style among female SSAOs with Multi-frame Dominance based on institution type (public versus private university).

Table 4

*Means and Standard Deviations for Each Leadership Style among Female SSAO's with Multi-frame Dominance by University Type*

Leadership Frame Style	Public		Private	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Structural	32.94	3.55	32.72	3.72
Human Resource	34.56	3.26	34.90	2.24
Political	31.93	3.09	31.81	2.73
Symbolic	31.65	3.68	32.53	2.94

Table 5 presents the four analyses of variance (ANOVA) that were conducted. Results of each of the analyses of variance were not statistically significant. For the Structural frame, the ANOVA was not significant,  $F(1, 199) = .179, p = .672$ , suggesting there were not significant differences between public ( $M = 32.94; SD = 3.55$ ) and private ( $M = 32.72; SD = 3.72$ ) university participants regarding their structural frame scores. For the Human Resources frame, the ANOVA was not significant,  $F(1, 199) = 0.0742, p = .390$ , suggesting there was not a significant difference between public ( $M = 34.56; SD = 3.26$ ) and private ( $M = 34.90; SD = 2.24$ ) university participants regarding their Human Resources frame scores. For the Political frame, the ANOVA was not significant,  $F(1, 199) = 0.088, p = .767$ , suggesting there was not a significant difference between public ( $M = 31.93; SD = 3.09$ ) and private ( $M = 31.81; SD = 2.73$ ) university participants regarding their political frame scores. For the Symbolic frame, the ANOVA was not significant,  $F(1, 199) = 3.55, p = .061$ , suggesting there was not a significant difference

between public ( $M = 31.65$ ;  $SD = 3.68$ ) and private ( $M = 35.23$   $SD = 2.94$ ) university participants regarding their symbolic frame scores.

Table 5

*ANOVAs for the Female SSAO Leadership Frames by University Type (Public and Private)*

Leadership Frame	SS	MS	df	F	p
Structural					
Between	2.40	2.40	1	0.179	0.672
Error	2659.84	13.37	199		
Human Resources					
Between	5.40	5.40	1	0.742	0.390
Error	1447.58	7.27	199		
Political					
Between	0.73	0.73	1	0.088	0.767
Error	1655.26	8.32	199		
Symbolic					
Between	37.70	37.70	1	3.55	0.061
Error	2111.74	10.61	199		

*Note:  $p < .05$*

Overall, none of the ANOVAs were statistically significant, indicating the female SSAOs were more similar than different on the four leadership frames: Structural, Human Resources, Political, and Symbolic. The null hypothesis could not be rejected. For those female SSAOs who utilized a multi-frame approach, there was no significant difference in the four leadership frame scores between those associated with a public university and those associated with a private university. The female SSAOs who

utilized multi-framed leadership styles scored similarly on the four leadership frame scales.

### Research Question 3

Research question 3 examined if there was a statistically significant difference in frame usage among women SSAOs at public and private four- year institutions with less than five years of experience in the profession as compared to those with five or more years of experience. Four analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to determine if there were differences in frame usage among female SSAOs with less than five years experience (45.8%) in the profession as compared to SSAOs with five years or more experience in the profession (54.2%).

The difference in mean scores for each of the four frames - Structural, Human Resources, Political and Symbolic - between SSAOs with less than five years experience as compared to those with five years or more of experience were relatively similar. Table 6 presents the means and standard deviations for each frame by years of experience.

Table 6

*Means and Standard Deviations of Female SSAO Leadership Frames by Years of Experience (Less than Five Years vs. Five Years or More)*

Leadership Frame	Less than five years			Five years or more		
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Structural	159	30.64	4.06	188	31.18	4.45
Human Resources	159	33.36	3.12	188	33.69	3.03
Political	159	29.87	3.13	188	30.53	3.60
Symbolic	159	30.19	3.82	188	30.46	3.75

Four analyses of variance were conducted for each frame by years of experience. For the Structural frame, the ANOVA was not significant,  $F(1, 345) = 1.37, p = .243$ , suggesting there was not a significant difference between participants with less than five years ( $M = 30.64; SD = 4.06$ ) of experience and those with five or more ( $M = 31.18; SD = 4.45$ ) years of experience. For female SSAOs, there was not a difference in the Structural frame scores according to years of experience. Those with fewer years of experience scored about the same as those with more years of experience. For the Human Resources frame, the ANOVA was not significant,  $F(1, 345) = 1.02, p = .314$ , suggesting there was not a significant difference between participants with less than five years ( $M = 33.36; SD = 3.12$ ) of experience and those with five or more ( $M = 33.69; SD = 3.03$ ) years of experience. For female SSAOs, there was not a difference in the Human Resources scores according to years of experience. Those with fewer years of experience scored about the same as those with more years of experience. For the Political frame, the ANOVA was not significant,  $F(1, 345) = 3.34, p = .068$ , suggesting there was not a significant difference between participants with less than five ( $M = 29.87; SD = 3.13$ ) years of experience and those with five or more ( $M = 30.53; SD = 3.60$ ) years of experience. For female SSAOs, there was not a difference in the Political frame scores according to years of experience. Those with fewer years of experience scored about the same as those with more years of experience. For the Symbolic frame, the ANOVA was not significant,  $F(1, 345) = .045, p = .505$ , suggesting there was not a significant difference between participants with less than five ( $M = 30.19; SD = 3.82$ ) years of experience and those with five or more ( $M = 30.46; SD = 3.75$ ) years of experience. For female SSAOs, there was not a difference in the Symbolic frame scores according to

years of experience, which indicated that those with fewer years of experience scored about the same as those with more years of experience. Results of the four ANOVAs are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

*ANOVAs on Female SSAO Leadership Frames by Years of Experience (Five Years or Less vs. Five Years or More)*

Leadership Frame	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Structural					
Between	25.01	25.01	1	1.37	.243
Error	6308.28	18.29	345		
Human Resources					
Between	9.63	9.63	1	1.02	.314
Error	3261.16	9.45	345		
Political					
Between	33.48	38.48	1	3.34	.068
Error	3971.58	11.51	345		
Symbolic					
Between	6.37	6.37	1	0.45	.505
Error	4946.58	14.34	345		

*Note.* \*  $p < .05$

Overall, none of the ANOVA analyses were significant, indicating that female SSAOs with fewer than five years of experience and those with five or more years of experience were more similar than different regarding the four leadership frames: Structural, Human Resources, Political, and Symbolic.



## Summary

Three-hundred and forty-seven female Senior Student Affairs Officers responded to *Leadership Orientation – Self* the survey. The participants were generally Caucasian, possessed the professional title of Dean, and had attained a graduate degree (Doctorate or Masters). The majority of participants were well experienced, having served in their positions for five years or more and were associated with private universities.

Research question 1 was examined using descriptive statistics to identify the leadership frames utilized among women who are Senior Student Affairs Officers at four-year public and private institutions. The public and private university groups had a similar response pattern. In both groups, more than 50% of the participants utilized multiple leadership frames (public: 63.3%; private: 54.8%), indicating they scored more than 32 points on two or more leadership frames. For participants that utilized a single leadership frame, the human resources frame was dominant among more than 20% participants (public: 18.0%; private: 23.3%). Approximately 13% of respondents scored below 32 points on each of the leadership frames, which demonstrated that there was not a dominant leadership frame utilized in any specific area. This included 10.2% of the public university respondents and 13.7% of the private university respondents. In this research sample, few respondents showed leadership dominance in either the Structural, Political, or Symbolic leadership frames.

Research question 2 was examined using four analyses of variance (ANOVA) to determine if differences existed between female Senior Student Affairs Officers who have adopted a multi-frame Leadership style at four-year public institutions as compared to Senior Student Affairs Officers at four-year private institutions. None of the four

ANOVA analyses were significant. The null hypothesis could not be rejected. For multi-framed female SSAOs, there was no significant difference in the four leadership frame scores between those associated with a public university and those associated with a private university. The female SSAOs who utilized multi-framed leadership styles scored similarly on the four leadership frame scales.

Research question 3, was examined using four analyses of variance (ANOVA) to determine if differences exist in frame usage of women Senior Student Affairs Officers at public and private four-year institutions with less than 5 years of experience in the profession compared to those with more than five years of experience. Overall, none of the ANOVA analyses were significant and the null hypothesis could not be rejected. Female SSAOs with less than five years of experience scored similarly on the four leadership frames as compared to female SSAOs with five or more years of experience. These results will be described in Chapter 5.

## Chapter 5

### Conclusion

#### Introduction

The role of the student affairs professional has evolved tremendously since its 17<sup>th</sup> century roots in the concept of *in loco parentis*, a legacy of the English model of higher education (Rudolph, 1962). With a shift to the Germanic research model in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, faculty members, initially entrusted with responsibility for the students' well-being as their primary role, began to engage in research and scholarship. During that same era, there was the introduction of the dean of students position, and in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the creation of the dean of women position, which paved the way for women in academia (Delworth & Hanson, 1989; Mathews, 1915). By the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, women represented 44.6% of all senior higher education administrators, a figure which includes 45.4% of chief student affairs officers (Jaschik, 2008).

Midlevel college administrators have been described as “the unsung professionals of the academy” (Rosser, 2004, p. 317). Highly dedicated professionals who are committed to “high standards of performance and excellence in their areas of expertise,” college administrators such as those in student affairs are indispensable to the success of colleges and universities but their contributions to the institution often go unrecognized (p. 317). Student affairs administrators tend to agree with this portrayal and point out that there is minimal research into their careers (Hamilton, 2004). Most higher education leadership research focuses on college presidents. However, the current generation of college presidents is older than any previous generation, thus implying an impending wave of retirements (Jaschik, 2008; June, 2008). By extension, the demographic trend

signifies new opportunities for middle and upper level administrators who might aspire to the presidency.

For many observers, a looming wave of executive retirements means unprecedented opportunities for women to strive for top level leadership posts (Jaschik, 2008; June, 2008; Sullivan, 2001). From the 1970s onward, as more and more women entered the business world, the question of gender differences in leadership styles has been a prominent topic in research. Some scholars argue that women's leadership styles are distinctly different from those of men. Characteristics such as caring, collaboration and concern for others have traditionally been associated with women and identified as the "female advantage" in leadership (Helgeson, 1990; Rosener, 1990). Conversely, critics argue that the idea that there is a distinct female or feminine leadership style has minimal empirical support and does nothing more than reinforce stereotypes while ignoring the myriad of individual variations in the experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of leaders of both genders (Billing & Alvesson, 2005; Parker, 2005). Attributes such as assertiveness, decisiveness, rationality, and vision have traditionally been linked with men and with leadership (Gilligan, 1982; Rosener, 1997). The most effective leaders have a repertoire of behaviors that includes both "feminine" and "masculine" characteristics (Bass, 1999; Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Bolman and Deal (1984, 1991, 2003) developed a comprehensive organizational theory to facilitate understanding of the dynamics involved in leading complex organizations. Their theory of leadership centers on four frames: the human resources frame, which emphasizes caring, the importance of the individual in relation to the organization and collaboration; the structural frame, which focuses on roles and rules

within the organization; the symbolic frame, which recognizes the importance of ceremonies and rituals and the culture of the organization; and the political frame, which incorporates coalition building, scarce resources and bargaining. Bolman and Deal's theory and their Leadership Orientation Survey (LOS) have allowed leaders to understand and expand upon their leadership capabilities by drawing upon the elements of the four frames, individually and in combination.

Bolman and Deal's four-frame leadership theory was selected to examine the leadership styles of female SSAOs, a group that is vastly underrepresented in educational leadership research. The previous chapters provided a framework for the study, a historical overview of student affairs administration, a review of the literature on leadership with an emphasis on women in leadership and leadership in higher education, and the statistical data gathered for this project. This final chapter presents conclusions based on the research findings and implications and recommendations for additional research.

### **Summary of Study**

Bolman and Deal's four-frame theory of leadership was used to examine the self-reported leadership styles of female SSAOs at public and private 4-year institutions. The purpose of this exploration was to (a) determine if there is a dominant leadership frame, (b) determine if leadership styles vary between females with 5 or more years experience as SSAOs and those with fewer years of experience, and (c) identify whether multi-frame leadership style usage differs between SSAOs at public and private institutions.

This study employed a cross-sectional research design through the use of a structured response survey, Bolman and Deal's Leadership Orientation Survey (LOS).

The LOS assists individuals in determining the degree to which they utilize each of the four leadership frames. The sample consisted of 347 SSAOs who responded to the *Leadership Orientation – Self* the survey. The participants were primarily Caucasian (86%), with approximately one-third holding the title of Dean, and they had attained a doctorate (48.6%) or Master's (47.4%) degree. More than half had held their position for 5 years or more (54%) and were associated with private universities (63%).

The respondents were asked to assess the degree to which they exhibit 32 behaviors by rating themselves on a five-point Likert scale that ranged from "1" meaning the behavior is never exhibited to "5" indicating the behavior is always exhibited. The mean scores were derived by adding item scores for each of the eight frame-oriented items and dividing by eight. Higher mean scores indicated primary leadership behavior. Qualtrics Software was used to administer the LOS, and the data were downloaded from the software program into the SPSS database for statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to identify the demographic characteristics of the survey participants and determine the frequency and relative distribution of their leadership frame preferences.

Primary leadership frame was determined for each respondent based upon which leadership frame represented the highest mean score. A minimum score of 4 or higher for a given frame was used to indicate whether a SSAO was classified as using a single, paired, or multiple frames. SSAOs with a mean score of 3 or lower were considered as not using a frame. This research followed the same assumption of frame usage indication established by Beck-Frazier (2005) and Harrell (2006) in their research. One-way ANOVA was used to test for significant differences between the dependent variable of

the LOS and the independent variables of time in position and public versus private 4-year institution.

## **Discussion**

**Research question 1.** Research question 1 was examined with descriptive statistics to identify the leadership frames utilized among the female Senior Student Affairs Officers at four-year public and private institutions. The public and private university groups yielded a similar response pattern. In both groups, more than 50% of the participants utilized into multiple leadership frames (public: 63.3%; private: 54.8%), an indication they scored more than 32 points for two or more leadership frames. Among the participants who employed a single leadership frame, more than 20% were identified as being human resources dominant (public: 18.0%; private: 23.3%). Between 10-14% of the respondents scored below 32 points on each of the leadership frames, indicating that there was no dominant usage of any particular frame. This included 13 (10.2%) public university respondents and 30 (13.7%) private university respondents. Few research participants showed leadership dominance in the structural, political, or symbolic leadership frames.

According to Bolman and Deal (2003), the most effective leaders employ a multi-frame approach, adapting aspects of each frame to meet the demands of the situation. It should not be inferred from the results of this study that the SSAOs who utilize a multiple frame approach are more effective than their colleagues with a single or non-dominant leadership frame perspective, which is beyond the scope of the present study. In fact, in their study of college executives' leadership orientations, which built on Bensimon's (1987) qualitative research, Bolman and Deal (1991) found that less than 1% of the

educational leaders utilized all four frames. The college presidents in their study were distinguished by their preference for the human resources frame, which was the preferred leadership frame of the SSAOs in this study. In general, the political and symbolic frames are the least utilized of the four leadership frames (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

**Research question 2.** Research question 2 was examined using four analyses of variance (ANOVA) to determine if there were differences between the SSAOs at four-year public and four-year private institutions who had adopted a multiple frames leadership style. None of the four ANOVA analyses were significant, thus the null hypothesis could not be rejected. Among the multi-framed female SSAOs, there was no statistical significant difference in the four leadership frame scores between those associated with a public university and those associated with a private university. SSAOs at public and private 4-year institutions utilized two or more frames. The female SSAOs who utilized multi-framed leadership styles score similarly on the four leadership frame scales. This is in contradiction to Bensimon's (1987) and Bolman and Deal's (1991) findings that the use of multiframe leadership styles by educational leaders was rare.

**Research question 3.** Research question 3 was examined using four analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine if there were differences in leadership frame utilization between the SSAOs with less than 5 years of experience in the profession and those with more than 5 years of experience in the profession at four-year public and private institutions. Overall, none of the ANOVA analyses were significant and the null hypothesis could not be rejected. The female SSAOs with less than 5 years of experience scored similarly on the four leadership frames when compared to the SSAOs with 5 or more years of experience.



There is an absence of literature discussing SSAOs' length of time in the profession and its impact on leadership style. The finding that years of experience did not make a difference in the SSAOs' use of the four leadership frames was not expected. Bolman and Deal's (2003) theory included experience as an important factor in the selection of leadership frames. However, the combined results for Research questions 2 and 3 seem to suggest that the leadership demands of the SSAO position may be quite similar even across different campuses and institutional types. It is also possible that the SSAO position attracts individuals with similar leadership style orientations.

No other primary leadership frame orientation other than the human resources frame was identified by the SSAOs in the present study. The respondents who reported a multiple leadership frame orientation scored equally in the remaining frames. Respondents who identified the symbolic, structural and political frames as their primary frame orientation constituted a minimal percentage of the sample as a whole. Following the human resources frame leadership orientation in order of frequency usage was multiple frame usage and no leadership frame usage followed by the structural frame, the political frame and finally the symbolic frame. Respondents from public universities believed their leadership style was consistent with the structural frame. No other difference in leadership frame preferences was noted between the SSAOs from public and private universities. No significance was found between study participants with less than 5 years of experience and 5 or more years experience as SSAOs at either public or private universities.

The limited reliance on the political and symbolic frames by the participants in this study reflects the overall body of research on Bolman and Deal's (2003) leadership

frames. According to House and Aditya (1997), the underutilization of the political frame may be due in part to the lack of a theory of political leadership in complex organizations. While it is generally recognized that politics and political behaviors are intrinsic facets of organizational life that are frequently needed for achieving organizational goals, there is no existing framework for understanding the intricate dynamics of political behaviors in organizations. The political frame can also carry a negative, Machiavellian connotation that makes some leaders reluctant to delve into the political realm (Bolman & Deal, 2003). At the same time, the underuse of the political frame may be unfortunate because politically adept leaders who act in the best interests of the organization and its stakeholders is a powerful and positive advocate.

Only one participant in this study exhibited symbolic frame dominance. This one study participant's response does not provide enough data to draw any conclusions. The symbolic frame is the least utilized of the four leadership frames and has been described as the most difficult leadership style to master (Monahan, 2004). Symbolic leadership is most often displayed by highly established, charismatic leaders who have developed poise and confidence over years of experience (Sullivan, 2001). Charismatic leadership is unusual in higher education, especially at the departmental level (Bess & Goldman, 2001). From a multiple frames perspective, symbolic leadership can effectively augment other leadership styles (Monahan, 2004). Birnbaum (1992) believes that approaches to leadership can be influenced by the number of years in the profession.

## Findings and Recommendations

An interesting finding of the present study is that 12% of the respondents revealed no leadership frame dominance, neither a multiple frame orientation nor a dominant leadership frame. Bolman and Deal's theory is considered an excellent model for examining higher education leadership (Bentley et al., 2004; Monahan, 2004; Mosser & Walls 2002; Sullivan, 2001; Thompson, 2000, 2005; Yerkes et al., 1992; Zhang et al., 2004). This finding warrants further investigation to explore whether certain facets of the SSAO position might not be captured by the LOS. The absence of significant differences in leadership styles by SSAOs in public and private universities, and especially between more and less experienced SSAOs, may suggest the need for a leadership instrument specially designed to capture the components of the boundary-spanning SSAO position.

On the whole, student affairs leaders have been ignored in educational, organizational, and leadership research. The leadership styles of the female SSAOs in this study are largely consistent with Sullivan's (2001) portrayal of women's higher education leadership. Sullivan's view on leadership is the premise that as more women rise to executive positions, there will be a shift toward nurturing and collaborative models of leadership. Sullivan views the looming retirements of college presidents and other college executives as an excellent opportunity for women in college leadership and she perceives women as a powerful force for change. The preference for the human resources frame by female SSAOs in this study is consistent with the purported "female advantage," which identifies characteristics such as caring, collaboration and concern for others as being associated with women and identified as the "female advantage" in leadership (Helgeson, 1990; Rosener, 1990). However, the majority of existing literature

supports the idea that the human resources frame is the dominant frame, regardless of gender (Knapp, 2009; Kotti, 2009; Maitra, 2007; Monahan, 2004). Monahan (2004). A larger sample of SSAOs including men and women would illuminate whether there are gender differences in the leadership styles of SSAOs or whether the leadership orientations of the SSAOs in this study are representative of the SSAO position.

Apart from gender, the sample used for this study was quite homogeneous in terms of ethnicity. As the student populations of colleges and universities are increasingly more diverse, there is a call for advancing the recruitment and promotion of more African American, Latino, Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American, and other minorities into campus leadership positions. The presence of professionals who reflect the diversity of the student body is important for supporting student success in higher education. As a result, one important recommendation for future study is the replication of this study using ethnically diverse groups of SSAOs.

An additional recommendation is the replication of this study with attention to other demographic variables such as age and educational background. In addition, in this study the term SSAO designation was broadly used to encompass individuals who hold different titles. Future research should replicate this study using more structured formal student affairs titles.

In general, there is a dearth of research on student affairs leadership, and even more broadly, on higher education leadership apart from college presidents. Bass and Avolio's Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (1999) (MLQ) is one of several leadership instruments that can be used for further examination of student affairs

leadership, either independently or in conjunction with Bolman and Deal's leadership frames or another instrument. Thompson (2000) combined Bolman and Deal's leadership frames with Quinn's theory of competing values in an exploration of higher education leadership. The findings demonstrated that the most effective leaders employed a varied or balanced approaches to leadership. Using two or more instruments might be more effective in portraying the leadership styles of SSAOs. The use of multiple instruments might be useful for detecting elements (such as differences between SSAOs in public and private institutions and with different levels of experience) that might be present but were not found by the present study. A synthesis of quantitative and qualitative methods would further elucidate the leadership styles and preferences of SSAOs.

Future longitudinal research should be done to determine whether female SSAOs change their leadership frame based upon years of experience. Also, additional research to determine whether mentoring from a leader who utilizes a particular frame contributes to female SSAO frame selection would contribute to the literature.

Finally, future studies to examine the symbolic frame and the impact of organizational culture upon leadership frame determination; as well as the importance of political frame usage and its impact in advancing the careers of female SSAOS.

### **Limitations**

This study was limited to female SSAOs from four-year public and private institutions. With a rapidly expanding and extremely diverse community college population, it is important to understand the leadership practices of student affairs leaders

in two-year institutions. Effective community college leadership may require more expertise in the political realm (Sullivan, 2001). It would be interesting to see if community college student affairs leaders draw more heavily upon the underutilized political frame.

## **Conclusion**

The number of females within senior student affairs leadership is not representative of the number of females in higher education. However, several professional organizations such as the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Association of College Student Personnel and American Council on Education have attempted to address the disparity in higher education gender leadership by providing training, development and mentoring opportunities specifically aimed at advancing women to senior student affair officer positions.

The overall findings of this study that demonstrate a preference for a multi-frame or human resources frame approach by the SSAOs is consistent with prior research conducted using Bolman and Deal's leadership frames. However, given the limited body of research on student affairs leadership, there are still many knowledge gaps. Ideally, future research will lead to the development of an instrument that fully captures the many dimensions of student affairs leadership.

This study has been successful in identifying the leadership behaviors of female Senior Student Affairs Officers at public and private 4-years institutions. However, additional research should be done to expand the breadth of literature. Since there is a trend of more women entering higher education as students and staff, additional

demographic data should be collected to identify the impact race, ethnicity, and age may play in leadership behavior. Additionally, limited research exists on the leadership style of community college SSAOs. This segment of SSAOs should be extensively examined, as they represent the greatest number of female SSAOs in the profession.

## References

- Aaker, S. (2003). *Leadership styles of executive female administrators in Tennessee community colleges*. (Doctoral dissertation, Tennessee State University.) (UMI No. 3116144)
- Aldoory, L., & Toth, E. (2004). Leadership and gender in public relations: Perceived effectiveness of transformational and transactional leadership styles. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 16*, 157-183.
- Amey, M. J. (2005). Leadership as learning: Conceptualizing the process. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29*, 689-704.
- Amey, M. J., VanDerLinden, K. E., & Brown, D. F. (2002). Perspectives on community college leadership: Twenty years in the making. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 26*, 573-589.
- Anderson, J. E., Guido-DiBrito, F., & Morrell, J. S. (2000). Factors that influence satisfaction for student affairs administrators. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 105*, 99-110.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72*, 441-462.
- Barbuto, J. E., Fritz, S. M., Matkin, G. S., & Marx, D. B. (2007). Effects of gender, education, and age upon leaders' use of influence tactics and full range leadership behaviors. *Sex Roles, 56*, 71-83.



- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 9-32.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 181-217.
- Baumgartner, D. (1991). *The student affairs professional: A study of the private colleges in Iowa*. (Report No. HE025917). Kent, OH: Kent State University. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED350939)
- Bennis, W. (1989). *Why leaders can't lead: The unconscious conspiracy continues*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bensimon, E. M. (1987). *The meaning of "good presidential leadership": A frame analysis*. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper. (Report No. HE021282). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED292416)
- Bentley, T., Zhao, F., Reames, E. H., & Reed, C. (2004). Frames we live by: Metaphors for the cohort. *Professional Educator*, 26(2), 39-44.
- Bess, J. L., & Goldman, P. (2001). Leadership ambiguity in universities and k-12 schools and the limits of contemporary leadership theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 419-450.

- Billing, Y. D., & Alvesson, M. (2000). Questioning the notion of feminine leadership: A critical perspective on the gender labelling of leadership. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 7, 144-157.
- Blackhurst, A. E. (2000a). Career satisfaction and perception of sex discrimination among women student affairs professionals. *NASPA Journal*, 37, 399-413.
- Blackhurst, A. E. (2000b). Effects of mentoring on the employment experiences and career satisfaction of women student affairs administrators. *NASPA Journal*, 37, 573-586.
- Blackhurst, A. E., Brandt, J. E., & Kalinowski, J. (1998a). Effects of career development on the organizational commitment and life satisfaction of women student affairs administrators. *NASPA Journal*, 36, 19-34.
- Blackhurst, A. E., Brandt, J. E., & Kalinowski, J. (1998b). Effects of personal and work-related attributes on the organizational commitment and life satisfaction of women student affairs administrators. *NASPA Journal*, 35, 86-99.
- Bogenschutz, M., & Sagaria, M. A. D. (1988). *Aspirations and career growth of mid-level administrators in higher education*. (Report No. HE021522). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED296652)
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1991). *Images of leadership*. NCEL Occasional Paper No. 7. (Report No. EA023002). Nashville, TN: National Center for Educational Leadership. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED332345)

- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1992). What makes a team work? *Organizational Dynamics*, 21(2), 34-44.
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Coleman, M. (2003). Gender and leadership style: The self-perceptions of secondary head teachers. *Management in Education*, 17, 29-33.
- Cullen, D. L., & Luna, G. (1993). Women mentoring in academe: Addressing the gender gap in higher education. *Gender and Education*, 5, 125-137.
- Dominici, F., Fried, L. P., & Zeger, S. L. (2009, July/August). So few women leaders. *Academe*, 25-27.
- Eagly, A. H. (2007). Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: Resolving the contradictions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31, 1-12.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 781-797.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 569-591. doi:10.1037/0033-2900.129.4.569

- Eddy, P. L., & VanDerLinden, K. E. (2006). Emerging definitions of leadership in higher education. *Community College Review*, 34, 5-26.
- Gallos, J. V. (2002). The dean's squeeze: The myths and realities of academic leadership in the middle. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 1, 174-184.
- Hamilton, K. (2004, November). A pathway to the presidency: Student affairs professionals are increasingly moving into the top job on college campuses. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 38-41.
- House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23, 409-473.
- Jaschik, S. (2008, February 7). Next generation president. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/02/07/path>
- June, A. W. (2008, February 15). Pipeline to presidencies carries lots of women, few members of minority groups. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A18.
- Kanter, R. M. (1993). *Men and women of the corporation* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Kanter, R. M. (2004, July/August). The middle manager as innovator. *Harvard Business Review*, 150-161. (Original work published 1982)
- Keim, M. C., & Murray, J. P. (2008). Chief academic officers' demographics and educational backgrounds. *Community College Review*, 36, 116-132.

- Knapp, D. W. (2009). Understanding university dance administrators through organizational framing and analysis: A mixed-methods approach. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences*, 69(9), 3410.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2007). *The leadership challenge* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kotti, W. P. (2009). Leadership orientations and demographic characteristics of chief development officers at doctoral/research universities. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences*, 69(7), 2630.
- Kuk, L., & Donovan, J. (2004). *Women in higher education revisited: Intergenerational conversation*. Retrieved from [http://www.sahe.colostate.edu/Journal\\_articles/Journal2003\\_2004vol13/Women\\_highered.pdf](http://www.sahe.colostate.edu/Journal_articles/Journal2003_2004vol13/Women_highered.pdf)
- Maitra, A. (2007). An analysis of leadership styles and practices of university women in administrative vice presidencies. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences*, 68(4), 1355.
- Monahan, M. L. (2004). *Leadership frames of presidents of masters 1 higher education institutions*. (Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University.) (UMI No. 3152275)
- Mosser, N. R., & Walls, R. T. (2002). Leadership frames of nursing chairpersons and the organizational climate in baccalaureate nursing program. *Southern Online Journal of Nursing Research*, 3(2). Retrieved from [http://www.snrs.org/publications/SOJNR\\_articles/iss02vol03.pdf](http://www.snrs.org/publications/SOJNR_articles/iss02vol03.pdf)

- Parker, P. S. (2005). *Race, gender, and leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Petersen, G., & Caplow, J. A. (2004, September). Leadership style and perceived effectiveness. *Academic Leader*, 5.
- Powell, G. N., Butterfield, D. A., Alves, J. C., & Bartol, K. M. (2004). Sex effects in evaluations of transformational and transactional leaders. *Academy of Management Best Conference Paper 2004 GDO*, E1-E6.
- Robinson, J. L., & Lipman-Blumen, J. (2003, September/October). Leadership behavior of male and female managers, 1984-2002. *Journal of Education for Business*, 28-33.
- Rosser, V. J. (2004). A national study of midlevel leaders in higher education: The unsung professionals in the academy. *Higher Education*, 48, 317-337.
- Rosser, V. J., Johnsrud, L. K., & Heck, R. H. (2000). *Mapping the domains of effective leadership: The case of deans and directors*. (Report No. HE033702). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Sacramento, CA. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED449703)
- Sasnett, B., & Ross, T. (2007). *Leadership frames and perceptions of effectiveness among health information management program directors*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2047298/pdf/phim0004-0008.pdf>
- Sattler, J. L. (1999). *Surviving the deanship: It plays in Peoria or perspectives of a private university dean*. (Report No. SP0238792). Paper presented at the annual

meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED434104)

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*.

New York, NY: Doubleday.

Sullivan, L. G. (2001). Four generations of community college leadership. *Community*

*College Journal of Research and Practice*, 25, 559-571.

Switzer, J. Y. (2006, Summer). Women college presidents: Interviews about journeys and

adaptations. *Advancing Women in Leadership Online Journal*. Retrieved from

<http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/summer2006/Switzer.html>

Thompson, M. D. (2000). Gender, leadership orientation, and effectiveness: Testing the

theoretical models of Bolman and Deal and Quinn. *Sex Roles*, 42, 969-992.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American*

*Psychologist*, 62, 17-24. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.62.1.17

Wallace, M. (2006, Summer). The paradox and the price: A case study of female

academic managers in an Australian regional university. *Advancing Women in*

*Leadership Online Journal*, 21. Retrieved from

<http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/summer2006/Wallace.html>

Wolverton, M. (2003). A matter of degree: Men and women deans of education. In W. H.

Gmelch (Ed.), *Deans' balancing acts: Education leaders and the challenges they*

*face* (pp. 35-48). New York, NY: AACTE.

Yerkes, D., Cuellar, M. F., & Cuellar, A. (1992). *Toward an understanding of*

*organizational culture in schools of education: Implications for leadership*

*development*. (Report No. EA024243). Paper presented at meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED348768)

Young, P. (2004). Leadership and gender in higher education: A case study. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 28, 95-106.

Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluative essay on current conceptions of effective leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 33-48.

Yukl, G., & Lepsinger, R. (2004). *Flexible leadership: Creating value by balancing multiple challenges and choices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.



## APPENDIX A

### Leadership Orientation (SELF)\*

(c) 1990 Lee Bolman and Terrance E. Deal, all rights reserved

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

#### **I. Behaviors**

You are asked to indicate how often each of the items below is true of you.

Please use the following scale in answering each item.

1 - Never    2 - Occasionally    3 - Sometimes    4 - Often    5 - Always

So, you would answer '1' for an item that is never true of you, '2' for one that is occasionally true, '3' for one that is sometimes true of you, and so on.

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

1. Think very clearly
2. Show high levels of support and concern for others
3. Have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.
4. Inspire others to do their best.
5. Strongly emphasizes careful planning and clear time lines.
6. Build trust through open and collaborative relationships.
7. Am a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.
8. Am highly charismatic.
9. Approach problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.
10. Show high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.
11. Am usually persuasive and influential.
12. Am able to be an inspiration to others.
13. Develop and implement clear logical policies and procedures.
14. Foster high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.

15. Anticipate and deal adroitly with organizational conflict.
16. Am highly imaginative and creative.
17. Approach problems with facts and logic.
18. Am consistently helpful and responsive to others.
19. Am very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.
20. Communicate a strong and challenging sense of vision and mission.
21. Set specific, measurable goals and hold people accountable for results.
22. Listen well and am usually receptive to other people's ideas and input.
23. Am politically very sensitive and skillful.
24. See beyond current realities to generate exciting new opportunities.
25. Have extraordinary attention to detail.
26. Give personal recognition for work well done.
27. Develop alliances to build a strong base of support.
28. Generate loyalty and enthusiasm.
29. Strongly believe in clear structure and a chain of command.
30. Am a highly participative manager.
31. Succeed in face of conflict and opposition.
32. Serve as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.

## **II. Background Information**

Are you:

Female      Male

What is your ethnicity?

African American

White

Asian/Pacific Islander

Latino/Hispanic

Other

What is your current title?

Vice Chancellor/Provost/President/Dean

Associate Vice Chancellor/Provost/President/Dean

Assistant Vice Chancellor/Provost/President/Dean

Other

How many years have you been in your current position?

Less than five years

Five years or more

What is your highest degree attained?

Ph.D./JD/Ed.D.

Masters

Bachelor

Associate

\*This survey has been modified for use in this study.

## APPENDIX B



## OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

### Interdepartmental Correspondence

Name: Orinthia Montague

Title: Leadership Styles of Female Senior Student Affairs Officers

The chairperson of the Human Subjects Committee for UM-St. Louis has reviewed the above mentioned protocol for research involving human subjects and determined that the project qualifies for exemption from full committee review under Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations Part 46.101b. The time period for this approval expires one year from the date listed below. You must notify the Human Subjects Committee in advance of any proposed major changes in your approved protocol, e.g., addition of research sites or research instruments.

You must file an annual report with the committee. This report must indicate the starting date of the project and the number of subjects to date from start of project, or since last annual report, whichever is more recent.

Any consent or assent forms must be signed in duplicate and a copy provided to the subject. The principal investigator must retain the other copy of the signed consent form for at least three years following the completion of the research activity and they must be available for inspection if there is an official review of the UM-St. Louis human subjects research proceedings by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office for Protection from Research Risks.

This action is officially recorded in the minutes of the committee.

Protocol Number	Date	Signature - Chair
<b>100406M</b>	4-7-10	<i>C. J. B...</i>

## APPENDIX C



## Division of Education Leadership & Policy Studies

One University Blvd.  
St. Louis, Missouri 63121-4499  
Telephone: 314-516-7396  
E-mail: boyerp@umsl.edu

Dear Participant,

My name is Orinthia Montague and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Missouri –St. Louis. I am inviting you to participate in a research project to study how women in senior student affair's positions lead. The results of this project will be used for my dissertation study. Through your participation I hope to better understand the leadership styles of women in senior student affairs positions. I hope that the results of the survey will be useful for future research on women and leadership in higher education.

Attached to this email is a web link to the survey instrument being used for this study. I am asking you to review the questionnaire and, if you choose to do so, complete it and submit your responses on line. It should take you approximately 20 minutes to complete the survey.

I do not know of any risks or direct benefits to you if you decide to participate in this survey but your participation will contribute to the knowledge about women in leadership. I guarantee that your responses will not be identified with you personally. I promise not to share any information that identifies you with anyone outside my research group which consists of my dissertation advisor.

Your consent to participate is indicated by electronically returning the completed survey. I hope you will take the time to complete this questionnaire submit it electronically. Your participation is voluntary and you may choose to not to participate in this research or to withdraw your consent at any time. You may choose not to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. You will not be penalized in any way should you choose not to participate or to withdraw.

By agreeing to participate, you understand and agree that your data may be shared with other researchers and educators in the form of presentations and/or publications. In all cases, your identity will not be revealed. In rare instances, a researcher's study must undergo an audit or program evaluation by an oversight agency (such as the Office for Human Research Protection). That agency would be required to maintain the confidentiality of your data. In addition, all data will be stored on a password-protected computer and/or in a locked office.

If you have any questions or concerns about completing the questionnaire or about being in this study, you may contact me via email at [montague@umsl.edu](mailto:montague@umsl.edu). You may also



contact my advisor, Dr. Patricia Boyer at (314) 516-7396. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Missouri has approved this study.

Sincerely,

Orinthia Montague, Doctoral Student  
[montague@umsl.edu](mailto:montague@umsl.edu)

Dr. Patricia Boyer, Advisor  
(314) 516-7396

## APPENDIX D



Orinthia Montague <rintymon@gmail.com>

---

## RE: Request for Survey Instrument Usage

1 message

---

**Bolman, Lee G. <BolmanL@umkc.edu>**

**Mon, Jun 14, 2010 at 4:26 PM**

To: "Montague, Orinthia T." <MontagueO@msx.umsl.edu>

I'll be glad to offer permission if you can agree to our standard conditions:

The instruments are copyrighted, and you must have explicit, written permission to use them. We routinely grant such permission at no charge for non-commercial, research use, subject to two conditions:

(1) The researcher agrees to provide us with a copy of any reports, publications, papers or theses resulting from the research.

(2) The researcher also promises to provide, if we request it, a copy of the data file from the research.

Lee G. Bolman, Ph.D.

Professor and Marion Bloch/Missouri Chair in Leadership

Bloch School of Business and Public Administration

University of Missouri-Kansas City

5100 Rockhill Road

Kansas City, MO 64110

Tel: [\(816\) 235-5407](tel:(816)235-5407)

From: Montague, Orinthia T. [mailto:[MontagueO@msx.umsi.edu](mailto:MontagueO@msx.umsi.edu)]

Sent: Monday, June 14, 2010 3:47 PM

To: [lee@leebolman.com](mailto:lee@leebolman.com)

Subject: Request for Survey Instrument Usage

Importance: High

Good Afternoon Dr. Bolman,

I am currently a doctoral student in the Higher Education Administration program at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. I am requesting permission to use the Leadership Orientation Survey (Self) for my dissertation regarding female senior student affairs officers.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Orinthia Montague

Orinthia Montague

Assoc. Vice Provost/Dean of Students

301 Woods Hall

One University Blvd.

St. Louis, MO 63121

[314-516-4884](tel:314-516-4884)

[314-516-5221](tel:314-516-5221) (fax)

This message is for the designated recipient(s) only and may contain privileged or confidential information. If you received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original.

**winmail.dat**

 8K

---