

HAVING THE RIGHT TOOLS: THE LEADERSHIP FRAMES OF UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS

Michael L. Monahan, Frostburg State University
Amit J. Shah, Frostburg State University

ABSTRACT

The presidency at an institution of higher education demands a person with a multiplicity of skills in order to deal with a multitude of internal and external stakeholders. They must be able to multitask and seek competitive advantage to deal with a myriad of stakeholders. Bolman and Deal postulated that leaders who analyze problems from a variety of perspectives were able to solve more complex problems. This study examined the leadership frames of University presidents. The findings show these frames presented in descending order: human resources, structural, political, symbolic and the absence of the any particular frame. By viewing problems from numerous perspectives, leaders may be able to perform more creative problem solving to better address stakeholders' concerns.

INTRODUCTION

The American University system is the envy of the world. At the helms of these institutions are men and women who demonstrated superior leadership ability. They are charged with moving their institutions forward. According to Porter and Opstal (2001), "A world class workforce is the baseline for global competitiveness" (p. 6). Nowhere is this mantra heralded louder than in America's universities. In academia competitiveness is critical to both maintaining the American standard of living and its leadership role in the world.

To deal with numerous competitive challenges ranging from student access to fiscal resources, higher education institutions in the United States have an increasing need for effective presidential leadership. Presidents must address more diverse student bodies thus placing additional demands on instructional and support staffs. These increasing numbers of students vie for a limited number of available employment positions as their level of communication, mathematics, and Internet competency varies tremendously.

Financial resources, which never have been in abundance, are continually being reduced, as public institutions must compete with other requests for State funding (State Support for Higher Education Continues to Fall, 2011). In addition to competing for students, university presidents compete for funding from alumni, grants, international students, and community patrons. These funding sources are integral to augment shrinking operating budgets. Presidents must also continue to attract and retain qualified faculty while utilizing or integrating technology to enhance teaching and learning (Levine & Cureton, 1998, Spanier, 2000, Van Dusen, 2000).

The aforementioned factors indicate that strong presidential leadership is crucial for institutional success. The presidents often personify their institutions, and through the power of their visions and actions, chart the institutions' paths through turbulent uncertain waters. In addition, their leadership may be the most integral factor in enhancing the institutions' reputations and progress on the road to success.

Presidential leadership can manifest itself in a variety of ways. Carnegie Mellon University (2011) defines their president's job as "the chief executive officer of the institution, overseeing all operations of the university, from academic affairs and international initiatives, to enrollment and student life, and is responsible for setting future goals and directions for the university". However, Richard Allen (2006), president of RPA Inc., an executive search consulting firm that specializes in higher education, contends: "There is a shift toward more corporate-like presidents, in terms of their ability to think overall about the product, price, and the institution's position in the market." This view is echoed by Amy Gutmann,(2010) president of Penn, who describes her job as having three major roles as a leader: "1) A leader as scholar-educator. 2) A CEO of a very large financial institution, and 3) A community leader. ... Put them together and you can explain what the presidency of Penn is". The president can also bring about dynamic and drastic change. Garvey (2007) extols James Gallagher, president of Philadelphia University, for his leadership resulting in dramatic change and institutional turnaround over the past 22 years. Jane T. Upshaw, Chancellor of the University of South Carolina, Beaufort asserts: "If you look at ten different chancellors or presidents you can see ten different leadership styles, but we all have certain characteristics—a belief in shared governance, the ability to listen, the ability to build consensus. Where we differ are the approaches we use" (p 9, Brown, 2008).

Balderson (1995) cites five major functions of university leadership. These functions include 1) the clarification of the mission of the organization and determination of long-range objectives and shorter-range goals, 2) the allocation of the organization's resources to priority uses within the terms of objectives and goals, 3) the selection and evaluation of key personnel, 4) representation of the organization to external constituencies and strategic management, and 5) organizational change.

In a study of 20 institutions by Gilley, et al (1986), "on the move" presidential leadership was found to be a strong force in every one of the institutions. Further, visionary intelligence was identified as the most important personal presidential quality as these presidents were not only creative and inquisitive but also had specific plans for the future of their institutions. In addition they were persistent in searching for ideas to help the institution move forward. Finally, it was concluded that in higher education, views of effective leadership vary according to constituencies, levels of analysis, and institutional types. After 25 years the results of this study are still applicable.

The concept of leadership defies a simple explanation as many definitions and styles of leadership exist. Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) identified six types of leadership theories. They are: 1) trait, 2) power and influence, 3) behavioral, 4) contingency, 5) cultural and symbolic, and 6) cognitive theories. Each of these theories offers a different perspective on leadership. Trait theories attempt to identify specific personal characteristics that contribute to a

person's ability to assume and successfully function in positions of leadership. Power and influence theories consider leadership in terms of the source and the amount of power available to leaders, and the way that leaders exercise that power over followers. Behavior theories examine the leaders' patterns of activity, roles, and categories of behavior. Contingency theories emphasize the importance of situational factors. Cultural and symbolic theories study the influence of leaders in maintaining or reinterpreting the system of shared beliefs and values that give meaning to organizational life. Finally, cognitive theories suggest leadership is a social attribution that permits people to make sense of an equivocal, fluid, and complex world.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to profile the leadership frames of university presidents in Masters I institutions and to determine what, if any, frames presidents use individually or collectively and if this usage varies by specific variables.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Bolman and Deal's (1990) *Leadership Orientations (Self) instrument* served as the conceptual framework for this study to determine the president's leadership orientation. In essence, Bolman and Deal assert that in order for leaders to address complex and ambiguous problems, they should employ multiple frames of perspective to seek creative solutions. There are four dimensions to their model and they consist of (a) the structural frame, (b) the human resource frame, (c) the political frame, and (d) the symbolic frame.

The structural frame focuses on formal rules and hierarchy of the organization. It further emphasizes goals and efficiency, formal roles and relationships, and creates rules, procedures and hierarchies (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

The human resource frame focuses on the needs of the people within the organization. Human resource leaders concentrate on feelings and relationships, and seek to lead through support and empowerment. In essence, they seek to align the needs of the organization with the needs of the individuals (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

The political frame views organizations as arenas where participants compete over resources, power, influence, and interests. The political frame focuses on the ever-present conflict and maneuvering by various groups and interests over an organization's finite resources. The political frame views organizations as vibrant, forceful political venues where a multitude of individual and group interests vie for attention (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Finally, the symbolic frame focuses on the intangible aspects of the organization such as culture, myths, ceremony, and rituals (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Leaders tend to favor certain frameworks over others, but a single framework style may limit their ability to successfully address situations. Therefore, in addition to the single frame,

leaders may utilize a paired (using two frames) or multi-frame (utilizing three or more frames) strategy. This reframing will enable the leader to view, analyze, and develop solutions from one or more different perspectives. Bolman and Deal (1997) contend that effective leaders are multi-framed; that is, they utilize at least three of the four frames. This multi-frame leadership provides the leader with more potential opportunities and solutions. Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of the four frames which embody the leadership styles described by Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989).

Table 1

*Characteristics of the Bolman and Deal Four Frame Model**

Characteristics	Structural	Human Resources	Political	Symbolic
Metaphor	Machine	Family	Jungle	Carnival
Central Concepts	Goals	People	Power	Culture
Leader	Analyst	Servant	Negotiator	Poet
Communication	Information	Emotion	Influence	Figurative

**adapted from Bolman and Deal, Reframing Organizations, 1997*

Bolman and Deal’s model (1984) is a reliable instrument for determining leadership style and has been utilized in a number of studies in higher education. For example, Jablonski, (1992) found that the majority of female college presidents utilized the structural frame. Kezar et al (2008) determined that use of the human resources frame was the most effective in promoting campus diversity. Echols Tobe, (1999) found two thirds of female African American presidents had multiple frame orientations. In addition, Raines & Alberg (2003) encourage multi-frame leadership for faculty seeking administrative positions.

Bethel (1998) examined the relationship between the presidential leadership orientation of Bible college presidents and the organizational effectiveness of the Bible colleges. Three statistically significant relationships were found between the leadership frames and the domains of organizational effectiveness. The relationship between the structural leadership frame and the external domain of organizational effectiveness was significant. When one score went up, the other score also went up. There was also a statistically significant relationship between the human resource frame and the academic domain; and the symbolic leadership frame and the external domain of organizational effectiveness.

Universities are especially susceptible to ignoring the tenets of the human resource frame. Becker and Lewis (1994) determined that fostering creative leaders for higher education requires an investment in its employees. However, Bennis (1989) found that “routine work drives out non-routine work and smotheres to death all creative planning, thus killing all fundamental change in the university or any institution” (p. 222). Therefore, universities should focus on fostering

individual creativity and strategic planning to ensure the growth and success of both the institution and the employees who serve it.

If the leader is able to obtain a good fit between people and the organization, mutual benefits can be found. Organizations that emphasize the human resource perspective benefit from people finding purposeful and rewarding work that translates into the organization getting the dedication, talent, and drive needed to succeed (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Bensimon (1989) conducted a frame analysis on 32 college presidents. Of the presidents interviewed, thirteen utilized a single frame, eleven utilized two frames, seven utilized three frames, and one utilized four frames. Bensimon concluded that although Bolman and Deal (1984) suggest that multi-frame leadership is better, many college presidents are not effectively using multiple frames. She further suggests that although the leaders have not successfully integrated the four frames into their leadership style, the leadership of the college/university continues to be effective when the top management team (TMT) have complementary leadership frame orientations.

Even though presidents generally come from positions in academic affairs, the frames utilized by the holders of student affairs, finance, public safety, and information technology are important as well as they too can be a path to the presidency. Becker (1999) studied chief information officers and found significant relationships between gender and use of the structural and human resource frames. Cantu (1997) studied deans at Masters and Doctoral institutions and found the human resource frame was primarily used, followed by the structural, then political, and finally the symbolic leadership frames. Travis (1996) studied senior student affairs officers and found the human resources frame was the preferred frame used. Kane (2001) examined mid-level student affairs administrators and likewise found the primary use of the human resources frame. Wolf (1998) examined 343 campus safety directors at public four-year institutions and found the human resource frame was the principal frame utilized by the campus safety directors. Borden (2000) studied campus administrators in Florida's state university and community college systems and found the human resource frame was primarily used, followed by the symbolic frame, the structural frame and finally, the political frame. Russell (2000) examined the leadership frames of community college deans and found the human relations frame the most prevalent. This finding was also affirmed by Sypawka, Mallett, & McFadden, (2010) in their study of community college deans.

In the field of health sciences, Mosser (2000) studied the leadership style of nursing chairpersons and found the human resource frame was the most utilized, followed by the structural frame, the symbolic frame, and the political frame. Turley (2002) studied radiation therapy program directors and found the human resource frames followed by the structural frames were utilized the most. Small (2002) examined the relationship between the perceived leadership style of nursing chairpersons and the organizational effectiveness of baccalaureate nursing programs. Faculty perceived chairs to use the human resource frames the most often. The structural frame, symbolic frame, and political frame followed in usage. In addition, Sasnett & Clay (2008) found the Human Resources frame to be the most prevalent in health science education; however, they assert the need for multi-frame leadership.

Current Study

This research employed the Bolman and Deal Leadership (Self) survey instrument to determine the leadership styles and frames of Masters I presidents. Further, demographic information was obtained to provide a portrait of these leaders and to ascertain if any significant differences were found in the leadership style they utilized.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

Questions

1. What are the demographic characteristics of these university presidents?
2. What frames were used by these presidents?
3. What leadership styles were utilized?

Hypothesis

- H1. There is no difference in frame usage by gender, ethnicity, age, or marital status.
- H2. There is no difference in frame usage by institutional size (student enrollment) and type of institution (public vs. private).

METHODS

Participants

The population for this study was comprised of all the 494 presidents of Masters I institutions as determined by the Carnegie Foundation. These institutions annually award more than 40 Masters Degrees in three or more disciplines (Carnegie Foundation, 2001). The data was solicited by way of a survey mailed simultaneously to all potential participants. If after three weeks, the returns were below 50%, a reminder notification was sent to participants who had not responded. If returns were still under 50%, a final reminder was sent. A total of 254 usable surveys were received yielding a return rate of 51.4 percent.

Instrument

The survey was the *1990 Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientations (Self)* instrument which consists of thirty-two questions. Respondents delineated their use of particular characteristics on a Likert-like five-option scale. According to the originators of the instrument, if a respondent scored an average of 4.0 or greater on the eight questions to determine the usage of a frame, they were active users of that frame. This instrument has proven to be reliable, yielding a Cronbach Alpha in excess of .91 (Bolman 2011)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. What are the demographic characteristics of these university presidents?

The respondents were predominantly married, Caucasian, males, over the age of 50, who were in their first presidency with at least six years and were formally Academic Vice-Presidents (see Table 2).

Table 2
Demographics in Percentage

Status	%	Gender	%
Interim	4	Female	23
Permanent	96	Male	77
Number of Presidencies		Ethnicity	
First	71	Caucasian	87
Second or more	29	Non-Caucasian	13
Years as President		Previous Position	
Less than 1 year	3	President	29
Between 1-5 years	30	Academic VP	47
Between 6-10 years	27	Development	5
Between 11-15 years	15	Student Affairs	5
Over 15 years	25	Finance	6
		Other	8
Age		Marital Status	
Under 50	4	Married	79
Between 50 and 60	49	Unmarried	21
Over 60	47		
Institution Type		Institution Size by Student Enrollment	
Public	52	Less than 2,000	15
Private	48	2,001-4,000	28
		4,001-6,000	19
		6,001-10,000	26
		Over 10,000	12

2. What frames were used by these presidents?

The mean responses for all four-frame styles were consistently high. The results ranged from a low of 3.842 for the Political Frame to a high of 4.149 for the Human Resources Frame (see Table 3). Similarly, the standard deviations were calculated and revealed both modest and consistent results as the standard deviations ranged from a low of .482 for the Human Resources Frame to a high of .550 for the Symbolic Frame. This analysis demonstrates, that with few exceptions, respondents consistently rated their behavior on the Likert scale questionnaire as 4 “often”, or 5 “always”.

Table 3

Frame Mean and Standard Deviation

Frame	Mean	Standard Deviation
Structural	3.988	0.488
Human Resources	4.149	0.482
Political	3.842	0.530
Symbolic	3.964	0.550

The 254 respondents in this study utilized a total of 600 frames. The frames employed in descending order were human resources (30.7%), structural (22.5%), political (22.5%), symbolic (18.8%) and no-frame (5.5%) (see Table 4).

A Chi-Square test determined the distribution of frames used were statistically significant as the critical value of 9.49 was greatly exceeded. A significant difference was found at the .01 level, $\chi^2(4, n=600) = 101.37, p < .01$. This finding points to the higher usage of the human resources-frame and the lower than expected usage of the no-frame style.

Table 4*Leadership Frame Utilized Alone or in Concert*

	N	%	χ^2 101.37**
No-frame	33	5.5	
Structural	135	22.5	
Human Resource	184	30.7	
Political	113	18.8	
Symbolic	135	22.5	
Total	600	100.0	

** $p < .01$

3. What leadership styles were utilized?

The lowest percentage (13%) was found among participants whose responses did not exceed 4.0 for a particular frame. These participants were categorized as using “No Frame”. This naming does not signify that the frames were not utilized, but they were not sufficiently utilized. Those who used the single frame (20.9%) most utilized the human resource-frame (12.6%). The paired-frame style was utilized by the same percentage of respondents (22.4%). Within the paired-frame style, the structural-human resources-frame was used most frequently (10.2%). The frame with the highest usage was the multi-frame style (43.7%). Interestingly, the four-frame approach accounted for over 26% of the responses (see Table 5).

Table 5
Frequency Distribution by Style and Frame

Style	N	%
No-frame	33	13.0
Single-frame		
Structural	11	4.3
Human Resource	32	12.6
Political	4	1.6
Symbolic	6	2.4
Total Single -frame	53	20.9
Paired-frame		
Structural-Human Resource	26	10.2
Structural-Political	1	0.4
Structure-Symbolic	1	0.4
Human Resource-Political	6	2.4
Human Resource-Symbolic	18	7.1
Political-Symbolic	5	2.0
Total Paired-frame	57	22.4
Multi-frame		
Structural-Human Resource-Political	6	2.4
Structural-Human Resource-Symbolic	14	5.5
Structural-Political-Symbolic	9	3.5
Human Resource-Political-Symbolic	15	5.9
Four-frame	67	26.4
Total Multi-frame	111	43.7
Total	254	100.0

H1. There is no difference in frame usage by gender, ethnicity, age, or marital status.

While it was found that female presidents employed the structural-frame more often than males (7.6%); males endorsed the human resource-frame more often than females (5.3%). Males also utilized the paired structural-human resource-frame most often (8.9%) (Tests of statistical significance did not reveal any relationships). A Chi-Square analysis was conducted and found

there was no significant relationship between leadership frames and gender at the .05 level, χ^2 (3, n=254) = 2.67, $p > .05$. This distribution must exceed the critical value 7.82 for significance.

In relation to ethnicity, the overwhelming number of respondents (87%) were Caucasian who utilized the No Frame style (8.2%) and the single style Human Resources frame (7.7%) more frequently. However, non-Caucasians utilized the paired Structure-Human Resources frame (5.2%) and the full Four-Frame style (23.9%) more often. However, tests of statistical significance did not reveal any relationships. A Chi-Square analysis was conducted and found no significant relationship between leadership styles and race at the .05 level.

Over half of the presidents were under the age of 60 (52.3%). These presidents tended to use the paired Human Resources- Symbolic frame (7.1%) and the Multi-framed Structural-Human Resources-Symbolic (5.8%). However, presidents over the age of 60 were more inclined to utilize the No-Frame (4.6%), the single Human Resources Frame (4.6%) and the full Four Frame style (3.8%) more frequently than their younger counterparts. Unfortunately, tests of statistical significance did not reveal any relationships. A Chi-Square analysis was conducted and found no significant relationship between leadership styles and age at the .05 level, nor was there a significant relationship found when calculating a Pearson's correlation coefficient between leadership style and age, $r = -.005$, $n = 252$, $p > .05$.

Most presidents were married (79.1%). The fifty-two unmarried presidents represented three types of single relationships (unmarried, divorced, widow (er)). In addition, the unmarried presidents' statistic may be skewed due to presidential posts held by members of the Catholic clergy (10.2%). An analysis was conducted by comparing the responses of married and unmarried presidents. Even though both groups of presidents most frequently employed the multi-frame leadership style, married presidents utilized the full four-frame style more often (7.9%). Unmarried presidents employed single- style leadership more than married participants (6.0%). Married presidents utilized the human resource-frame more (5.6%) than their unmarried counterparts; however, unmarried presidents employed the structural frame more frequently (6.7%) Again, tests of statistical significance did not reveal any noteworthy relationships. A Chi-Square analysis was conducted and found no significant relationship between leadership styles and marital status at the .05 level, χ^2 (3, n=252) = .77, $p > .05$. This very low result was distant from the critical value of 7.82. A Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated and found no statistically significant relationship between leadership style and marital status, $r = -.052$, $n = 253$, $p > .05$.

The hypothesis was confirmed as there was no difference in the president's leadership style based on gender, ethnicity, age, or marital status.

H2. There is no difference in frame usage by institutional size by student enrollment and type of institution (public vs private).

When comparing the leadership style by student enrollment it was found that the Multi-frame style was most utilized by presidents regardless of the number of students. Generally, as enrollment increased presidents were less apt to use a No-frame style (see Table 6) A Chi-Square

analysis was conducted and found a significant relationship between leadership frames and student enrollment at the .05 level, χ^2 (12, n=254) = 34.2, $p=.001$. This finding points to the much lower than average Paired and No-Frame style by presidents of larger institutions.

Table 6
Frames Used by Institutions Size(Student Enrollment) in Percentage

	Single	Paired	Multi	No Frame
< 2000	23.7	18.4	42.1	15.8
2001-4000	21.4	24.3	37.1	17.1
4001-6000	10.4	33.3	45.8	10.4
6001-10000	22.4	22.4	44.8	10.4
> 10,000	29.0	6.5	54.8	9.7
Total	20.9	22.4	43.7	13.0

The frame usage by presidents of the public and private institutions were remarkable similar. Single and No-frame were nearly identical while public presidents were more apt to use the Multi-frame style than the presidents of private institutions (see Table 7). However, no statistical differences emerged.

Table 7
Frames Used by Type of Control in Percentage

	Single	Paired	Multi	No Frame
Public	20.3	19.5	47.4	12.8
Private	21.5	25.6	39.7	13.2

The hypothesis was confirmed as there was no difference in the president's leadership style based institutional type (public vs private). However, the hypothesis was disproved based on Institutional size (student enrollment).

CONCLUSIONS

The majority of the respondents employed the full four frame style. This finding did not vary by gender, ethnicity, age, marital status, or type of control. However, differences in leadership style were found by the institutions' student enrollment size. Based on these results, it is clear, the role of a university president is very complex and requires the use of versatile abilities. Further, it is apparent that as the student population grows there is a greater need to employ multi-faceted leadership styles. Incumbents must deal with multiple internal and external constituencies over a vast array of challenges and opportunities. To effectively lead, presidents must be able to examine and address problems from multiple vantage points. By doing so they can be afforded the following advantages:

- An opportunity to see problems from various stakeholders perspectives
- The ability to reframe issues to structural, human resource, political and symbolic vantage points
- Allows leaders to step away from viewing problems from their safe, favored perspective which may be inappropriate to solve the problem
- A leader's capacity and talent to reframe their experiences enhances and expands a leaders range (Bolman and Deal, 1997).

The literature confirms that a multi-framed leadership style enables leaders to utilize every instrument in their managerial toolbox. This flexibility provides more versatility and options to respond to dynamic ever-changing problems. The finding from this study supports the contention of Bolman and Deal (1991) that given the complex nature of the contemporary presidency, the use of at least three frames is critical to effectively lead the organization.

The results of this study support Echols Tobe's (1999) findings. Over three-fourths of African American presidents in this study utilized multi-frame leadership. In addition, the results of this study support Becker and Lewis's (1994) contention that the Human Resources frame can be viewed as an investment in its employees. Finally, this study supports the findings of Cantu (1997), Travis (1996), Kane (2001), Wolf (1998), Borden (2000), Russell (2000), Mosser (2000), Turley (2002), and Small (2002) where it was identified that the Human Resources frame was the most utilized.

Interestingly, while this study found the majority of female college presidents utilized the Human Resource frame, Jablonski (1992) found the structural was the most employed frame. Even though Bensimon (1989) found limited usage of the full four frame model, this study found a disproportional percentage (44%) of presidents employing the full frame style. The authors contend that two decades after Bensimon, the myriad of environment issues encountered today have possibly created more of a need for presidents to utilize multi-frame leadership.

Presidents who were not multi-framed in this study should be encouraged to acquire multi-frame leadership training which can be delivered via workshops, simulations, case studies, role-playing and self-introspection. They are also encouraged to have their top management team view problems from a comprehensive multi-frame perspective.

Furthermore, the current study provides recommendations for future presidents. Since nearly all presidents come from prior positions in academia, those who wish to ascend to the presidency should develop multi-frame thinking now to both assist them with their current positions, as well as also assist in positioning them for opportunities if presidency arises.

The U. S. standard of living could either be maintained or lost in the next generation depending on the products of institutions of higher education (Obama, 2011). Robust competition for resources, faculty, students, staff and even presidents could affect outcomes on a national basis. While the organization of a university invites conflict in dealing with the multitude of internal and external constituencies, resolved conflict can inspire healthy competition and produce impressive results.

In a 1996 study, Murphy found that colleges and universities were “among the most moribund and resistant to change institutions in the United States. Overcoming such opinions and inertia will be one of the major challenges of 21st century college presidents.” Clearly, leadership is needed to not only be reactive to environmental changes but also to proactively initiate and effectively implement change and energize both the internal and external constituencies. Kerr (1984) contends, “each campus (and higher education in its entirety) will suffer if that central role is not performed to full effectiveness.” This sentiment still holds true today!

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Subsequent research should include the Bolman and Deal (1990) *Leadership Orientations (Other)* instrument to survey executive staff and members of the president’s cabinet at the participating institutions to ascertain if their view of the president’s leadership style is related to what the president perceives is being employed.

The survey could also be used to compare community college, baccalaureate and research intensive presidents and examine institutional variables such as size, location, and type of control.

Further, the turnover and appointment of new senior officers with a new president could be studied. This research would be of value since presidents can have a great impact on the future of their institutions through the staff selections they make. Relationships between leadership style and turnover of executive team could then be explored.

Finally, research could explore frame usage and institutional effectiveness.

REFERENCES

- (2011). State support for higher education continues to fall. *Chronicle of Higher Education* Jan 24, 2011, retrieved Jan 26, 2011 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Interactive-Map-State-Support/126032/>
- Allen, R. (2006). Key role for new president: Raise funds. retrieved 1/27/11 from <http://www.columbiamissourian.com/stories/2006/12/15/key-role-for-new-president-raise-funds/>
- Brown, P. (2008). Presidential leadership: Understanding the influence of academic disciplines *Public Purpose* April/May 9-13 retrieved Jan 28, 2011 from http://www.aascu.org/media/public_purpose/08_0405leadership.pdf
- Balderson, F. (1995). *Managing today’s university: Strategies for viability, change and excellence* (2nd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Becker, N. (1999). Implementing technology in higher education: The leadership role and perspectives of the chief information officer. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60 (07), 2395A. (UMI No. 9939460)
- Becker, W., & Lewis, D. (1994). The economics of American higher education. *The Journal of higher education* 65 (1) 116.
- Bensimon, E. (1989). The meaning of good presidential leadership: A frame analysis. In Peterson (Eds.), *ASHE Reader of Organization and Governance in Higher Education* (pp. 421-431). Lexington, MA: Ginn.
- Bensimon, E., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). Making sense of administrative leadership: The 'L' word in higher education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University
- Bethel, C. (1998). A study of the relationship between presidential leadership orientation and organizational effectiveness in bible colleges. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(06), 1838A. (UMI No. 9926656)
- Bolman, L. (2011) Reliability of Leadership Orientations Scales. Retrieved March 25, 2011 from <http://www.bolman.com/LGB%20Web%20working%20area/orientations.htm>
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1984). *Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1990). *Leadership Orientations (Self)*. Brookline, MA: Leadership Frameworks.
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1991). *Images of leadership*. Occasional Paper No. 7. The National Center for Educational Leadership. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 332 345)
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Borden, M. (2000). Leadership orientations of area campus administrators in Florida's state university and community college systems: A frame analysis. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61, 3913.
- Cantu, D. (1997). The leadership frames of academic deans randomly selected and nominated as exceptionally effective at public colleges and universities. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58 (03), 657A. (UMI No. 9724134)
- Carnegie Foundation (2001). *Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education, 2000 edition*. Menlo Park, CA.
- Carnegie Mellon University (2011). The role of the president. Retrieved Jan 28, 2011 from <http://www.cmu.edu/about/leadership/president/role.shtml>
- Echols Tobe, D. (1999). The development of cognitive leadership frames among African American female college presidents. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60 (07), 2300A. (UMI No. 9939485)
- Garvey, J. (2007). "Philadelphia University: The role of presidential leadership in market adaptation and evolution of mission" (January 1, 2007). *ProQuest paper* AAI3255875. <http://repository.upenn.edu/dissertations/AAI3255875>
- Gilley, J., Fulmer, K., & Reithlingshoefer, S. (1986). *Searching for academic excellence: Twenty colleges and universities on the move and their leaders*. New York: Macmillan.

- Gutmann, A (2010) retrieved Dec 28, 2010 from <http://www.upenn.edu/president/meet-president/gutmann>
- Jablonski, M. (1992). Leadership styles of women college presidents. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53 (03), 676A. (UMI No. 9221576)
- Kane, S. (2001). Mid-level student affairs administrators' organizational "frame" orientations and perceptions of their effectiveness by senior student affairs officers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62 (12), 4087A. (UMI No. 3035847)
- Kezar, A., Eckel, P., Contreras-McGavin, M., & Quaye, S (2008). Creating a web of support: an important leadership strategy for advancing campus diversity *Higher Education* 55, 1, p69-92
- Levine, A., & Cureton, J. (1998). *When hope and fear collide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mosser, N. (2000). A study of the relationship between the perceived leadership style of nursing chairpersons and the organizational climate in baccalaureate nursing programs. (Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 43A.
- Murphy, M. (1997). *The advancement president and the academy: Profiles in institutional leadership*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Obama, B. (2011). State of the Union Address. January 25.
- Porter, M. & Opstal, D. (2001). U. S. competitiveness 2001: Strengths, vulnerabilities and long-term priorities. *Council on Competitiveness*, Washington, D.C.
- Raines, S. & Alberg, M. (2003) The Role of professional development in preparing academic leaders *New Directions for Higher Education*, n124 p33-39.
- Russell, C. (2000). Community college academic deans: Leadership frames and stress *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61 (10), 3866A. (UMI No. 9990484)
- Sasnett, B. & Clay, M.(2008) Leadership styles in interdisciplinary health science education, *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 22(6): 630–638.
- Small, T. (2002). A study of the relationship between the perceived leadership style of nursing chairpersons and the organizational effectiveness of baccalaureate nursing programs. (Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63, 2077A.
- Spanier, G. (2000, June/July). Five challenges facing American Higher Education. *Executive Speeches* 14, 19-25.
- Sypawka, W., Mallett, W. & McFadden, C.(2010). Leadership styles of community college academic deans *The Community College Enterprise*. 16, 1; 63-74
- Travis, A. (1996). Leadership styles of senior student affairs officers: A comparison by race and gender. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57 (11), 4619A. (UMI No. 9711725)
- Turley, C. (2002). Radiation therapy program directors: A frames analysis of leadership in higher education. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63 (03), 1246B. (UMI No.3045492)
- Wolf, R. (1998). Campus safety directors: A leadership frame analysis. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59 (11), 4082A. (UMI No. 9910810)

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Michael L. Monahan, is the Chair of the Department of Management at Frostburg State University in Maryland. He has 30 years of experience in administration and academia. His primary areas of interest are management, leadership, operations and strategic management. He has published more than 15 articles on Entrepreneurship, Leadership, Operations, and has conducted management development workshops for businesses in the community. He is the advisor for the Frostburg chapter of the Society for the Advancement of Management and has twice been awarded the Advisor of the Year by SAM. He is also active in a number of community organizations.

Amit J. Shah is professor of Management and Director of Center for Leadership Development at Frostburg State University (FSU) in Maryland. He has over 25 years of experience in industry and academia. He has taught a variety of business courses including business, management, strategic management, and international business. He has presented numerous papers at various conferences both domestically and internationally, published refereed articles in various journals and published proceedings, authored a text, Business Now, co-authored a text, Introduction to Business, both published by McGraw-Hill, and conducted workshops for various organizations in the area of business, strategy, and learning. He has also served as president of the Southeastern Chapters of the Decision Sciences Institute and president of the Institute for Operations Research and Management Sciences.