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ABSTRACT

LEADERSHIP STYLES OF DOMINICAN COLLEGE PRESIDENTS AT FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

There is plentiful information regarding leadership styles and higher education especially in the United States. However, literature on leadership styles of Dominican college presidents was almost non-existent. This study examined the leadership styles of selected Dominican college presidents in the United States. Bolman and Deal’s four cognitive leadership frames of structural, human resource, political, and symbolic provided the theoretical framework for this study. Bolman and Deal (2003) observed that the ability to use multiple frames was a correlate of effective leadership. Further they said, recent research found that effective organizations rely on multiple frames. Specifically, it examines the administrative style of the college presidency. Data for this study were obtained from the institutional policy on leadership in Dominican colleges, the Leadership Orientations Questionnaire, and adapted structured and unstructured interviews of Dominican college presidents.

Qualitative method of interview, documents, and survey (questionnaire) were used to collect and analyze data. A comparison was made between the frames determined from the interview analysis, documents analyzed, and the Bolman and Deal (1991) Leadership Orientations Questionnaire results. It was expected that the scores from the Leadership Orientations Questionnaire and the current frame usage, as determined from the interview transcripts of each of the president, and the documents analyzed corroborate. But the results of Bolman and
Deal (1991) Leadership Orientations Questionnaire indicated some findings that differ from the interview data, and the documents analyzed. In the Leadership Orientation Questionnaire, the three presidents utilized multi-frame, one utilized pair frame while two utilized the four cognitive frames slightly. The results of the presidents' interview and the documents when analyzed showed that the four presidents utilized the four cognitive frames.

The results showed four frames of leadership orientations to all the four of the cognitive frames, revealing that the presidents in this sample led in a participatory team orientations, and analytical manner toward a shared vision for the university. Specific circumstances required their immediate attention upon assuming the role of the presidency. The presidents in this sample did not limit their actions to only one or two single frames indicating that other university situations were not completely ignored.

The Dominican order democratic governance was evident in the presidents' leadership styles. They showed the importance of collaborative work and the need to consult extensively before making important decisions. The findings can be used by leaders in small academic organizations as well as by Dominicans aspiring to senior positions to help define and develop effective college presidential leadership styles. It could be the basis for further planning of leadership training programs and evaluation of these programs. It will also serve to introduce a new fertile research ground to survey the Dominican Order educational system.
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Chapter I

Introduction

Higher education is experiencing some remarkable changes, especially as they relate to the issue of leadership. As higher education leadership becomes increasingly demanding and complex, and as external and internal issues mount pressures, college and university presidents must understand these internal and external demands for an improved sense of identity, purpose, and leadership roles. Bolman and Deal (1984) proposed four different organizational lenses through which managers can better understand their organizations: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic.

Frames, for Bolman and Deal, influence what leaders see and do. Commenting on this, Bensimon (1989) said, “A frame represents a distinctive cognitive lens that helps the manager of an organization or the President of a college determine what is important and what can be safely ignored” (p. 426).

The topic of leadership in higher education is broad and its dynamics are poorly understood (Chaffie, 1989), because we know very little about how presidents take on roles, how they identify and assume their responsibilities, they face difficulties and the mistakes they make (Neumann, 1990). Ellis (1998) sees “leadership style as a pattern of behavior that reflects a sense of drive action and focus in applying a particular leadership mode” (p. 142). Tebbano (2002) said:

The concept of leadership style in a variety of organizations has created many studies assessing the effects of autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, transactional and transformational leadership styles. Organizational members were found to
prefer a democratic form of leadership style as to autocratic styles of dominant decision-making or manipulative forms of leadership. (p. 26)

Like other public and private higher education institutions, the presidency is a key position of power and leadership in Dominican higher institutions in the United States. From the position of the presidency, policy is generally shaped and the vision developed. The body of literature surrounding the history of Dominican colleges and universities confirms that research concerning Dominican education leadership has been scanty. Nealy (1957) poited, “Much has been said about Dominican education but little has been written” (p. 1). For over half a century, little has changed, and consequently, there is a paucity of literature on leadership styles of Dominican college presidents in higher education. McGreai (2003) described the culture of Dominican administrator as “one which was dominated with excellence and progress” (p. 14). McCaffrey (1992) indicated that “fundamental to all the presidents was the Catholic (sic) identity of the college, the relation of the seven hundred year old scholastic nucleus, a strong commitment to liberal arts, and a successful adaptation to the trends of higher education set by regional and national accrediting associations” (p. 14).

A search of available literature revealed few studies on the leadership styles of Dominican college presidents, with the exception of notes in the histories of the various colleges and universities. For example, of Father Slavin Joseph, the president of Providence College from 1947 to 1961, McCaffrey (1992) said, “stately, handsome, imperial, exuding an aura of authority, competence, and brilliant leadership, Father Slavin sought to bring Providence College to new heights in academia” (p. 10). In another development, it is said of the presidents of Dominican University, not College
San Rafael, "The Dominican College of San Rafael was fortunate in having a series of presidents who were and are women of outstanding caliber; especially, Mother Raymond O'Connor who served as president from 1936 to 1950 noted for her administrative ability and her devotion to the Dominican tradition" (Barry & Barry, 1987, p. 6).

Systematic studies of the theoretical framework used by leaders of higher education studies have been carried out (Bredeson, 1985; Dantley, 1989; Marshall & Scribner, 1991; Sturman 1986). Also Lee Bolman and Terence Deal (1991, 1992, 1997, 2003) have developed and validated a research instrument designed to categorize the leadership orientations, or dispositions toward particular theories of educational organization, of leaders. They held that effective leaders utilize more than one theoretical framework in solving problems and in setting policy (Flak, 1998). Their leadership orientations instrument suggests that the capacity to reframe determines one's success as a leader.

Challenges to higher institutions are well recognized, such as a decrease in state government funding, changing demographics of potential students, declining public esteem, emerging new models of higher education, and economic transformation (National Association of Universities and Land Grant Colleges, 1977). These forces have led to increased competition among institutions for both enrollment and financial support (Alfred & Carter, 1999). In view of these current issues, Peterson and Dill (1997) cautioned that higher education institutions needed to examine critically their programs and processes, to urgently adapt them when possible, and to recognize and restructure when needed. Meanwhile, Bass (1988) and Bennis and Nanus (1997) asserted that at a
time when an organization is undergoing dramatic transformation, a new kind of leadership at all levels is desperately needed.

Like other Catholic higher educational organizations in the United States, Dominican colleges are driven to engage in change by a variety of forces. As small, liberal arts colleges, Dominican colleges are faced with the social expectations of higher education, financial issues, enrollment, and increased competition. Besides the need to generate income, Dominican colleges also have to deal with emerging competition. Faced with unprecedented educational reform and improvement, Dominican colleges must find ways to cope with major changes beyond their control. Reframing leadership is desired and required as never before and, if Dominican college presidents are to cope with the challenges confronting higher institutions today, then how they frame their leadership experiences needs to be studied.

This study seeks to investigate the leadership styles of Dominican college presidents. It is necessary to know what qualities Dominican presidents bring to the presidency to better understand what must be done to help them maintain their position. Birnbaum, Bensimon, and Neumann (1989) affirmed, “that leadership is among the most complex of human phenomena.” Examination of leadership styles might illuminate what enables the president to succeed in different situations. Thus, being a leader in the higher education institution will require leading by values and building relationships. Minor (2001) claimed that, “education leadership is important to any organization, but particularly important to institutions of higher education given the amount of ambiguity surrounding the purpose and direction of colleges and universities” (pp. 1-2). Leadership style is important for Dominican college and university presidents to meet the needs of
their various institutions. The variety of forces (e.g., the need to develop sophisticated perspectives about diversity, the global awareness and empowerment from a variety of perspectives, basic concepts and elements in education about teaching and learning, and social expectations) indicates the importance of examining the leadership styles of Dominican college presidents.

It can be said that from the 1700s to the 1840s, the major concern of religious orders and bishops in the United States was the funding of Catholic colleges and universities. "According to Fairfax McLaughlin in college days at Georgetown was the Indian school taught by Father Andrew at St Mary's City, Maryland in 1634" (Power, 1951, p. 29). Hutchison (2001) said, "Some historians trace the roots of the first American Catholic college to the educational and missionary efforts of Jesuit Father Andrew White in St. Mary's City, Maryland in 1634" (p. 2). The first Catholic higher education institution was Georgetown University, which was founded in 1789. In 2001 there were 234 Catholic colleges and universities that enrolled more than 705,000 students in the United States (Hutchison, 2001, p. 1). In 2003 there were 239 all together, serving some 749,000 students (Glazier & Hellwig, 2004, p. 136). Glazier and Shelley (1997) said, "Aside from the Sulpicians, the only other Orders to establish colleges before 1840 were the Dominicans (briefly in Kentucky) and the Vincentians" (in Missouri) (p. 250). However, properly organized Catholic universities started about 1789.

A Catholic college may be described as a college or university, which chooses to emphasize the deepest human and spiritual traditions and values (Crockert, 1982, p. xvii). "The traditions of Catholic colleges and universities are also rooted in the long history of religious Orders, each with its distinctive focus, and each with its
outstanding teachers, scholars, and researchers. There is the Benedictine tradition, the Dominican tradition, and Franciscan tradition” (Crocker, 1982, p. xvi). Some other religious traditions include the Jesuits, Elizabeth Ann Seton, Ursuline sisters, Brothers of Christian schools, and Holy Cross brothers and sisters.

Crocker (1982) stated,

“Three characteristics that distinguish all Catholic colleges are (a) tradition, (b) values, and (c) campus ministry. Tradition deals with the Judeo-Christian tradition that lays emphasis on the importance of the individual and the nurture of the human mind. Value sees education as a social enterprise. The campus ministry is usually run by a priest, sister, brother or a lay Catholic, and it stresses the Catholic liturgies and practices” (p. xviii).

Hutchison (2001) reported,

In a study focusing on value sharing, that Murphy (1991) examined five very different Catholic colleges and universities: DePaul University, a large, Midwestern urban institution; Santa Clara University, a medium size west coast institution; Barry University in Miami FL; Trinity College, a small urban college in Burlington, VT; and St. Mary of the Woods College, a small rural women’s college in Terre Haute, IN. Murphy concluded that values shared in each institution are strong and well anchored in the Catholic tradition and also deeply marked by the charisms of the sponsoring congregations of the institutions. (p.10) Dominican colleges and universities, except Barry, fall within the small size colleges and universities with an average population range of 1200 to 4900 students. The Dominican
colleges and universities represent about five percent of the 239 Catholic colleges and universities in the United States.

Dominican colleges share similar Catholic values with any other Catholic higher institution. These Catholic traditions and values are embedded within the Dominican charism. The founding purposes of Dominican colleges and universities are similar to other American Catholic colleges. Catholic colleges were first founded for the preparation of clergy and religious men and women. Dominican colleges fit into the broader context of other United States Catholic higher education by being dedicated to the search for truth. Dominicans believe teaching, contemplation, and actions are joined together. One can only teach when he or she has first grasped the truth. The Dominican higher education institutions are known for openness to the investigation of the truth. Albert (1994) said, “These institutions [Dominican colleges] are known for their excellence in teaching, preaching, and dedication to truth, study, contemplation, and action” (p. 9). Quigley (1993), commenting on Dominican higher education said:

“A theological vision of reality, a theological mindset or world view informs all decisions, actions, and plans. Everything in Dominican life—its institutions, agencies, apostolate, forms of living and lifestyles—must have a theological rationale. The very being of the Dominican is theological so that all that is done is from the perspective of God and the things of God.” (p. 8)

Dominican higher education bears a distinctive character that is expressed in the 800-year-old scholastic nucleus and a strong commitment to liberal arts education. It is a character that is informed by the Dominican practice of disciplined inquiry and enriched by its integral theological excellence, preaching, and research. A character based on the
Dominican philosophy of education and tradition. The Dominican philosophy of education is an orientation to study, a contemplative attitude and prayer, and a collaboration based on respect. McNicholas (1996) claimed that, "through its intellectual, contemplative, and communal expression, the Dominican charism provides the spiritual foundation for the philosophy which is expected to permeate Dominican schools" (p. 2). She further said that the balance between contemplation and action is a priority for all Dominican leaders, who exercise leadership in the various institutions. Dominican higher institutions are known for their ideals of truth, academic excellence, and openness to diverse worldviews. It is the aforementioned issues that make Dominican higher education different from other Catholic institutions.

The Dominican Order consists of men and women as members of its religious group. McGreal (2003) said, "The Order of Preachers (Dominicans) is composed of men and women of four branches: friars, who may be priests or brothers; clustered nuns; sisters; and laity" (p. 2). In the United States, there are 19 Dominican colleges and universities. Examples of such colleges are Providence College in Rhode Island, founded by the Dominican fathers (Friars) of United States in 1919 (McCaffrey, 1992), and Caldwell College in New Jersey, founded in 1939 by the Sisters of Saint Dominic (McGreal, 2003). "The Dominican house of studies was first established in 1834 at Somerset, Ohio as a General stadium of the Dominican Order in the United States, and later moved to Washington, DC in 1935" (Albert, 1994, p. 24). These institutions are the heirs to the rich heritage and traditions provided by their founder, Saint Dominic Guzman, and his followers.
Historically, education has been at the root of the Dominican Order. For instance, on December 22, 1216, Pope Honorius III, in the foundation document, declared Dominic's order “etiolable... for all time to come.” A brief bull predating, “That the brethren of your Order will be the champions of the faith and true light of the world,” followed this document. From the beginning, “St. Dominic, by the particular inspiration which was his, laid the foundation for the involvement of religious in the work of education” (Nealy, 1957, p.34). Halpin (1968) noted that “because of Dominic’s work and accomplishments, Dominicans found themselves at the source and heart of the educational apostolate” (p. 23). All the Dominican institutions have a history going back to their founder Dominic and followers such as Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great, Catherine of Siena, Meister Eckhart, and many others.

Dominican institutions in the United States have been in existence since the 19th century. The Dominican University of San Rafael, California was established in 1890 and was the first to grant degrees in 1917 (Albert, 1994, p. 9). “During its first few years Dominican University mee college of San Rafael faced a hard time, by the fire that burnt down the school” (Barry & Barry, 1984). In 1915 the college was reopened and became a 4-year college in 1917. Dominican colleges and universities in the United States are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of university/college</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date of Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominican House of Studies</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican School of Philosophy/Theology</td>
<td>Berkeley, California</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican University, San Rafael</td>
<td>San Rafael, California</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquinas Institute of Theology</td>
<td>St. Louis, Missouri</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Dominican University</td>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence College</td>
<td>Providence, Rhode Island</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siena Heights University</td>
<td>Adrian, Michigan</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albertus Magnus College</td>
<td>New Haven, Connecticut</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquinas College</td>
<td>Grand Rapids, Michigan</td>
<td>1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican University</td>
<td>River Forest, Illinois</td>
<td>1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood College</td>
<td>Madison, Wisconsin</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's College</td>
<td>Newburgh, New York</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquinas College</td>
<td>Nashville, Tennessee</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell College</td>
<td>Caldwell, New Jersey</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry University</td>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine's College</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican College</td>
<td>Orangeburg, New York</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas Aquinas College</td>
<td>Sparkill, New York</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molloy College</td>
<td>Rockville Centre, New York</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All are deeply rooted in the Dominican traditions, which have been tested and proven through centuries, and they owe much to their heritage.

Albert (1994) said, "In reviewing the mission statements of all the Dominican institutions in the United States, one will find a common element that weave tapestry of how they communicate the word of God through teaching, preaching, and services" (p. 9). Even though Dominican colleges and universities share some common elements, no two of them are exactly alike. Their differences are most visible in the ethnic background of students, the size of students' enrollment, and programs offered. Albert continued, "Dominican educational tradition is a conviction of the importance of the religious dimension of life and a concentration on essentials in the search for truth" (1994, p. 9).

Bouchard (2001) said, "The Dominican education tradition, like the Jesuit, Marianist, Franciscan, Vincentian and other great religious traditions, is derived from, and deeply rooted in, the wider Catholic ethos. Like these traditions, Dominicans bring certain elements of the Catholic heritage together in a distinctive way. Contemplation, study, and virtue should form the matrix of Dominican higher education" (p. 57). A long tradition of learning, sanctity, and culture connotes this tradition.

Many Dominicans have earned leadership positions in higher education and in teaching. They are making strides as full participants in providing leadership roles to different institutions of higher learning. Quigley (1993) stated, "The world of higher education is a most apt place for the presence of Dominicans" (p. 5). Dominicans are active in higher education throughout the United States. McGreal (1998) wrote, "Out of their traditional association with Universities in Europe and the Americas, Dominicans have served as administrators and professors in higher education throughout the United
States" (p. 14). A majority of them are involved in theological and philosophical departments where they often hold departmental leadership. The great emphasis that the Order places on study and intellectual life has been a key element that contributes to the success of Dominican educational work. The purpose of Dominican institutions has always been to strive to bring people in harmony with themselves and with their God, which they have accomplished through liberal arts as they prepare their students to become leaders in the world.

Presently, the Dominican colleges in the United States are going through a tremendous change. Some of the colleges are expanding significantly. Board (2000) reported, "Barry University, a small college, opened its doors in 1941 with an enrollment of 45 students to its present student population which numbered more than 8000 undergraduate and graduate students in the spring of 2000" (p. 123). Barry University is now a comprehensive university (Barry Graduate Catalogue, 2002). In 2002–2003, the total enrollment of Barry University was 8,469 full-time undergraduate, graduate, adult and continuing education, and professional. Another example is Rosary College in Chicago that changed its name to Dominican University in 1995, and reaffirms its commitment to the Dominican values of education (Undergraduate Bulletin 2002-2004).

In 1981 Dominican University had two undergraduate schools and two graduate schools (Undergraduate Catalogue, 1981). This university in 2004 has six schools, two undergraduates, and four at the graduate level. They are: the Rosary College of Arts and Sciences, the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, the School of Business, the School of Education, the Institute of Adult Learning and the Graduate School of Social Work. In addition, Ohio Dominican College changed its name to Ohio
Dominican University in 2003. While some are growing, others still remain small liberal arts colleges, for example, St. Thomas Aquinas College, in New York (Student Handbook, 2003-2004).

Through these changes, most notably expansions, Dominican institutions have maintained their goals in liberal arts and theological education. Through liberal arts, they sustain the teaching of humanities in the face of the expansion of scientific and technological knowledge. In order to meet these challenges, Dominican college presidents may benefit through a clearer identification of their leadership styles.

**Problem Statement**

Many studies concentrate on higher education administration. A good number of them explore a wide range of presidential leadership positions in colleges and universities. Examples include “Leadership in Higher Education,” by McDade (1987), and “The Meaning of Good Presidential Leadership,” by Bensimon (1989). The topic of leadership is broad, and its dynamics are poorly understood (Chaffee, 1989) because we know very little about how presidents identify and assume responsibilities, the difficulties they face and the mistakes they make (Neumann, 1990). Some theories of leadership have adopted the idea of reframing leadership as the needed style in dealing with rapid change and uncertain environments. Transformational theory and symbolic theory are two examples of these theories. Presidents will face many challenges, which will result in new directions for higher education. Kurt Waldheim (as cited in Keller, 1983) said:

Many great civilizations in history have collapsed at the height of their achievements because they were unable to analyze their problems, to change
direction, and adjust to new situations, which face them by concerting their wisdom and strength. (p.171)

Dominican higher institutions are in a state of change. They are at a crossroads brought about by social, political, and economic factors that confront the leaders in higher education. These factors require strong presidential leadership to resolve the challenges facing higher education today. It is an era which calls for different leadership styles for the future. For a majority of Dominican institutions, adequate funding, student enrollment, up-to-date computer technology, and instructor accountability in relation to academic assessment remain issues for future resolution. By the same token, there is no research on how Dominican college presidents frame their leadership experiences. As a result, there is the need to examine their leadership experiences and share them with others who aspire to higher positions within the higher education domain.

Researchers have posited theories that identify the leadership characteristics and attitudes of leaders in higher education institutions. Among the theories are trait theory (Kerr & Gade, 1986), social exchange theory (Carson, 1960), transformational theory (Bennis, 1972) behavioral theory (Blake & Mouton, 1981), symbolic theory (Martin 1982), and reframing theory (Bolman & Deal 1997; Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). As Bolman and Deal (2003) noted, “Many views of leadership fail to recognize its rational and contextual nature and its distinction from power to position” (pp. 338-339).

Reviewing the different theories indicated that an administrator would use any number of theoretical approaches successfully in a given situation in higher education. Bolman and Deal (2003) said, “Each of the frames offers a distinctive image of the leadership process.
Depending on the leader and circumstances, each can lead to compelling and constructive leadership, but none is right for all times and seasons" (p. 348).

The theoretical approaches adopted by an administrator depend on the environment, the temperament, and the fiscal constraints. This study uses the Bolman and Deal (1994) theory to discuss the leadership styles of Dominican college presidents. Bolman and Deal’s work was chosen because it adopts a system theory. “Reframing offers a way to get beyond narrow and oversimplified views of leadership” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 13). Secondly, Bolman and Deal’s (1997) work was chosen because it represents the accepted scholarship in the field of leadership. Their work also adapts a reframing theory to higher education and is presented as sensitive to diversity.

Bolman and Deal argued that the ability to assume a multi-frame perspective is critical for successful leadership. This conceptual framework supports, and is useful for, analyzing leadership in variety of settings and situations (Bassoppo-Mayo, 1997; Becker, 2000; Bensimon 1989; Bolman & Deal, 1984,1991a, 1991b, 1997; Flak, 1998; Knudsen, 2000; McClellan-Holt, 2001; Van Dei Veer, 1993; Wolf, 1999), because it has been applied to leadership in higher education. It is important to acknowledge the current progress made by Dominican college presidents, and it is necessary to know what individual qualities they take to the presidency as well as what one who aspires to higher education leadership can learn from that.
Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to utilize the four cognitive frameworks of Bolman and Deal (1994), to identify and analyze the leadership styles of Dominican college presidents in 4-year institutions of higher learning. The contributing factors to the development of these leadership traits were also studied. It discussed presidents' opinions and beliefs about leadership in higher education. It examined the early experiences of Dominican college presidents in 4-year institutions of higher learning, and how they frame their experiences. This study addressed the question of whether Dominican college and university presidents utilize the four cognitive frames in their leadership styles, and what is unique about them. This is a qualitative study. Qualitative method was chosen in order to do an in-depth study on the topic. Patton (2002) stated, “Qualitative methods permit the evaluator to study selected issues in depth and detail” (p. 348).

Significance of the Study

First, the research of this study is significant as it investigates the influences of Dominican college presidents' leadership styles, as well as how certain attitudes, values, and life experiences may play a role in the differences in their leadership characteristics. It will also give further insight into the Dominican education tradition and its emphasis on the intellectual life.

Second, this study has relevance for all people in higher education, although it is aimed especially at college presidents. Murphy (2001) said, “What is abundantly clear is
that leadership, especially presidential leadership, necessarily qualifies the mission and the mission in turn, conditions the president’s leadership” (p.15).

Third, this study is significant as it examined the Dominican college president leadership styles, as well as how symbolic, human resource, political, and structural influences may play a role in the differences in their leadership styles.

Fourth, it is also important to examine what Dominican college presidents, once in positions of power, need in order to have an influence on the situations they lead.

For years, researchers have defined leadership in myriad ways. They have found that there are various kinds of leadership, that leadership works in many ways and it has distinctive requirements and processes. Leadership does not result merely from individual traits, but it also involves attributes of the transaction between those who lead and those who follow in the context of situational variables (Carraway, 1990; Friesen, 1983). The data of this study can produce practical theories by which further Dominican educational history can be studied. The findings of this research may also be added to the increasing body of knowledge on the subject of Dominican education.
The Research Question

What are the leadership styles and characteristics of Dominican college presidents?

Subsidiary Questions

Other research questions designed to help guide this study are based on Bolman and Deal’s (1994), four-frame work. They include the following:

1. Do Dominican college presidents utilize the structural framework for leadership, and if so, how?
2. Do Dominican college presidents utilize the human resource framework, and if so, how?
3. Do Dominican college presidents utilize the political framework, and if so, how?
4. Do Dominican college presidents utilize the symbolic framework, and if so, how?

Definition of Terms

Frequently cited terms are defined as they are used in this study.

Leadership: a subtle process of mutual influence fusing thought, feeling, and action to produce cooperative effort in the service of purposes and values of both the leader and the led (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Leadership styles: strategies and techniques used to motivate others to perform a task for the good of the institution. Styles may include attitudes, decision-making strategies, communication styles, supervision techniques, values, perceptions, or skills. The term “leadership styles” may be used interchangeably with leadership traits, leadership qualities, leadership behaviors, leadership skills, or leadership characteristics.
Dominican: properly called Order of Preachers (Ordo Praedicatorum), the mendicant Order of men and women established in 1215 by St Dominic (Encyclopedia of American Catholic history, 2003).

Friars: meaning brothers, a word used by Dominican men to address themselves.

College: A school conferring degrees / diplomas to students upon graduation for pursuing academic curricula beyond the high school level.

Dominican College: a 4-year school for higher studies founded within the Dominican tradition, owned and sponsored by the Dominicans.

Presidents: in education, the chief executive officer of an institution of higher education, that is a college or university. Presidents (or chancellors as they are called in English and a handful of American universities) are charged with carrying out broad educational policies determined by governing boards of trustees, in the case of private institutions, or boards of state-appointed regents, in the case of public colleges or universities.

Institutions: a specialized 2- or 4-year institution of higher education operating either independently or as a school within a large university. An institute is usually limited to offering associate's or bachelor's degrees in scientific and technical fields. The term is also used to refer to a brief, intensive and rarely held university or postgraduate courses of instruction in a selected area not usually covered by conventional, regularly scheduled courses.

Higher learning: a broad term referring to formal study beyond the secondary school level usually provided by colleges and universities.

Frame: refers to a perspective for understanding a given subject matter, in our context, leadership style.
Human Resource is based on the interaction between individual and organizations. Human resource leaders are concerned with the feelings of others and seek to lead through facilitation and employment (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 315).

Political frame focuses on conflict among different groups and interests for scarce resources. Political leaders are effective at building alliances for mutual support. They are also effective in mobilizing people and resources (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 198).

Structural frame emphasizes rationality, efficiency, structures and policies (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 40).

Symbolic frame: sees a chaotic world in which meaning and predictability are socially constructed, and facts are interpretive rather than objective (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 270).

Limitations of Study

This study is limited to a sample of 6 of the 19 Dominican colleges and universities in the United States. It has implications as well for all Dominican colleges and universities in the United States. This study limits its focus on the leadership characteristics of six Dominican college presidents, and is thus limited to their views and those of some selected deans, administrators, faculties, and boards of trustees. All three of the theological and philosophical schools are outside the scope of this study. They offer degrees only in two disciplines, theology and philosophy. Secondly, the theological and philosophical schools are primarily for the preparation of men and women for the church ministry. Also the two 2-year Dominican colleges are excluded. The 2-year
Dominican colleges offer only associate's degrees. This study is conducted in six Dominican liberal arts colleges.

All the six colleges are doing well with respect to the indicators of enrollment and academic program development. The six Dominican colleges claim to have a strong commitment to liberal arts, a successful adaptation to the trends of higher education and to the Dominican education tradition. Also, the six colleges offer a full range of undergraduate majors as well as master's degrees. Carnegie, (2004) classified the six Dominican colleges as master's granting institutions.

Summary

Chapter 1 presented the problem that was examined and provided the introduction, significance, and the purpose for studying this particular issue. Along with the introduction, the research questions have been stated, specific terms have been defined, and limitations have been identified. Chapter 2 provided a review of literature, the history of Dominican institutions of higher learning, and the Dominican teaching apostolate. It included a review of literature on leadership in higher education, leadership styles theory, leadership styles in higher education and presidential leadership as it pertains to the role of a president in higher education and leadership theories. Chapter 3 contains the methodology, conceptual framework, research design, the population and sampling process, the instrumentation, data collection and data analysis for this study. Chapter 4 is the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the data. Chapter 5 presents the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.
Chapter II

Literature Review

Dominican Institutions of Higher Learning in the United States

To grasp the Dominican institutions of higher learning in the United States, this section presents an overview of the 19 Dominican colleges and universities. The mission given to the Dominicans by their founder, Dominic de Guzman (1170-1221), was to proclaim the word of God while sustained by life in common, through preaching and teaching by example. Men and women of the Order of Preachers (Dominicans) have been more on this mission in the United States for more than 2 centuries. The Dominican colleges, universities, and seminaries, which began to appear in the United States in the 19th century, had an ancient tradition drawn from their founder, Saint Dominic. Albert (1994) claimed “These institutions are known for their excellence in teaching, preaching, and dedication to truth, study, contemplation, and action” (p. 9).

Dominican colleges and universities were founded in different cities within the United States. Some of these institutions took the name of the city in which they were located, such as Providence College in Rhode Island and Ohio Dominican University in Columbus, Ohio. “An atmosphere of intellectual effort and struggle was the very condition laid down. The friars were to be intent on study... to stay up at night if they wish to study, and to make their church services brief so that this aim should not be impeded” (Hinnebush, 1975, p. 345).
"The Dominican University, nee college, of San Rafael California started in 1890 as a junior college, and in 1917, a four year college became a reality" (Barry & Barry, 1984, p. 4). It conferred its first bachelor's degree that same year. From its foundation, the Dominican University was faithful to the Dominican education tradition. "The goal of the college was a liberal arts education which provided a sound basis for the understanding of the natural and social environments in which we live and the relationships and responsibilities they offer" (Barry & Barry, 1984, p. 8). "The Dominican University of San Rafael is dedicated to a tradition of interdisciplinary study and has a strong commitment of involving students in fostering their own intellectual, spiritual, ethical and social development" (p. 23). Further, "the hallmark of this program started in the thirties with a pioneering humanities program for the interdisciplinary study of western civilization" (p. 8).

The humanistic basis of Dominican education emphasizes the moral and intellectual values, while the interdisciplinary focus was on specialization. The colleges exhibit the Dominican ideal of intellectual curiosity and educational creativity, of personal freedom, and moral involvement. The Dominican House of Studies was founded in 1834 and conferred its first degrees in 1906. "It was founded for the training of future Dominican friars in philosophy and theology. Dominican House of Studies trains students to develop skills in preaching, sacramental ministry, pastoral counseling, Christian education, communication, teaching, and research"(Albert, 1994, p.25). Rotary College in River Forest, Illinois, nee Dominican University was founded in 1922 and granted its first bachelor's degree in 1904. "Dominican University River Forest promotes teaching and learning as its first purpose which takes place in the context of a Catholic, humanistic
tradition that affirms the sacredness and significance of life in an atmosphere of free inquiry and respect for divergent opinion" (Albert, 1994, p. 39).

McGreal (1998) reported, "Between two world wars five colleges were founded. Providence College in Rhode Island, granted its first degree in 1923. Providence College fosters the intellectual development of its students through the disciplines of the sciences and humanities, equipping them to become productive and responsible citizens of a democratic society" (p. 37). Albert (1994) repeated:

In the succeeding years, Siena Heights College, nee university, was founded in Adrian, Michigan and granted degrees in 1924. Siena Heights University provides an educational process, which challenges the individual to identify, to refine, and to achieve his/her personal goals. The Ohio Dominican University, nee college, at Columbus founded in 1911, grounds educational experiences in the liberal arts that foster long learning through research and creative activities. It promotes the development and responsible use of human skills and talents in professional and social services. (p. 350)

Albertus Magnus College in New Haven, founded in 1924, bestowed bachelor's degrees in 1928. The college believes in core education in liberal arts that prepares students to become leaders in a rapidly changing world.

During the 1930s, more Dominican institutions of higher learning were founded. At Berkeley California, the Dominican school of theology and philosophy started in 1851 and awarded its first degrees in 1936. The Dominican school of philosophy and theology at Berkeley educates students in the knowledge and effective communication of philosophical and theological truth, thereby forming a community of learning inspired by
the gospel. The Dominicans of Newburgh, New York founded Mount Saint Mary College in 1930. The college develops in its students the attitude of lifelong learning involving ongoing acquisition of skills and knowledge, a continuing selection of and commitment to values and a value system. In Kentucky, a junior college was opened, named Saint Catherine’s College, and granted its first associate’s degrees in 1931. Saint Catherine College commits itself to the free pursuit of truth as a 2-year independent, Catholic, co-educational, liberal arts college in the Dominican tradition.

American provinces of the friars took part in the postwar period in promoting the study of theology among the laity by means of Thomist Associates, regional study groups, and courses in theology in colleges for women and men throughout the country (McGreal, 2003, p.10).

McGreal (1998) said:

- The same decade of the 1940s was marked by the initial conferral of bachelor’s degrees in five Dominican institutions of higher learning"(p. 10). The province of Saint Albert the Great sponsored the Aquinas Institute of Theology in 1925.
- “Aquinas Institute commits to the advancement of theological scholarship, a deeper understanding of God’s revelation in Jesus Christ, and the academic and pastoral training of women and men for service in the church and to society in the Dominican tradition (Albert, 1994, p. 49).

Between 1922 and 1942 three institutions emerged. The Grand Rapids Dominicans founded Aquinas College. The Adrian Dominicans founded Barry University, nee College. The Barry encourages students to assume leadership through quality education and examine the fundamental questions of human experience in the
liberal arts tradition. Sinsinawa Dominicans founded Edgewood College, and it promotes intellectual competence by providing instruction in disciplined inquiry and reflective judgment in the arts, science, and professional fields. "Another institution granting first degrees that year was Caldwell College, sponsored by Caldwell Dominicans" (McGreal, 2003, p. 11). Caldwell provides a liberal arts education, which promotes spiritual, aesthetic, and intellectual growth.

The Amityville Dominicans founded Molloy College in Rockville Centre, New York in 1955. Molloy College provides a value-centered educational experience that enhances intellectual, ethical, spiritual, and social development. In 1959, degrees were granted by the Dominican College of Blauvelt, founded by Blauvelt Dominicans. "The college provides education that enables the students to develop the personal, intellectual, moral, and social competencies needed for excellence, leadership, and service. In 1961, the Nashville Dominicans granted associate degrees earned at Aquinas Junior College" (pp. 11-15). Aquinas College provides an education of learning permeated with faith, and directed to the intellectual, moral, and professional formation of the human person. McGreal (1998) recounted:

Out of their traditional association with universities in Europe, and the Americas, Dominicans have served as administrators and professors in higher education throughout the United States. They have established more than eighteen colleges and universities, including the unique graduate school for men and women Aquinas Institute of Theology. Recent movement had lead toward collaboration in the United States, which had resulted in a consortium. (p. 13-14)
Dominican institutions of higher learning’s general aims were to develop to the fullest extent the intellectual powers of the person, to permeate the educational training with Catholic principles, to develop the social nature of the students, and to give necessary attention to the development of their physical well-being.

Murphy (1991) said,

The spirit of abundant gladness derives from a more general, 700-year-old Dominican value. Saint Dominic charged the Dominicans with the spread of truth by the development of the intellectual life and by spreading the Dominican motto, contemplata alis tradere, or to give others the fruits of contemplation. (p. 9)

Murphy further said,

The distinctive character of the Dominican is an aura of joy, a joyfulness that permeates all aspects of life. If the Dominicans through the centuries would become famous for their mission of delivering the fruits of contemplation, scholarship, and education, they believed they would become equally famous for the method in which they achieved their mission: with a spirit of joy. (p. 23)

In reviewing the mission statements of all the Dominican institutions in the United States, one finds a common element that weaves a tapestry of how they communicate the word of God through teaching, preaching, and service (Albert, 1994).

She further reported, “The institutions of the Order of Preachers strive to insure a Christian presence in the world, by building community among its faculty, staff, students, board of trustees, and administrators that adhere, to the moral values and Christian commitment” (p. 9).
Dominican Teaching Apostolate

The Dominican educational system of teaching is derived directly from the Order's own spirit. It is a passion for teaching, which has endured for 8 centuries. First, there is the willingness to use contemplation in human knowledge, and secondly, there is the stress on the search for truth. Dominican education is not complete without the attention to develop the moral, intellectual, and spiritual well-being of the person. Keegan (1997) elaborated:

The need for study, for a well-educated clergy, and the need to live on the frontiers of society is what brought Dominicans to the universities in the thirteenth century. And it was there that the Dominican educational tradition took hold. All the great universities of Europe had Dominican centers of learning; teaching is at the heart of the Dominican life. (p. 5)

Keegan continued, "Examples of the great European universities with Dominican centers of learning are Oxford University, University of Cologne, and University of Salamacia. Keegan further stated, The Dominican educational tradition has always been intellectual at its core" (p. 5).

McCaffrey (1992) said, "Dominic immediately sent his sons to study at great European universities" (p. 3). Where they went to study, they remained to teach. The Dominicans have been engaged in university teaching, research, and scholarly publication almost since the foundation of the Order. "The legacy of Dominican teaching is understood through anecdotal references to legendary teachers here and elsewhere or perhaps through the lives of the most famous Dominicans of the past and present. So, while the raison d'être of Dominican education itself may seem uncompromising and
ultimate, the means of bringing about an understanding of this ultimate truth have been left up to the men who were on the place, as it were. "Saint Thomas Aquinas took Dominic’s idea and affirmed that teaching was one of the essential objects of the Order and in his Apologia for Religious Orders argued the appropriateness of the teaching apostolate for religious" (McCaffrey, 1992, p. 4).

For the next 6 centuries, some Dominicans held the teaching chairs of scripture and theology at nearly all the major European universities from Oxford to Lyons, Paris, Bologna, Bordeaux, Cologne, Milan, and Valencia. Dominicans recognize that universities remain crucial institutional settings in the Order. By the 19th century, a host of Dominican men and women have carried on the Dominican teaching tradition throughout Europe. McCaffrey (1992) noted, "The idea then traversed the Atlantic Ocean" (p. 4).

Quigley (1993) reported,

Dominicans made the intellectual life, the life of the mind, central to their lifestyle.

Dominicans teach on faculties at a host of universities and schools of theology; e.g. Catholic University of America, St. Thomas Aquinas University in Rome, Notre Dame, The Chicago Theological Union, the Graduate Theological Union at Berkeley, Aquinas Institute at the University of St. Louis, and the Pontifical faculty of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, DC. (p. 5)

Dominican men and women continue to be involved in the work of teaching. They can be found in the different colleges, universities, and seminaries in the United States. The idea of teaching was seen as an aspect that characterized the Dominican life
and spirit. It is within this scenario that Dominicans continue to push ahead within the educational field, even within our century.

*Leadership in Higher Education*

Bennis and Nanus (1997) said, "Multiple interpretations of leadership exist, each providing a sliver of insight but remaining an incomplete and wholly inadequate explanation" (p. 4). Sergiovanni (1992) stated, "Leadership can come in many forms.

Further he said that leadership is a reciprocal process of leading and directing the efforts of others (Sergiovanni, 1996, p. 87). Burns (1978) distinguished "leadership from power holding and brute power" (p. 5). Hensley (1998) defined leadership as a conceptual, moral, and performing art form, it is an integrating art form involving the orchestration of ideas, values and skills. It is a venture in moral philosophy (p. 145). "Leadership is any attempt to influence the behavior of another individual or group" (Hensley, 1998, p.147).

Eisenschel (1999) asserted that leadership it the ability to decide what is to be done and then get others to want to do it. It is also seen as a process, which induces groups to pursue objectives shared by the leader. Foster (1986) posited, "Leadership as being neither a property of the individual nor a property of the situation, rather it is a transient phenomenon...leadership represents a hermeneutic view, it is a communal democratic effort founded in the notion of praxis, penetrating structure and predicted on language and communication." (p. 2). Evans (1996) defined leadership as "an act of creating a vision, developing an overall plan or strategy, enlivening the members of a
group or organization to follow this plan and vision, and proceeding to change the culture of the organization” (p. 148). Foster (1996) reported that:

Research traditions in leadership could be grouped into six major categories: trait, power and influence, behavioral, contingency, cultural and symbolic, and cognitive. The trait theory, attempts to identify specific personal characteristics that appear to contribute to a person's ability to assume and successfully function in positions of leadership. Power and influence theories consider leadership in terms of source and amount of power available to leaders and the manner in which leaders exercise that power over followers through either unilateral or reciprocal interactions. Behavioral theories study leadership by examining patterns of activity, managerial roles, and behavior categories of the leader that they consider what it is that leaders actually do. Contingency theories emphasize the importance of situational factors, such as the nature of the task performed by a group or the nature of the external environment to understand effective leadership. Cultural and symbolic theories study the influence of leaders in maintaining or reinterpreting the systems of shared beliefs and values that give meaning to organizational life. Finally, cognitive theories suggest that leadership is a social attribution that permits people to make sense of an equivocal, fluid, and complex world. (pp. 1-2)

Leadership is seen as a normative concept where followers work to satisfy the arrangement of relationship for the purposes of the organization and that issues particular organization is faced with any given time (Tebbano, 2002). Hensley (1998) claimed that, “leadership exists to create social activities, social structures,
and social institutions designed to carry out the functions of a society. Leadership exists only in the context of social relationships. For leadership to exist, there must be a leader and followers” (p.147). According to Bennis (1999), the nature of leadership is mercurial due to the rational and irrational nature of people and is a reflection of the culture in which it is found.

According to Gotechall, “Character is vital in a leader, the basis for everything else” (as cited in Bennis, 1989, p. 140). “True leadership is synonymous with self-expression, which is the highest expression of a true individualist” (Plass, 1996, p. 76). “Leadership is a challenge of character” (Bogue, 1994, p. xii). “Leadership is an observable, learnable set of practices. Leadership is not something mystical and ethereal that cannot be understood by ordinary people. Given the opportunity for feedback and practice, those with the desire and persistence to lead can substantially improve their abilities to do so” (Kouzes & Posner, 1995, p. 323). Further they said that it is the participation of the people within an organization to react and act upon the forces of decision making and vision building engages them to be involved in the leadership process. In this manner, leadership is defined “as the art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for shared aspirations” (as cited in Tettcano 2002, p.15).

According to Plass (1996b):

Leadership is an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves a structuring or restructuring of the situation and the perceptions and expectation of the members. Leaders are agents of change—persons whose acts affect other people more than other peoples’ acts affect them. Leadership occurs
when one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in the group (pp. 19-20).

Kouzes and Posner defined:

Leadership as the participation of people within an organization to react and act upon the forces of decision-making and vision-building that engages them to be involved in the leadership process. In this manner, leadership is defined “as the art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for shared aspirations” (p. 30).

Burns (1978) said,

Leadership induces followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations, the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations of both leaders and followers. Leadership over human beings is exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers (pp. 18-19).

Juižus, Haldérglde and Jeffrey (1999) proposed, "The issue of leadership and power within institutions of higher learning is derived from the ability of leadership to accept multidimensional perspectives that are characterized by interdependence, diversity, and famous paradigms of authority" (p. 1). They also asserted that effective leadership is a combination of structural attributes (rank / positions), being in the right unit, and location, the amount of control over resource allocation and the organizational culture. They attributed personal qualities of a leader as:

One that demonstrates vision, ethos, integrity, intellectual and socialization skills in-addition to having appropriate dress appearance and maintaining social
activities. Further, they declared that leaders must have the ability to influence others. They contended that structural attributes of leadership are the abilities to manage and contain external and internal conflicts. Julius, et al. identified, exercising influence and persuasion in strategic ways, setting priorities, building a team, and managing conflict as skills efficient leaders utilize in addition to using structured decision-making processes and establishing policy convergences (p. 1). Leadership does not result merely from individual traits, but also involves attributes of the transaction between those who lead, those who follow, situational variables (Carraway, 1990; Fiesen, 1983). Kotter (1990) maintained, Leadership establishes direction, aligns people by communicating the direction by means of both words and behavior, motivates and inspires people to overcome obstacles to change, and finally produces change, which may be highly useful and notably different from past practices (p. 1). The three major factors in the leadership process are the leader, the follower, and the situation, and all situational approaches require the leader to behave flexibly (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) defined “leadership as the basic energy to initiate and sustain action that translates intention into reality” (p. 200). Gardner (1986) wrote, “Leadership is the process of persuasion and example by which an individual induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers” (p. 1). “Most definitions share the assumption that it involves a social influence process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people in an attempt to structure the activities and relationships in a group or organization” (Yuki, 1998, p. 14).
Leadership is largely a function of communication and information management (Parker, 1998, p.6). Leadership is perceived as special characteristics that manifest themselves early in the life of outstanding leaders (Fincher, 1987, p.159). Diï (1991) explained “Leadership addresses the interpersonal processes of motivation, training, helping, and dealing with issues of authority and dependence” (pp. 304-320). Leadership should be viewed as an extension of management not as an opposite (King, 1989). Some forms of leadership may inspire some followers while causing contempt in others (Yammarino & Bass, 1990). Selznick (1957) suggested that, “leadership refers to the ability to infuse daily behavior with meaning to create an institutional embodiment of purpose” (p. 149).

**The Trait Theories**

Trait theory had to do with leaders and followers. It examined those personality attributes that constitute the ability of a leader to lead. Traits are classified as those attributes relating to personality, physical appearance, social background, intelligence, and ability; it was believed that their presence differentiated leaders from followers and, even effective leaders from ineffective leaders (Dessler, 1980, p. 256). Trait theory describes leaders as approachable, articulate, attractive, charismatic, confident, decisive, fair, flexible, imaginative, rational, reliable, sensitive, self-assured and tactful (Dressel, 1981). Church said, “Executive aspirant needed certain physical and moral traits and when he learned from his predecessors and had the experience, he would become effective” (as cited in Wren, 1979, p. 206).
Situational Leadership

Situational leadership had to do with specific characteristics of organizational climate, structural properties of the organization, subordinate characteristics, and so on. Walter (1998) verified "that leaders who attend to both task and personal needs are considered to be most effective; indeed, the majority of the evidence indicates that no style or one type of leadership is consistently more effective than another: those perceived to be effective are task oriented at times and concerned with socio-emotional needs at other times" (p. 42).

Situational leadership addresses the contextual nature of leadership. While the exercise of leadership is indeed self-evident, it is not universal. Each situation demands a different leadership style (Hersey & Blanchard, p. 113, 1993). Hensley (1998) said, "Leaders must be able to diagnose the situation, adapt and select the leadership style appropriate for the situation" (p. 41). Stogdill held that the most effective leaders appear to exhibit a degree of versatility and flexibility that enables them to adapt their behavior to the changing and contradictory demands made on them (as cited in Hersey & Blanchard, 1993). Hensley asserted that, "situational leadership's contribution is found in its attention to situational nature of leadership itself" (p. 41).

Situational leadership is related to an institution's philosophy (Miller, 1983) and to motivation theory (Brin, 1983). "They held that leaders should engage in different combinations of tasks and relationship behaviors depending upon the maturity of members of the group in relation to a specific task" (Walter, 1998, p. 618). Leithwood and McLean (1987) wrote, "Highly effective heads know many forms of decision making and are skilled in their use, and are situationally sensitive in their selection of a particular
approach to decision making" (p. 35). Flaeer (1998) posited, "The situational leadership theory of Hersey and Blanchard (1988) is an extension of Tannenbaum and Schmidt's (1973) leadership style continuum, Blake and Mouton's (1985) managerial grid, and Reddin's (1970) three dimensional leadership styles." Further he suggested, "The situational leadership theory, which relates appropriate behavior of leaders to the maturity of followers, evolved from the earlier studies at the Ohio State University and the University of Michigan" (p. 5).

**Behavioral Theories**

Behavioral theory saw leadership as observable actions of the leader, instead of personality traits. Mouton (1964) adapted Blake and their managerial grid into an academic grid and applied it to higher education. Their model suggests five styles of academic administration: caretaker, authority-obedience, comfortable, pleasant, constituency-centered, and team (as cited in Blake, Mouton, & Williams, 1981). Hensley (1998) said, "Behavioral theories concentrate on what leaders actually do ... activity patterns, managerial roles, and psychological learning patterns" (p.45).

**Instructional leadership**

Instructional leadership emphasized the overall issue of academic program, curriculum, goal setting, teacher's evaluation, and assessment results. Goodlad (1978) stated that the work of those who lead in the formulation of educational policy "is to maintain, justify and articulate sound, comprehensible programs of instruction for children and for youth" (p. 326).
Wen (1994) said "Transactional leaders appeal to the self-interest of subordinates for compliance to directives issued in the work place." (p. 24).

**Transformational Leadership**

Transformational leadership had to do with process of change, and the transformation of the individuals. It implied treating people as human beings. Burns (1978) defined transformational leadership as "when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality—their purposes (which many have started out as separate) become fused" (p. 20). Hensley (1998) said, "Transformational leadership is about change, innovation, and entrepreneurship. It is a leadership process predicated on the ability of leaders to teach people how to change through a systematic management of conditioned behavioral changes. It is a systematic, purposeful, and organized search for change. It is a capacity to re-allocate resources for effective functions" (p. 48).

Tichy and Devanna (1986) proposed seven characteristics of transformational leaders: (a) "identify themselves as change agents; (b) have the courage to be risk-takers; (c) believe in people and ownership; (d) are value-driven; (e) are life long learners; (f) have the ability to deal with complexity, ambiguity, and uncertainty; and (g) are visionaries" (pp. 271-281). "Transformational leadership theory sees leaders as catalysts, who are capable of marketing their ideas and themselves, willing to take great risks, committed to a common enterprise, and resilient enough to absorb conflict" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 216).
Transformational leadership is a viewpoint that takes into account the collective aspirations of the organization; it is also a symbiotic relationship between leaders and followers in which the leader senses the needs and wants of their followers; it is causative in nature, and leaders must be capable of creating a corporate culture that empowers employees (Bennis & Nanus 1985, p. 218). Hunsley, (1992) said “Transformational leadership concentrates on technical competence, expertise and judgment”. Burns believes that, when such leadership is in evidence, significant change can occur within organizations; it occurs because the leadership is collective, dissentual, causative, and morally purposeful (pp. 48-55). “Transformational leadership mutually stimulates and elevates both leader and subordinate and ‘converts followers into leaders,’” said Burns, (as cited in Bass, 1990a, p. 2) resulting in leadership development.

“The goals in transformational leadership are frequently presented “as concerned with larger social values, including justice and equality, while a major function of transformational leadership is to dramatically change the organizational culture (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Kouzes & Posner, 1990). Three factors associated with transformational leadership are individual attention, intellectual stimulation, and charisma (Avolio & Bass 1988; Congar, 1989). According to Leithwood (1994) there are four dimensions of transformational leadership in education namely, (a) development of a widely shared vision for the school, (b) providing individual support and intellectual stimulation, (c) encouraging democratic decision-making, (d) strengthening a school’s culture by using symbols and rituals to signify the institution’s values. Fivush (2000) quoting Bass and Avolio said, “Transformational leaders change their organization’s culture by inspiring a
sense of mission and purpose about the importance of the group’s work and stimulating new ways of thinking and problem solving” (as cited in Avelio & Bass, 1993, p. 1).

Trow (1991) held, that “leadership in higher education, in large part, is the taking of effective action to shape the character and direction of a college or university, presumably for the better.” Further he said that, “leadership shows itself chiefly along symbolic, political, managerial, and academic dimension” (p. 355). “Symbolic leadership is the ability to express, to project, indeed to seem to embody, the character of the institution, its central goals and values, in a powerful way. Political leadership refers to an ability to resolve the conflicting demands and pressures of many constituencies, internal and external, and is gaining their support for the institution’s goals and purposes, as they are defined” (Trow, as cited in Peterson 1991, p. 355).

Trow (1991) claimed that, “managerial leadership is the familiar capacity to direct and coordinate the various support activities of the institution; this includes judgment in the selection of staff, the ability to develop and manage a budget, to plan for the future, and to build and maintain a plant” (as cited in Peterson, 1991, p. 355). Academic leadership shows itself, among other ways, as the ability to recognize excellence in teaching, learning, and research, in knowing where and how to intervene to strengthen academic structures, in the choice of able academic teachers and scholars. Administrators in support for the latter in their efforts to recruit and advance talented scholars advance academic excellence. Senge (2000 a) claimed that “leadership has become the goal for an organization to shape its future and to deal in a cogent manner with the complexities and obstacles of change and restructuring within the organization” (p. 16).
Leadership Styles Theory

It is necessary to know the behavior pattern of an individual who tries to influence others. To function effectively in tomorrow's world, college presidents will be required to demonstrate a leadership style quite different from that of today. They are no longer the undisputed authorities in their institutions. Fielder defined leadership style "as the underlying needs structure of the individual which motivates his behavior in various leadership situations" (1967, p. 36). Tanner and Tanner (1987) defined leadership style as the particular methodology a person (leader) utilizes in order to accomplish certain goals or certain tasks, while Northouse (2001) said, "Leadership style refers to the behavior pattern of an individual who attempts to influence others. It includes both directive (task) behaviors and supportive (relationship) behaviors" (p. 57). It also refers to the underlying need structure that motivates a leader's behavior in various situations.

Leadership styles were defined above "as pattern of behavior that reflects a sense of direction and focus in applying a particular leadership model" (Ellis as cited in Tebbano 2002, p. 21). Tebbano (2002) held that "the concept of leadership styles in a variety of organizations has created many studies assessing the effects of autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, transactional, and transformational leadership styles. Organizational members were found to prefer a democratic form of leadership styles of dominant decision-making or manipulative forms of leadership." Constituent members are more satisfied when allowed to take an active role in group decision-making processes and organizational management (Foul, Driskill, Mullen, & Sales 2000, p. 26).

Lippitt and White defined leadership styles as follows: "In authoritarian leadership, the leader makes all the important decisions without consulting the
subordinates; in democratic leadership, the leaders encourage group discussion and group decision making; in laissez-laire leadership, the leader's largely passive (as cited in Lawler 1973, p. 176). A good number of writers in higher education emphasize accessibility and listening as key elements in leadership style (Birnbaum, 1985; Vaughn, 1989). Good leaders set the overall goals and inspire, delegate, and truly listen to the people in their organizations, often counting subordinates' opinions more important than their own (Peters & Austin, 1985).

Before the 20th century, organizational research was predominantly concerned with how bureaucratic systems were formed (Mises, 1980). Theorists have identified four distinct organizational models, namely: (a) democratic or participative where policies are open for group discussion and group decision-making; (b) human relations in which policies reflect a concern for the workers; (c) authoritarian, where task concerns are emphasized and worriers are told what to do and how to do it; (d) laissez-faire, where workers do whatever they wanted because there were no policies or procedures established (Hersey & Blanchard; 1977 Lawler, 1973, pp. 90-92).

Factor analysis examines the pattern of co-variance among variables (Fleishman, 1953; Yukl, 1989b), and is a theoretical educative approach, which develops typologies by making deductions from theories (Lockwood 1986; Stodgill, 1963). Factor analysis is also a judgmental classification approach that is based on perceived similarities in content or purpose (Lockwood, 1986; Luthans, 1984; Mintzberg, 1973). These researchers developed categories of behaviors or taxonomies for leadership (Yukl, 1989a, pp. 93-94). They used many terms identified by scientists studying organizational development to define leadership styles and behaviors (democratic or participative, human relations,
authoritarian, laissez-faire, (Lawler, as cited in Runae, 1998, p. 16). Cohen and Much called higher education an "organized anarchy" in which there is a garbage can decision process" (Peterson, 1991, p. 179). Bensimon, et al., (1985) supporting this, said, "Even though the literature on leadership and organizational theory is rich, its many conceptual orientations and interpretations do not appear to be particularly influential, at least not explicit, in informing the literature on administrative leadership in higher education" (p. 20).

Another concept is that leadership style is dependent on the situation (Hersey & Blanchard, as cited in Cox, 1991, p. 6). The leadership style is the behavior pattern a person exhibits when attempting to influence the activities of others as perceived by others (Jablonski, 1992). The most effective or successful leaders demonstrate style variability (Immelgort, 1988). Tebbano (2002) said, "The concept of leadership styles in a variety of organizations has created many studies assessing the effects of autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, transactional, and transformational leadership styles" (p. 26). An adaptive leadership style is seen in those scenarios that require a new framework or paradigm for dealing with complexity and chaos within organizational settings (Heifetz, 1994, pp. 14-15).

Some examples of leadership styles attributed to educators in colleges and universities are symbolic, political, structural, human resource, managerial, and academic leadership. Trow (1991) sees leadership styles for educators in higher institutions, as "symbolic leadership, which is the ability to embody the character of the institution powerfully; political leadership, as the ability to solve conflicts and meet the demands of different constituencies both inside the college and outside while gaining support for your
goals; and academic leadership, recognizes intellectual excellence and excellence in teaching” (p. 355).

Bolman and Deal (1984) developed four distinct frames that leaders use to respond to the different problems in the organization. Bolman and Deal (1984) believe that the four distinct images (frames, maps, orientations, lenses) exist in the ways that leaders think and act in response to everyday issues and problems. Bolman and Deal (1997) said of symbolic leadership, “Whenever reason and analysis fail to continue the dark forces of ambiguity, human beings erect symbols, myths, rituals, and ceremonies to bring order, meaning, and predictability out of chaos and confusion” (p. 439). Thus they relate leadership to transformational leadership. Political leadership “recognizes that power is essential to their effectiveness and they know that it needs to be used judiciously” (p. 438). In human resource leadership, “They increase participation, provide support, share information, and move decision making as far down in the organization as possible” (p. 433). But “structural leadership develops a new model of relationship of structure, strategy, and environment for their organization” (p. 428).

The authors asserted that while a considerable amount of time and energy has been devoted trying to identify the characteristics or traits of effective leaders, the results have been disappointing. Bolman and Deal’s (1984) research attempted to identify how leaders see their worlds and frame their experiences. Bolman and Deal (1992) suggested “that heritage, early experiences, formal training, and experiences on the job are factors that have affected the worldviews of leaders. Any combination of these often plays a more powerful role than formal education” (p. 2). Effective leaders probably learn early to define accurately various situations and make frame adjustments accordingly.
Bensimon's (1989) research on the leadership frame orientation of college presidents also supports Bolman and Deal's theory. "A frame represents a distinctive cognitive lens that helps the president of a college determine what is important and what can be safely ignored" (p. 108). Bolman and Deal (1984) suggested that presidents are able to define their roles through the use of different cognitive lenses. The framework of these researchers, therefore, is especially appropriate for the studying of the cognitive lenses implicitly used by college presidents.

The research conducted by Chaffee and Tierney (1988) and Glueck and Thorp (1974) on leadership characteristics in higher education add to Trow's work. They emphasized the importance of ethical behaviors, helpfulness, communication, and the ability to positively represent the interest of the staff. Other studies have identified the need for a good leader to be a resource person and coordinator (Trow, 1991, pp. 374-376).

Cultural and symbolic leaders can use the traditions, the senior staff, and the policies and practices of the institution to ensure their success. Many presidents of small private liberal arts colleges have been described as transformational leaders (Rice & Austin, 1988). Behavioral studies have compared task-oriented leaders and people-oriented leaders. The characteristics of these two different leadership styles have been identified as caretakers vs. authority-obedience; comfortable, pleasant vs. constituency centered (Blake, Mouton, & Williams as cited in Bensimon, Neumann, & Birbaum 1999, pp. 501-502). Contingency theories, as opposed to behavioral theorist, said that a leader adapts his or her styles of leadership and behavior to the situation he or she encounters (Peterson, 1991).
It is essential to know the major job roles, problems, expectations, and experiences that characterize administrative positions and styles of leadership in higher education institutions. It is important that leaders examine what they do, and how their colleagues, peers, and subordinates perceive them. Leaders need to show greater interest and commitment for the organization, for the people within it and demonstrate flexibility to insure stability within the organization.

In the past century, management in organizations has undergone several transitions. At one time, management style was autocratic in nature, with a heavy reliance on formal structure and delegation of authority. It has since moved to a style exposing a more participatory worker-involved style (Darling & Brownlee, 1982). Studies conducted on leadership styles show that there is no single effective style (Carraway, 1990; Gill, 1986). "Participative leadership refers to leaders who invite subordinates to share in the decision making" (Northouse, 2001, p. 220). Situational leadership "stresses that leadership is composed of both a directive and supportive dimension and each has to be applied appropriately in a given situation" (Northouse, 2001, p. 222).

Both personal and group variables influence leadership styles and effectiveness. Even though there is no secret formula for developing leadership styles, Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) indicated, "there are two implications in choosing a leadership style. The successful leader is keenly aware of these forces, which are most relevant to his or her behavior at any given time. And the successful leader is able to behave appropriately in light of these perceptions" (p.101). It is in the nature of human beings to acquire
leadership skills a little at a time, building on previously learned precepts (Carraway, 1990). Administrative leadership plays a critical role in determining the success or failure of an academic institution (Darling & Brownlee, 1982).

Leaders can emerge from anywhere within an academic group such as a department or division, as well as being formally appointed (Darling & Brownlee, 1982). Effective leadership should be measured within a framework of how well the leader's institution fulfills its mission and objectives and achieves its identified goals (Darling & Brownlee, 1982). Styles must be modified to cope with changes in the professional work environment (Darling & Brownlee, 1982; Lewis, 1989). In leadership styles the recurring themes are communication, trustworthiness, concern, and decisiveness.

In examining leadership styles in higher education, Desjardin and Brown (1991) determined that changing values reflect a leader's basic orientation. Regardless of the characteristics, leadership is concerned with vision, mission, goals, change, direction, and meaning (Lewis, 1989). These concepts are difficult to deal with in any setting. But as Birnbaum (1988) pointed out, "The study of leadership is more difficult in colleges and universities than in any other setting because of the dual control systems, conflicts between professional and administrative authority, unclear goals, and other unique properties of professional, normative organizations" (p. 22). Tinch (1987) suggested, "Leadership styles are fascinating, and there are no doubt many situations in which style is as important as substance, occasions on which style will carry the day when substance fails" (p. 191). He went on to say that "style is especially difficult to assess (in terms of effectiveness) when observers (and followers) do not have informed expectations as to what leaders should do first" (p. 191).
Fincher (1987) explained, "The administrative styles of presidents vary and may reflect the inner structure of presidential relationships more than a president's lack of experience or personal qualifications for the position" (p. 183). Bénézet, Katz, and Magnusson believed that "presidential style and accomplishments are reflected in institutional image or reputation, and that president's desires to leave their mark are a source of presidential motivation" (as cited in Fincher 1987, p. 183).

**College and University Presidential Leadership**

Düll and Fullagar (1987) claimed, "It is important to know the extent to which college presidents' leadership works" (p. 20). Fincher (1987) said, "Administrative leadership in American colleges and universities is a direct function of presidential leadership, the personal qualities of presidents, and their interpersonal effectiveness with other administrators and leaders within the academic community. Glimpses of presidential leadership can be gained from institutional histories and their celebration of institution greatness (p. 181)."

Perspective on presidential leadership range from theoretical (Bessimon, 1989; Tierney, 1991), to structural (Etzioni, 1991), to political (Nugent, 1996; Rosenzweig, 1998) to many lessons and advice (Levine, 1998; Shaw K, 1999; Smith, 1991). Although there are divergent voices among authors, there are a few strands of consensus about the context, in which college and university presidents work. This has important consequences for their success (as cited in Clough 2001, pp. 10-11). "The presidential leadership style of Connects is internally directed and concerned with the well being of the constituent members of the institution. This type of president attends to organizational
life in the present moment more than in the future (Birnbaum, 1988, p.689). Vayseyc
(1965) wrote, “The history of American university’s emergence gives insight into
administration and governance almost as such as it does into the new structures and
functions of higher education” (p. 68).

Trow (1991) believed, “The president of a leading American college or university
can exercise leadership: symbolic, political, intellectual and administrative” (p. 360).
Further he stated, “American presidents have control over the budget of their institution
and academic autonomy too” (p. 368). The discussion of presidential leadership styles
begins with Birnbaum (1988). He distinguished among four types of presidential
leadership with a focus on institutional type: collegial, bureaucratic, political, and
anarchical. Neumann and Bensimon (1990) described four types of presidential
leadership: “A type of president who is distant, a type who reacts to environmental
changes, a type who connects with constituents of the institution, and a type of president
who initiates actions”. Tierney (1991) attested that, “The symbolic role of a college or
university president allows an individual to try to communicate a vision of the institution
that other individuals are not capable of communicating” (p. 433). “College presidents
hold certain beliefs about leaders, defining the roles in traditional terms such as (those
individuals) responsible for deciding the directions in which an institution should move
and for coordinating the structures and processes to help it get there” (Birnbaum, 1989,p.
133).

Rudolph, in the histories of American colleges and universities (1962) and his
book The Undergraduate Curriculum (1977), provided the historical perspectives of
presidential roles and responsibilities in the development of higher education (as cited in
Fincher 1987, p.181). Gray (1951) referred to one of the many interesting institutional histories that place presidential leadership in perspective. Leadership of college presidents is given a more critical examination by Benezet, Katz, and Magnusson (1981), who concluded that presidents do make a difference in institutional effectiveness. The college presidency has no “common role” (p. 80) and is often what the incumbent makes it,” suggests Carbone. Leadership, according to Walker (1979), must be exercised in an environment that is active. Cowley (1980) proposed, “Presidential responsibilities are overburdened, with fundraising and institutional development, and the day has long passed since presidents can continue as scholars in their chosen academic field” (p. 68).

Fincher (1987) wrote, “Leadership in policymaking is a major function of presidential leadership, and no college or university has become great without such leaders” (p. 15). Fisher and Koch (1996) drew a parallel to the heads position when they noted, “The woeful state of the college presidency is a direct and almost inevitable result of unwise governing board policies and presidents who do not understand the principles of leadership and power” (p. 334). Trow (1991) claimed, “Presidential leadership is often found in programs which rest largely on his administrative staff rather than on the reshaping of the academic programs” (p. 362). He continued, “In the United States, the president of a college or university is the link between ‘the administration’ and its support services on the one hand, and the faculty and its programs of teaching, learning and research on the other” (p. 365).

The presidents are responsible for developing vision and goals for achieving the academic need. Presidents must prepare themselves to assume this role with trustee involvement and employee assistance. Birnbaum (1989) believed that “in higher
education, there is a strong resistance to leadership, as it is generally understood in more traditional and hierarchical organizations, and it is often more accurate to think of faculty as constituents rather than as followers” (p. 26).

The review of the literature indicated that leadership styles do impact the various ways through which a leader leads. Researchers in the area of leadership styles have concluded that multiple uses of the four cognitive frames will promote effective leadership skills. Leadership establishes a direction for every organization. “One sign of a leader is followers. Leaders create strategic visions from their environment. Leaders exhibit integrity and develop relationships built on trust. Leaders integrate participants in the process of carrying out their mission” (Hensley, 1998,p. 53). Bolman and Deal (1994) argue that the ability to assume multi-frame perspective is critical for successful leadership. This conceptual frame work supports, and is useful for, analyzing leadership in a variety of settings and situations (Becker 2000; Bensimon, 1989; Bolman & Deal, 1997; Bassoppo-Mayo, 1997; Flak, 1998) and because it has been applied to leadership in higher education.

Summary

This chapter reviewed the history of Dominican institutions of higher learning and their involvement in education. Each of the Dominican institutions is unique, but they all held similar goals in common, cherished by the Order of Preachers from its beginning. It also reviewed literatures on leadership in higher education, leadership styles theory, leadership styles in higher education, and presidential leadership as it pertains to the role
of a president in higher education. Chapter 3 describes the research methodology for this study.
Chapter III

Methodology

**Conceptual Framework**

The theoretical framework of this study was based on the work of Bolman and Deal as outlined in their book *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership* (1997). The work of Bolman and Deal was chosen because it analyzes the usefulness of existing leadership research for understanding college and university leadership. This study examines the Dominican college presidents' leadership styles, utilizing Bolman and Deal (1997) model as the conceptual framework. Bolman & Deal (1997) said:

> Managers who master the ability to reframe report a liberating sense of choice and power. They are able to develop unique alternatives and novel ideas about what their organization needs. They are attuned to people and events around them, they are startled by organizational perversity, and they learn to anticipate the turbulent twists and turns of organizational life. The result is managerial freedom and more productive, human organization" (p. 17)

Expanding the definition of leadership styles has implications for the assessment of the administration of higher institutions of learning. This study focuses on how Dominican college presidents utilize human resource, political, symbolic, and structural frames. Bolman and Deal (1994) approached leadership using four frames of leaders
working effectively in the four frameworks of an organization structure: symbolic, human resource, political, and structural.

The symbolic framework treats organizations as tribes, theaters, or carnivals. It sees organizations as cultures, propelled more by rituals, ceremonies, stories, heroes, and myths than rules, policies, and managerial authority. The leader is seen as a facilitator who brings a sense of organizational purpose and reinforces institutional culture with an ongoing process.

The human resource framework views organizations much like an extended family, inhabited by individuals who have needs, feelings, prejudices, skills, and limitations. The institution is considered a community of equals, and differences in status are de-emphasized. Political framework regards organizations as arenas for contests and jungles. It emphasized the view with issues of groups vying for power, and a call for decision-making through bargaining process, influence, and coalition building. The structural framework emphasizes the goals, specialized roles, and formal relationships. It encompassed the ability of a leader to be analytical and organized. The structural frame emphasizes on roles, technology, tasks, and goal of organization. Leaders mediate and negotiate between the shifting political groups, and the leader’s power is based on control of information and manipulation of expertise.

Research Design

This is a study of six Dominican college presidents’ leadership characteristics. The qualitative interview, content analysis, and questionnaire were selected as the
methodology to be used for this study. Content analysis is a method used to analyze the
symbolic content of written documents. Interview is used to gather descriptive data in the
respondents' own words whereas questionnaire is a type of survey used to address
individual aspects of an issue (e.g., leadership styles). I utilized the reframing theory of
Bolman and Deal (1997) in order to identify the leadership characteristics exhibited by
the Dominican college presidents identified in this study.

This method (interview, content analysis, and questionnaire) formed the basis for
analyzing the Dominican college presidents' leadership styles. "Qualitative inquiry is
especially powerful as a source of grounded theory, theory that is inductively generated
from fieldwork, theory that emerges from the researcher's observations and interviews
out in the real world rather than in the laboratory or the academy. The purpose of
interviewing is to allow us to enter into the other person's perspective"(Patton, 2002, p.
341). "Content analysis is used to refer to any qualitative data reduction and sense-
making effort that takes a volume of qualitative material and attempts to identify core

The documents analyzed in this study are (a) reports written about the presidents,
(b) reports written about their institution while they are still in the office, (c) how they
were selected as presidents of their respective colleges, and (d) how their leadership
styles were perceived by others (e.g., deans, administrators, etc.). Each of the four areas
was reviewed and analyzed using Bolman and Deal's (1997) four categories of framing
organizations namely, structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. These
documents were reviewed for manifest content and frequency relating to the president's
leadership characteristics, as well as their interrelationships in making a whole.
Triangulation procedures were used in this study. Patton (1980) suggested that triangulation can “guard against the accusation that a study’s findings are simply an artifact of a single method or single data source, or a single investigator’s bias” (p. 470). “Using multiple methods, allows inquiry into a research question with an arsenal of methods that have non-overlapping weaknesses in addition to their complementary strengths” (Brewer & Hunter, 1989, p. 17). I used triangulation to compare the interview data with the information obtained in the two forms of the surveys and in the documents, which were reviewed (Flak 1998, p. 66).

This study used the reframing theory of Bolman & Deal (1994a) to study six Dominican college presidents’ leadership styles in four aspects: human resource, symbolic, structural, and political frames. In this study, their leadership styles framing was examined. A leader seeks collaborative decision-making using a human resource approach and emphasizes the use of interpersonal skills. It is believed that frames bring focus to actions, and thus encourage members of the organization to make meaning based on what place the leader takes in specific context. Bolman and Deal (1991a) have offered a useful way of thinking about issues, arguing that effective strategic thinking requires proficiency in four domains or frames (pp. 50-51).

This is basic research. As Patton (2002) said, “Basic researchers work to generate new theories or test existing theories” (p.215). The idea of a frame enables leaders to focus greater attention on some aspects of organizational behaviors over others (Campbell, 2002). The questionnaire, institutional reports, and interviews were utilized to explore the leadership characteristics of six Dominican college presidents at 4-year institutions of higher learning. The Leadership Orientations Questionnaire was adopted
from Bolman and Deal (1990), while I adapted from Flak (1998) the interview questions. I wrote to the authors of the questionnaire and interview questions and was granted permission to use the materials for this study (See Appendixes A&B). After testing the interview questions on two college presidents for reliability, I found them suitable for this study.

Participants

According to Merriam (1988), "The needs of qualitative research are best met by non probability sampling as based on the assumption that one wants to discover, understand, gain insight; therefore one needs to select a sample from which one can learn the most" (p. 48). This study employed purposive sampling. The overall criteria for sample consideration included (a) those Dominican college presidents who indicated willingness to participate in the study and their colleagues; (b) those Dominican college presidents who had been presidents of their college for at least 1 year, and (c) those Dominican college presidents who were one time president. They were six who agreed to participate in this study. The Leadership Orientations Questionnaire (Bolman & Deal, 1990) (a) was administered to the six Dominican presidents and the (b) other version of the questionnaire was administered to some selected deans, administrators, faculty, and members of the board of trustees, while the adapted interview questions were administered to the presidents only.

All six presidents had held administrative positions before assuming the position of presidency. Some worked as deans, academic vice president, provosts and departmental chair. Their selection process to the presidency varied. The processes used
in their selection included having been appointed, because of ill-health or resignation of the predecessor, search committee through an interview. All six presidents were aware they were chosen as presidents because they possessed some characteristics that the institution lacked at the time. These characteristics included, but, were not limited to, organizational skills, strong leadership skills, motivating, and team orientation. One president mentioned during the interview that she was chosen because she was not a stranger to the college.

The six Dominican colleges and universities were selected based on the following reasons: All six universities are located in suburban area of their metropolis and have student populations between 1,800 and 4,900. Each of the six Dominican colleges has between 30 and 32 member boards of trustees, and administrative officers, and from 169 and 250 full-time and adjunct faculty members. Six Dominican college presidents agreed to participate in the study, three women and three men. The number was considered adequate for this study given that they represent one third of the 19 institutions.

Procedure

Data for this study were collected from four main sources: (a) unstructured interviews of six Dominican college presidents; (b) structured self-evaluating questionnaire completed by the presidents; (c) structured questionnaire evaluating the leadership style of the presidents by others e.g. deans, faculty, administrators and board of trustees; and (d) institutional reports of the six Dominican colleges. A letter of introduction was sent to all the presidents to ask for their informed participation in the study (See Appendix F). Then, it was followed up with phone calls to those who did not
respond to the letter. Those who declined or resigned were substituted with other Dominican college presidents. Six Dominican college presidents agreed to participate in the study. The six Dominican college presidents and their colleagues completed the informed consent (see Appendixes G & I). Each president who agreed to participate in the study was sent the Leadership Orientation Questionnaire (Bolman & Deal, 1990). This questionnaire was administered by mail to the participating presidents, some deans, administrators, faculty and board of trustee with a self-addressed, stamped envelope within one month.

Prior to the mailing, each survey was coded to ensure confidentiality. I had access to the code that was used to determine which presidents and colleges had returned the Leadership Orientations Questionnaire (Bolman and Deal, 1990). A total of 50 questionnaires, version two, were sent to each participating university. The reason for sending an equal number of the questionnaire to all the six universities is that they are of similar size and in program enrollment. Secondly, the size of the number of their deans, administrators, faculty and board of trustees are within the same range. Version one of the questionnaire was completed and returned by all six presidents. While in the version two of the questionnaire, the return rate was as follows: President A - 45, B - 45, C - 47, D - 38, E - 35, and F 48. The presidents’ return of the questionnaire yielded a 100% return rate, while the one for the deans, administrators, faculty, and board of trustees yielded a 75% rate return.

The participants were asked to provide biographical statements or vitae, to complete a leadership questionnaire (Leadership Orientations Questionnaire, Bolman & Deal, 1990) by mail (Dillman, 1978), and to be interviewed personally for 50 minutes
to an hour. This is a long interview technique as described by McCracken (1988). McCracken (1988) provided a general description that a qualitative study should follow. He suggested the use of the standard qualitative data collection techniques of participant observation, informant interviewing, and document review supplemented by other appropriate methods such as surveys (p. 223).

The data from the interviews consisted of direct responses from the presidents on the questions about their experience, opinions, feelings, and knowledge regarding their leadership styles. According to Patton (2002), "The purpose of the interviewing is to find out what is in and of someone's mind" (p. 312). It is important to hear their own stories and about their work in order to develop a context for their anecdotes. The interview follows a protocol in order to provide consistency in the questions to be asked. Patton (1980) indicated that this "technique reduces the possibility of bias that comes from having different interview for different people, including the problem of having more comprehensive data from certain persons, while getting less systematic information from others" (p. 198). Using an established protocol is advantageous since it is focused and interview time is carefully utilized. The interview took a nature of a "friendly" conversation as described by Spradley (1979) in a discussion of critical aspects of an interview. A copy of the interview questions that were asked, in the same order is found. The advantage of this is crucial, knowing the busy schedule of the presidents.

Six Dominican college presidents signed response cards specifying that they agreed to participate in the study, to be interviewed, and to have the interview audiotaped. Rubin & Rubin, (1995) suggested, "In interviewing it is imperative to keep a record so that the report you write will be based on accurate renditions of what was said."
Recording the interviews in an audiotape helps to get the materials down in an accurate and retrievable form" (p. 78). I personally interviewed the six presidents for 45 minutes in their home institutions.

Snowball sampling was used in order to ensure that the Leadership Orientations Questionnaire (other) (Bolman & Deal 1990) was sent to faculty of different ranks and both sexes. "Snowball, or chain, sampling is an approach for locating information-rich key informants or critical cases" (Patton, 2002, p. 237). This type of sampling involves asking a few faculty members of the college some questions regarding who is who in the college. The questions revealed some key persons in the college who were sent the leadership orientations survey.

Before the interview, background information describing the institutions, where the presidents serve, was collected from various sources (e.g., institutional reports, admission standards, enrollment, and description of academic environment). As Weiss (1972) noted:

Evaluators use the whole gamut of research methods to collect information, questionnaires, tests of knowledge and skill, attitude inventories, observation, content analysis of documents, records, examination of physical evidence. Ingenious evaluators can find fitting ways of exploring a wide range of effects. The kind of data collection scheme to be used depends on the type of information needed to answer the specific questions that the evaluation poses.

(pp. 8-9)
Background information was procured, and it was essential to know how presidents' leadership styles were perceived, and to know why they were selected as the presidents of their respective colleges.

More information about the different presidents was collected from the books authored by the presidents, newspaper articles written about the presidents, or their own institutions. The information is for manifest context and frequency and the need to find clear meaning of the message and to locate particular information. Singleton (1993) claimed that the information is “to identify obvious messages that can be understood by the source and the reader (receiver).” These sources were reviewed for topics relating to leadership, and they provided some clues about the presidents' leadership styles. This part of the research was completed 2 months before the interview of each president.

*Instrumentation*

*Interviews*

The interview consisted of standardized open-ended questions from the protocol of Patton’s qualitative research and evaluation methods (Patton, 2002). The interview questions consisted of a series of questions about the definition of leadership, tasks, problems that the presidents face in their professional, interpersonal context, relationships in their current positions. The questions were intended to keep the interviewees focused on how the individual Dominican college president utilizes the four frameworks namely, structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. The interview questions include
components of leadership and organizational theory across Bolman and Deal’s (1992) four frames. The questions were asked of all of the subjects in sequential order.

1. I am interested in knowing how you became the president of this college.

2. How were you selected for the position?

3. How will you describe your college?

4. Can you tell me, please, what path your career followed to the role of a college president?

5. What are the roles and responsibilities of leadership?

6. In what ways do you, as a president, exercise leadership?

7. What individual qualities in a president can advance or detract from the achievement of his/her leadership goals?

8. What is the measure of a successful college/university system?

9. Will you describe for me the reality of being a president of a Dominican college/university? What kind of problems might a president who heads a Dominican college/university encounter?

10. What sorts of activities lead to your success as a president? If you could represent your typical day’s activities with a pie chart, how much of your day would you be devoted to various activities?

11. What metaphor would you use to characterize your leadership style?

12. Please describe a current educational project, which you initiated, that would help describe your beliefs about education.

13. Please describe a recent innovative program that you implemented that would reflect your management style.
14. Please describe a particularly challenging problem, which you have encountered as a president, and describe how you went about solving it.

15. How has the role of a president met / not met your expectations? What are the positive and negative aspects of the job?

16. If, as a president, you have the experience of working with a faculty where there was consistent or regular majority opposition? What are some ways to ensure effectiveness under these circumstances?

17. Is there anything else I have forgotten to ask about leadership in the role of a college president?

Questions one through four served as background questions. Interview questions five through seven were to elicit the subject’s conceptions of structural frame. Questions 8, 9, and 12 were aimed toward obtaining the president’s views of their work and human resource frame usage as it relates to their positions as college presidents. Questions 10, 13, 14, and 16 were to capture the subjects’ use of the political frame. Question 14 was asked to provide beliefs, written, critical incidents that are challenging and raised issues of how to provide effective leadership styles. Question 16 was to inquire about how they manage conflict issues, which has to do with political frame, as well. Questions 11 and 15 were to capture their symbolic frame orientation usage and allow for elaboration on their unique experiences. It was also meant to know how many frames they utilize and which ones. Question 17 provided an opportunity to gather data from previous questions; it allows for an open-ended response to enhance understanding of the president’s leadership.
This study was conducted from a present perspective, using a qualitative interview approach that closely followed the protocol. Historical data directly related to the president's present position was collected. "Qualitative methods consist of three kinds of data collection- (a) open-ended interviews; (b) direct observation and (c) written documents. The data from interviews consist of direct quotations from people about their experiences, opinions, feelings and knowledge," (Patton, 2002, p.4).

The purpose of the interview was to examine the participant's personal and philosophical views concerning leadership. All six presidents were asked the same questions. The six presidents agreed to have the interviews recorded and transcribed. Recording the data is an essential aspect of the qualitative research in that the raw data of the interviews are the actual quotations spoken by the interviewees. Patton (1980) suggested that, "it is important to make it perfectly clear to the interviewees the major justification for using the tape recorder" (p. 247). Patton recommended that immediately after the interview, the researcher checks the tapes to see if they have functioned properly, takes extensive notes of everything that is pertinent to remember, and records any observations which would help to develop a context for the interview (p. 251). This procedure was rigorously followed. A verbatim transcription of the interview was made within 48 hours, to avoid the possibility of losing the tape or not recalling important information. Three visits were made to the various institutions (Gluck & Patai, 1991; Thompson, 1988)
Leadership Orientations Survey

The Leadership Orientation Survey (Bolman & Deal, 1990) was used to collect data for this study. This instrument assesses some self-reported leadership beliefs. Lee Bolman and Terence Deal developed the Leadership Orientations Survey in the 1980s. The instrument is designed to measure eight separate dimensions of leadership, two for each frame (Bolman & Deal, 1990). Human resource emphasizes supportive and participation; structural dimensions, analytic and organized; political, powerful and adroit; and symbolic dimensions, inspirational and charismatic. The instrument has two parallel forms: one for the evaluation of individual (president) to rate themselves, and another in which their colleagues (deans, administrators, faculty, and board of trustees) can rate them.

A study that used this instrument was completed by Joan Tedrow Gilson, in a doctoral dissertation, Leadership Study: Public Higher Education Administrators in Missouri Compared with Bolman and Deal Database on Multi-frame, Multi-sector Leadership. This study compared the leadership practices of Missouri higher education administrators to the Bolman-Deal database on multi-frame, multi-sector leadership. It also compared the variables in the Bolman and Deal study (1991a), framing leadership styles and the relationship of these styles to gender and work experience, to the Missouri higher education administrators. Further the study investigated the question of whether communication styles, favored means of thinking about a problem for public higher education administrators of 4-year colleges in the state of Missouri, and their college organizations and environments are related to measures of leadership practices as described by Bolman and Deal (1991a). This instrument was also used in a doctoral
dissertation entitled, *A Frame Analysis Of Principals’ Leadership Orientations (Multi-frame Thinking)* authored by Peggy, G. Rivers. This study sought to identify the leadership orientation frames of elementary, middle, and high school principals, and to determine if a relationship between principals’ frame use and gender, age, experience and school level existed. It also examined if there was any relationship to effectiveness as a leader and as a manager. The questionnaire is relevant to my study because, as a form of survey, it is able to predict the leadership styles of college presidents (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993, pp. 32-33).

The Leadership Orientations Questionnaire (Bolman and Deal, 1990) is a 32-item questionnaire, asking the respondents to describe their leadership styles by indicating how frequently a behavior is true for them. Each item is presented on a 5-point Likert Scale as follows: (1) never, (2) occasionally, (3) sometimes, (4) often, (5) always, (continuum with scoring weights of 0-5). Test-retest coefficients (.91-.93) show a high level of reliability (Bolman & Deal, 1991a).

Previous statistical analysis of this instrument indicated a high degree of internal consistency (Redman, 1991) for each of the frames. Bolman and Deal (1991a) found internal reliability for the survey. Cronbach’s alpha ranged between .91 and .93. “The validity of the instrument has been tested and significant correlations between the questionnaire and proficiency have been shown” (Miller, 1991, p. 442).

The Leadership Orientation Questionnaire was designed to measure eight separate dimensions of leadership, two for each frame. The eight dimensions were:
Structural Dimension (8 items)

a. Analytical: thinks clearly and logically, approaches problems with facts and attends to details.

b. Organized: develops clear goals and policies, holds people accountable for results.

Human Resource Dimension (8 items)

a. Supportive: concerned about others' feelings, supportive, and responsive.

b. Participative: fosters participation and involvement, listens, and is open to new ideas.

Political Dimension (8 items)

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

b. Adroit: politically sensitive and skillful, a skillful negotiator in face of conflict and opposition.

Symbolic Dimension (8 items)

a. Inspirational: inspires other to loyalty and enthusiasm, communicates a strong sense of vision.

b. Charismatic: imaginative, emphasizes culture and values, is highly charismatic.

Planned Data Analysis

The procedures described in this section were designed to analyze the leadership styles of six Dominican college presidents as measured by Leadership Orientation Questionnaire (Bolman & Deal, 1990), the structured and unstructured interview questions, and the documents. Qualitative description and interpretation served as the
core of this study. The Leadership Orientation Questionnaire (version 1) was administered to the presidents and (version 2) was administered to selected colleagues of the six participating Dominican college presidents. The mean score and standard deviation was computed for both versions 1 and 2 of the questionnaire separately. Also, the results of version 1 and 2 of the questionnaire were computed together. Appropriate statistical tests were performed. Comparison of the two versions of the questionnaire was made. The combined results of the two versions of the questionnaire were put in a graph and in a table form. The highest and lowest scores were contrasted to showing the variation in the six presidents' leadership styles. The interview questions were analyzed to answer the research questions. Also, written documents collected about the six presidents were reviewed and categorized into the four cognitive frames. All the three documents collected namely, Leadership Orientation Questionnaire, interview and institutional reports finally serve for the findings, conclusion and recommendation.

Marshall and Rossman (1989) defined data analysis as ‘the process of bringing order, structure, and meaning to the mass of collected data. They further reported that the researcher analyzes data through the processes of “data organization, theme development, testing, and report writing” (p. 112). Multiple sources were sought for the insight into Dominican college presidents' leadership styles. The sources were the Leadership Orientation Questionnaire (Golman & Deal, 1990), completed by presidents and their colleagues, institutional reports, and the interviews with the presidents.

The interview transcripts were examined to identify the cognitive frames espoused by each of the six Dominican college presidents. Responses were analyzed to answer the subsidiary research questions:
1. Do Dominican college presidents utilize the structural framework for leadership, and if so, how?

2. Do Dominican college presidents utilize the human resource framework, and if so how?

3. Do Dominican college presidents utilize the political framework, and if so, how?

4. Do Dominican presidents utilize the symbolic framework, and if so, how?

Writing samples, such as speeches of participants, were reviewed for manifest content design, and frequency. Manifest is to check the clear understanding of the writing. Content referred to checking all the key words or issues that are contained in a piece of writing, while frequency is to count the number of times certain words or issues were repeated. The methods content and frequency were utilized to uncover the clear meaning of messages and to locate particular information. Singleton (1993) said, “Particular writing samples were used because they were provided by the presidents or because of their availability” (p. 385). The documents I collected were from college journals, magazines, newspapers, catalogues, and one article. One written sample of article titled “Up and Coming Mover and Shaker” was available from one of the presidents. Although most of the presidents had published articles about education or combination of other subjects, one had published an article on “Value Pedagogy in Higher Education” and also authored numerous professional articles in the field of education. One of the presidents had a physical therapy style of management.

Data coding process: The data coding process involves three steps: (a) the first is to develop role categories emerging from the responses; (b) I coded them into four
categories, structural, human resource, political and symbolic frames; (c) each response was then classified into role category independently by the four-coding system.

The first was using the SPSS computer software to compute and analyze the questionnaire (version 1 & 2). The version 1 and 2 questionnaire was analyzed first separately. This was to check the scores between self-scored and colleagues-scored if there were some differences. Secondly, the combined results of the two versions of the questionnaire were also computed and analyzed together. A score for the Leadership Orientation Questionnaire was calculated by averaging the item scored in each of the four cognitive frame categories. The calculation followed the method prescribed by Bolman and Deal in 1990. They are scored in a 5-point Likert scale: 1 = never, 2 = occasionally, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, and 5 = always. Items 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29 were for the structural frame, and 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, and 30 were for the human resource frame. Items 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31 were for the political frame, and 4, 8, 12, 16, 28, 24, 28, 32 were for the symbolic frame. Each of the items was summed and divided by 8 as measures of each president's perceived use of the structural, human resource, political and symbolic frames (see Analysis of the Leadership Orientations Survey).

The second was the written documents: the key and commonly used words in the written documents were selected. In the written documents, 20 words frequent in all the documents (see list of the words in Appendix J) was collected. The 20 words were also categorized into the four cognitive frames, structural, human resource, political and symbolic.

The third was the interview: The first stage was writing analytical notes as I conducted the interview. I wrote down what each president was saying as he/she
answered the interview questions. Also based on the interviewee’s pace of response and non-verbal communication, taking notes was critical to enriching the data. This process helped me to reflect on the study, its design, and to be sure that it was actually accomplishing what it intended. As a result, this process also served as a way to ensure validity for the study. Secondly, I compared these notes with the transcribed tape, then listened to the recorded tapes over and over again. It is an analytical way of making connections between the data and the research question.

The third stage began with my transcribing the tapes and carefully reviewing the interviews by looking at the choice of words the presidents used to answer the questions. Secondly, the areas where each president and particular emphasis were examined, seeking to draw out the meaningful themes. It was done in order to create flexible, yet descriptive, categories for data that may be identified as leadership style attributes utilizing the frameworks of Bolman and Deal (1990). During the process of making sense of the data, the terms sometimes needed to be organized and reorganized in flexible ways to determine the best frame category. After transcribing the interview responses, I read each transcript to identify key words and phrases according to the Bolman and Deal 1994, framework. This procedure is an acceptable means to determine a leader’s leadership orientation (Bolman & Deal, 1991c). During the research process, ideas, concepts and leader’s leadership orientation were often refined with the help of faculty members. Faculty in this case can be seen as “outsiders” who provide an objectively trained eye to critique research (Lincoln & Gruha, 1985).

I also looked at the key terms and the kind of language the presidents were using in answering the interview questions. The key terms they were using were planning, good
relationship, vision, working together and collaboration. The word “vision” occurred 21 times in the text, and “conversation” was the least. The majority of the presidents were using the present tense in their responses.

The interview transcripts were coded for references to a cognitive leadership frame. The presidents’ names were not used throughout the work. The key words and phrases relayed in the interview were highlighted using a different color marker for each frame: yellow for the structural frame, green for the human resource frame, red for the political frame, and blue for the symbolic frame. A typological analysis was done on the interviews completed by the presidents. The president in the interview saw their position as leadership opportunity to bring life to the profession and as an opportunity to bring energy and freshness to their different universities. They saw their being asked to be the president of the various Dominican universities as a challenge. It was a call for socially oriented action, and to strive to work through groups’ characteristics by solidarity, so that they can focus in moving their institutions forward.

A president that uses words like implementation and planning utilizes the elements of structural frame. In contrast, presidents using words like participation, needs, negotiation, and organizational culture were referring to the elements of human resource, political, and symbolic frames respectively. The analysis utilized key terms from the definition offered by Bolman and Deal (1991a). Using Bensimon’s (1989) method of analysis, presidents were considered to use a particular frame if their responses contained at least two references to it (e.g., one of the presidents said, “I describe my position as planning, fundraising, constituency with alumni, faculty, staff and students”). The president described characteristics found in the structural frame, and according to
Bensimon’s method, such presidents are recorded as espousing that frame. The
typological analysis suggests that the presidents were structure oriented. More of their
comments about leadership relate to their making overt attempt to achieve organizational
goals. Their other comments about leadership emphasized a deeper concern for the group
members’ needs. They expressed empathy and concern for the community, for students,
staff, administrators, and for their faculty.

The presidents’ responses were analyzed based on their experience in the office
and the style of their leadership within the four frames of structural, political, human
resource, and symbolic. A comparison was made between the frames espoused by the
three measures of leadership: questionnaire, documents, and interviews. A part
classification was made between presidents about their frame usage. Using this
classification, I was able to look at the possible combinations of frames (see Table 8.
p. 135). The study was specific to Dominican presidents at 4-year institutions of higher
learning, while most of the other literature on leadership styles comes from the perception
of higher education, women leaders in higher education, and community colleges.

Summary

This chapter provided information on the methodology, research design, data
collection, the participants, instrumentation, procedure, and planned data analysis used in
the study of the leadership styles of Dominican college presidents at 4-year institutions of
higher learning. The instruments used were the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation
Questionnaire (Boorman & Deal, 1990), institutional reports, and structured open-ended
interview format. SPSS computer software was utilized to analyze data to ensure consistent and reliable results. Chapter 4 will present the analysis and interpretation of the data.
Chapter IV

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Content Analysis of Written Documents

This section reports the content analysis of written documents collected for the study of the leadership styles of six Dominican college presidents. The documents analyzed were written reports about the presidents and reports written about their institutions. The titles of the books, speeches, or presentations listed on the resumes, vitae, or in articles about the presidents suggested humanities orientation in their works. Twenty terms were chosen to be examined in the articles and speeches of the presidents (see Appendix J). Leadership and vision were the most prevalent of the 20 terms used. They appeared in five of the six samples. Each of the two terms leadership and vision appeared five times in the samples. The term vision was used to discuss the future plans of a program or school.

All the speeches were from copies that are easily accessible to the public. The speeches were considered as reflections of the presidents' thoughts and sentiments and not as public documents. The words of the presidents in these speeches were held in equal importance by this researcher as the word written in monographs by the presidents. One president's articles listed on his resume or vitae as written or edited by him were secured. The articles were examined according Bolman and Deal's 1991a four cognitive frames. The terms leadership, relationship, and management appeared in the articles written about the presidents. The terms vision, decision-making, relationship building,
leadership, and management appeared often among the works of the six presidents for whom titles were used for the written content analysis.

Institutional data were gathered from all six institutions. The accreditation agency for the majority of the institutions was the North Central and Middle States Association of Colleges / Schools. All six colleges were members of the Association American of Colleges and Universities, the Council of Independent Colleges and Universities, Association of American Higher Education, and the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities. The six Dominican colleges were located in the Eastern and Midwestern regions of the United States. Their school calendar systems are based on the semester system.

*Analysis of the Leadership Orientations Survey*

To determine the leadership cognitive frames currently used by the sampled Dominican college presidents, a mean score obtained from the Leadership Orientations (self and other) Questionnaire (Bolman and Deal, 1990) was computed across 32 items. The mean score and standard deviation was computed for each frame using (SPSS) (Triola, 2001). For each of the 32 items, respondents were asked to rate their use of the various aspects of leadership using a 5-point scale (1=never, 2=occasionally, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always). A frame score of 4.0 or above was considered leadership strength with possible high score of 5 and low 1. Results of the presidents’ self-scored questionnaires showed that the six presidents reported slight use of the four frames. In the structural and human resource frames, the six presidents’ scores are all 3.00. Then, in the political frame five presidents had scores a little above 3.00, and
President F had 2.90, and in the symbolic frame five presidents had again a little above 3.00 while President B scored 2.35. There was a difference here.

While in the second version of the questionnaire (Other - Colleagues) President A utilized four frames: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. President B used three frames structural, political, and symbolic. President C slightly utilized the four cognitive frames. President D utilized the four cognitive frames, structure, and human resource, political and symbolic. President E made use of the three frames structural, human resource, symbolic and a slight use of the political frame. President F slightly made use of the four frames. There are some differences here, though significant. Table 2 shows the overall results of the mean and standard deviation of version two questionnaire.

Table 2

Overall Mean and Standard Deviation of Version 2 of the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Structure M</th>
<th>Structure SD</th>
<th>Human Resource M</th>
<th>Human Resource SD</th>
<th>Political M</th>
<th>Political SD</th>
<th>Symbolic M</th>
<th>Symbolic SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the standard deviation for the second version of the questionnaire are as follows, President A scored 0.39 for the structural frame, 0.57 for the human resource, 0.37 for the political and 0.29 for the symbolic frame. President B scored 0.61 for the structural frame, 0.94 for the human resource, 0.75 for the political and 0.96 for the symbolic frame. President C’s score was 0.95 for the structural frame, 1.23 for human resource, 0.95 for the political and 1.20 for the symbolic frame. President D’s scores were as follows, structural 0.46, human resource 0.71, political 0.47, and symbolic 0.61. President E scored 0.34 in the structural frame, 0.47 in human resource frame, 0.52 in political frame, and 0.61 in symbolic frame. President F’s scores were 0.62 for the structural frame, 0.95 for the human resource, 0.72 for the political, and 0.95 for the symbolic frame. There are some discrepancies in their scores. In the standard deviation President A scored low in symbolic frame, while President E scored low in the structural frame. In the standard deviation score, President C consistently scored low in two dimensions, human resource and symbolic frames. Table 3 shows the overall results of the self and other reported mean scores of the six presidents in the four frames namely, structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. In this table, the self-scored showed that four presidents scored 3.00 in all the four areas.

Then in version two of the questionnaire, two presidents (A and D) did score 4.00 in all the four frames. Presidents B and E scored 4.00 in three out of the four frames. Presidents C and F scored slight in all the four cognitive frames. In the self-described leadership and colleagues’ perceptions of the presidents, there was a high variation between the self-scored and that of the colleagues. Also, there were some discrepancies between self-scored and the colleagues scored. The discrepancies showed the areas in
which some of the presidents are not very strong. The reason being that the presidents with work experiences as academic affairs, did some fundraising, strategic planning and worked as deans have an edge over the presidents without these experiences. In general the presidents’ colleagues score was higher than the self scored of the presidents. Their colleagues perceived them as strong leaders in the four cognitive frames, compared with how the presidents perceive themselves. One common attribute among the six Dominican presidents in this study was their attempts to make use of all the four frames.

Table 3
Overall Mean of the Self and Other Scored Questionnaire (LOQ) for the Six Presidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 presents the overall results of the combined versions of Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation Questionnaire (1990). When the two versions of the questionnaire results were computed together, the result came out differently (i.e., the self and other reported scores). Among the six Dominican college presidents, the results showed that four of the six presidents made use of the structural frame. Three of the six presidents
used the human resource, political, and symbolic frameworks. The table shows that four of the presidents used two or more of the cognitive frames in their leadership styles, whereas two presidents used the four cognitive frames slightly.

Table 4
Overall Mean Score Results of the combined two version of the Leadership Orientation Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Human Resource</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean and standard deviation scores were computed for the responses of each president and their selected colleagues together. The higher the mean score, the stronger the use of the dimensions associated with a particular frame. The larger the standard deviation, the more dispersed the scores are from the mean. Table 5 displayed the overall mean and standard deviation scores of the structural, human resources, political, and symbolic framework of six Dominican college presidents. In the structural frame, Presidents A, B, D, and E had the highest mean scores of 4.00 and above. All six presidents have scores of 0.35 and above in the standard deviations in the structural frame. In the human resource frame, Presidents A, D, and E, had mean score of 4.00 and above. Five presidents had a standard deviation of 0.43 and above in the structural and human resource frames.
Presidents A, B, and D scored 4.00 and above in the mean score for the political frame. All six presidents had standard deviation scores of 0.34 and above in political frame. In the symbolic frame, Presidents A, D, and E, had a mean score of 4.00 and above. Five presidents had standard deviation scores of 0.30 and above, and one with a standard deviation of 1.16 and 1.22 in the symbolic frame.

From the overall results, Presidents A, B, D, and E scored above 4.00 in two or more frames. The greatest strength for four presidents was on structural frame. The presidents have their greatest strength on human resource, political, and symbolic frames. "Human resource leaders are advocates, openness, mutuality, listening, coaching, participation, and empowerment" (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 354). "Political leaders have the ability to resolve the conflicting demands and pressures of his/her many constituencies, internal and external, and in gaining their support for the institution’s goals and purposes, as he or she defines them" (Trow, 1985 p. 143). While “symbolic leaders have the ability to express, project, indeed to seem to embody, the character of the institution, its central goals and values, in a powerful way" (Trow, 1985 p. 143). The results may provide an initial result of corroboration of a multi-frame orientation (See Table 5).
Table 5

Results of combined version 1 & 2 of Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation Questionnaire Mean and Standard Deviation by Cognitive Frame (N=6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Human Resource</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section shows the results of leadership dimension Leadership Orientation Questionnaire (Bolman and Deal, 1990) by way of leading (see Table 6). The analytical, supportive, powerful, inspirational, organizational, participative, adroit and charismatic styles of the six Dominican presidents were analyzed. Scores between 4 and 5 are considered strengths in those particular dimensions, while a score between 1 and 3 was considered low in that particular dimension. In the structural dimension, the presidents are scored according to their abilities to be analytical and organized. The human resource frame was rated by the degree to which the participant was supportive and participative. The political dimension was rated by the degree to which the president was perceived to be powerful and adroit. While in the symbolic dimension, the president was scored on being inspirational and charismatic. Presidents A and D scored 4.00 and above in all the eight dimensions. President B scored 4.00 in six of the eight dimensions; President E
scored 4.00 in five of the eight dimensions; President F scored 4.00 in one of the eight dimensions; and President C did score high in some of the four dimensions. President A had the highest overall usage of the four frames. President D was the second highest in the use of the frames. President E was the third highest score in the use of the frames, and President C was fourth in the frequent usage of the frames. Overall, more than half of the presidents in this study used slightly two or more of the four cognitive frames in their leadership experiences.

Table 6

Results of combined version 1 and 2 of Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation Questionnaire
By Way of Leading (N=6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pr</th>
<th>An</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Po</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Pa</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>Ch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presidents who scored 4.00 and above in the eight items of structural dimension have the ability to be organized and to be analytical is the way they lead their institutions. They think logically and use data to inform decisions. They are realistic,
have the ability to get facts organized, and help others think things through. It also shows that they carefully attend to details. The structural leaders rely on policies, procedures, and goals in order to accomplish their objectives. They exhibit the ability to establish goals and timeliness and hold others accountable. The presidents who scored 4.00 and above in the eight items of the human resource dimension tend to be sensitive to the needs and concerns of others and build trust through open and collaborative relationships. They tend to motivate others through encouragement and recognition for work well done. They are open to new ideas and listen and have the ability to be supportive and participatory in their leadership styles. Presidents who scored 4.00 and above in the eight items of the political dimension showed the ability to be powerful and adroit. They have the capacity to mobilize people and resources to get things done and are effective at building support and alliances. Presidents with frame score averages of 4.00 and above in the eight items of the symbolic dimension demonstrate the ability to inspire and generate loyalty and enthusiasm in others. They communicate a strong and challenging vision and sense of the mission and emphasize culture and values and are highly charismatic. The presidents who scored between 3.00 and 3.90 showed minor use of the eight dimensions.

Combined version one and two questionnaire cognitive frames usage showed President A made use of the four cognitive frames of structural, human resource, political and symbolic. President B used two cognitive frames of structural and political. President C used slightly the four cognitive frames. President D utilized the four frames of structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. President E used the three cognitive frames of structural, human resource, and symbolic. President F slightly used the four
cognitive frames of the Leadership Orientation Questionnaire (Bolman & Deal, 1990)
(See Table 7).

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Frames Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Structure, Human, Political, Symbolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Structure, Political, slight use of the other two frames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Slight use of the four frames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Structure, Human, Political, Symbolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Structure, Human, Symbolic, slight use of Political frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Slight use of the four frames</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall results showed that leadership needs are similar in such colleges. The differences in their use of the four cognitive frames were dominant, although significant.

Analysis of the Interview Questions

President A Background and Career Path

President A was in a Catholic university on the East Coast as a Vice President before coming to this university. Through a search committee and interview she was appointed as the President of University A. University A has about 3,000 students. There are six schools in the university; primarily it is a liberal arts teaching university. The university has graduate and professional programs in business, library science, information services, education, and social work. President A’s career is a varied one, psychologist, dean of students, academic dean of a college, 5 years in fund raising and
advancement before moving over to senior vice president, then chief of staff—university secretary. She was very experienced in teaching and planning before she came to the University A. Her preparation for the presidency included work in academic affairs, student affairs, fund raising, and strategic planning.

Structural frame. The structural dimensions of leadership were evident in President A’s position description. President A believes that leadership needs to be accomplished by structural and vision-oriented goals. President A also described her primary task as a university leader as follows:

I describe my position as having three tasks (a) planning, (b) fund raising; (c) constituency with alumni, faculty, staff, and students. And I do the administrative work before anybody else walks in, in the morning and on weekends. My primary task is to focus on the people who are at the heart of this institution.

I am the steward of the strategic plan. I set the tone of the institution, and I believe that the president’s relationship with faculty and students sets the sense that people have about the institution. My cabinet has eight people on it. I consider myself to be the primary financial manager of the institution. I am responsible for the budget and the fund raising of the institution. And I am the primary spokesperson. If you are going to feel comfortable in a challenging role, you have to have a combination of leadership, strategy, and innovation. And then, you have to have the capacity to absorb a lot of chaos and give back calm and build confidence on one hand, but on the other hand, keep working internally with the
strategic issues of the institution. You must accept the fact that you are also a public figure. You have to feel comfortable to tell the university story in every public place and gathering. You have to be comfortably engaged in interpersonal relationships, but ultimately, you have to be able to make the hard decisions by yourself.

This president knows the practical values of well-defined structure and clear procedures, as well as good organizational and logical thinking in the management of a university system.

*Human resource.* Human Resource leaders are concerned the needs of others. Organizations and people are independent. Organizations need ideas, talent; people need careers, salaries, and work opportunities. President A analogically described how success was measured saying:

We have a series of key performance indicators that we use to measure our success. Some of them are very practical. This includes finances, enrollment, level of student satisfaction, and ratio of debt to income, net tuition revenue and the like. But I really think that there are two measures of importance. One is that you understand the mission of the institution and you anchor strongly on it. Number two is that the campus culture is supportive of the people in it, focused on the future, and consistent to the mission of the institution.
She went further to describe an educational project she initiated and how she went about it.

I was instrumental in redesigning our undergraduate curriculum and in introducing a series of interdisciplinary seminars. All students here are required to attend eight seminars during their 4 years of undergraduate education. What drove me to this is my strong commitment to liberal arts. I was concerned that our students were not getting a 4-year liberal arts experience. They were racing around doing their general education and focusing on their majors. So the redesigning of the curriculum assures that all undergraduate students, regardless of their major, will have 4 years of liberal arts education. And that was a very important initiative in our strategic plan.

President A spoke about the ability to be well planned and collaborative with her staff. She went on to describe how she spent a typical day, placing great emphasis on key strategic issues, constituents and resources.

A president's success is founded on good planning. We are a very well planned institution. The plan is done collaboratively, with very extensive involvement of the faculty, staff, and students. We make our decisions within the context of that plan. We do our fund raising within the context of that plan. We celebrate our success. We talk honestly about those areas where we didn't do well. We operate with a lot of integrity. We are mission centered. I am constantly engaged in meetings, in programs and the like. I will say a third of any given day is spent on discussing and designing key strategic issues. This morning (day of interview) I
had a long meeting with the academic block. I spent an equal amount of time on financial, fundraising, practical nuts and bolts. Much of the time from a meeting I stop to greet people, talk with them. I spend as much amount of time as I can with constituents. I chair meetings, attend student events, faculty, athletic, performing events that I possibly can. I get to the office 7:30 a.m. and finish by 10:00 p.m. or 11:00 p.m., daily. I do a lot of paper work on weekends. No two days are alike.

Political frame. The political frame views conflict as a normal by-product of collective action. Political leaders spend a good deal of time networking, building coalitions, building a power base and negotiating compromises (Bolman & Deal, 2003). President A sees problems as opportunities, and she went on to describe how she manages disputes in the face of conflict and opposition. She reflected on leadership roles, placing much emphasis on trust and decision making, a behavior used in association with Bolman and Deal's political frame.

I don't see problems. Rather, I see opportunities. Most of my staff will tell you that I turn most problems into opportunities. We are growing as an institution and we are landlocked. We needed to purchase another campus.

Now there are a lot of strategic decisions and deliberations that go into developing the financial capacity to do it. And we did it! We made the decision to purchase a new property, down the block. I believe that leadership, no matter the circumstances, is always 51% responsible for resolving disputes. No matter what the situation is, it is always my responsibility to reach over the divide to help that faculty member or group not to place themselves in a corner, and to always find a way of
managing the conflict and putting the situation right. I don’t personalize things. I do believe a sense of humor is important. If you work on your relationships with faculty, staff and students, day in and day out, and if these relationships are healthy, they can absorb the conflict, and you can agree to disagree and then move along.

This shows that this president made use of the political frame. This president is powerful and adroit.

*Symbolic frame.* The symbolic frame focuses on how humans make sense of the messy, ambiguous world in which they live (Belman & Deal, 2003). Symbolic leaders are highly charismatic and emphasize culture and values. President A speaks about the metaphor that characterizes her leadership style in these words, I am decisive, but am a good listener. I believe that at the heart of all that we do is our relations with people. I say people will believe that I am accessible and that I care about the mission, the community and the constituencies of the college. I speak from the heart.

Articulating how her role as a president of a university has met her expectations, this president went on to say:

> It is a privilege to be the president of this institution. It is a fascinating leadership experience. And it constantly challenges me personally, emotionally and strategically. In fact, you do not want to often think of the responsibility of leading the institution forward, of caring for the faculty and staff, being accountable for a lot of things, because it is an enormous
burden. But I find it extraordinarily satisfying. It is more than a job; it is a lifestyle. You need to recognize that, because if you don’t recognize it and accept it, it can feel overwhelming because it takes over your life. It is good for me. I am excited and fascinated by all the things going on. The only thing I will highlight as negative is that you have to be someone who is comfortable with the independence of the job. It can be a lonely job because you have to be available and accessible to people, but you have to be sufficiently removed that everybody will trust that you will make a fair and good decision whatever the circumstances on behalf of the institution. So you have to treat people about the same. You can’t have “special people,” or you compromise people’s feelings or your integrity to make balanced decisions.

This president’s values and commitment is evident when she continued to say:

I do a lot of teaching about leadership. You have to differentiate between person and role. When you are in a leadership role, a lot of people come at you. Every person has opinion of that project or decision. When you are in a leadership position, you have to understand their response is to the role of the president and is not, in most cases, personally at you. If you are confused or wounded by an angry faculty member’s negative opinion, then you are not in a position to respond back in a way that is productive to the conversation. It is always good to balance “the person” and “the role.” To do that, you have to be healthy and balanced in your life. If you’re exhausted or if you’re overwhelmed, or if you’re not happy, you
personalize things. As a president, you need to be happy in your role and healthy in your life. Take care of yourself. The people who work for you should not be responsible for your mental and emotional alertness.

Another thing I would say is that leadership is always a package, and you are more effective if you know your strengths and weaknesses. Surround yourself with people who disagree with you and also with people who are not afraid to tell you the truth. Very often, you find people who tell you what you want to hear. That is okay a lot of time. But you need to have people in your life and in your cabinet who would tell you the hard truth, whether it is about a situation or a decision that you made, because otherwise you don’t have the information that you need to lead the institution.

President B Background and Career Path

President B has been at this college since 1973. She came first as a faculty member and then was asked to take an administrative position as Director of Continuing Education. This was followed with 6 years as departmental chair in the foreign language department. So for 9 years, she was the Academic Dean of the college, which is now called the Vice President for Academic Affairs, which was her second leadership position. President B’s career path followed a natural progression. When the president resigned after two terms, which was typical for the normal institution, the board appointed her as President. Having been at the college for about 7 years, and having been
the Academic Dean, and chair of the Middle States Self-Study Committee, she was very visible and probably had excellent faculty support. She was asked to become president. It was not an open application process. This school is a small Catholic, Dominican liberal arts institution, primarily undergraduate with a growing graduate program. She has been in education all her professional life and has been at the college since 1973. "I followed a natural progression from faculty member to administration and from there to presidency."

*Structural frame.* President E described an important dimension of the structural frame as the ability to plan and organize and explains her role as a college president.

In terms of the institution, the buck stops at the president’s office. The president is responsible for the overall management of the institution and she is the end of all. I think my role as president involves primarily working with my executive administration in terms of overseeing all of the areas of the college, whether in terms of academic life, student affairs, or around institutional advancement. What is a little less obvious is my being present to the institution in a variety of ways, especially being very much involved in the strategic planning process of the institution. I exercise leadership that way.

She further explained the need to listen to other people and her ability to make a decision.

All right, possibly the ability to make decisions, but also in the making of the decisions, I think it is very important to be willing to listen to other people and to be collegial in terms of leadership, to be a team player. Yes, I guess the president has to be the captain of the team but unless you have
good relationship with staff, faculty, and administration, you will not get too far. So good leadership means the ability to make decisions, the ability to listen and the ability to make it clear that you think you don’t know it all and other people also have answers. I think personality has a lot to do with how effective you are as a leader. And that is why I said being present to the institution, being visible, having a good sense of humor all help in good leadership.

Human resources frame. President B elaborated on the measure of a successful college saying:

First of all, it will be obvious depending on the enrollment of the college, the appearance of the campus, the upkeep and maintenance of the buildings, the quality of the faculty, the academic credentials of the faculty, the quality of the students and the activities at the campus. Certainly, I think you don’t need to go to US News and World Report to find out if the college is good, because some things are better measured differently at a place like this college.

She utilizes the diminished number of Dominicans on the staff to narrate the reality of being a Dominican college president.

The reality now is that it is a tough one. For example, the number of Dominicans on the faculty or staff diminished 19 years ago. When the physical presence of the Dominicans is not there, it becomes more difficult to maintain the Dominican mission and charism. And so in that respect it is important for the leadership to bring the lay faculty and staff into the
ownership of that mission and charism. It is a little bit harder and it was never easy, because even the name of this college does not indicate that we are a Catholic college or a Dominican college. So I always laugh because I say, "We are the only Catholic college named after a Presbyterian minister," because we are named after the town, and the town was named after a Presbyterian war hero and minister. Even the name gives us a challenge in terms of telling everybody that we are a Catholic and Dominican college. We are very careful in our advertising, in our catalogue, to make sure that we highlight the Catholic Dominican tradition.

She explained the current educational project she initiated and went further to explain her leadership style.

I think, I was instrumental in developing several years ago what we call our Center for Excellence in Teaching. That basically came about because we were looking for a linchpin on which to attract federal money. So you have to put the request under a sort of unified umbrella, so I developed the concept of the Center for Excellence in Teaching program, which involves programs in teacher education, of which we have many in our college.

Political frame. She spoke of conflicts, negotiating, and bargaining and demonstrated how her extensive background in higher education has been of great help leading to her success as a president. She continued by explaining her schedule.
That second question is almost impossible to answer. Coming back to your first question, as a president, I have quite extensive background in higher education even though I have actively worked in only one college. I was, and still am, active in a number of national organizations and so there is a reputation outside the college. I think inside the college, it is my activities as the academic dean and my work at the accreditation of the self-study process. There is no such thing, as a "typical president's day activities." There is not even a typical week. Last week, and this week (interview week) have been very busy with meetings with the trustee committee. My board meeting, my first of four per year, will be this Thursday. For the first few weeks prior to that board meeting, every one of my trustees meets and I try to go to as many of them as possible. There are seven of those committees. You multiply them with a minimum of an hour, and in some instances 21/2 hours. And the meetings may be 8:00 in the morning or 6:30 on a Friday night. If you have corporate executives on your trustee committee, you have to be flexible in your own schedule. So it will be nice to say that the office hours is 8:30 in the morning to 2 or 6:30 in the evening, but you cannot just do that. This Saturday, I have an alumni brunch and meeting and I have installation of a pastor dinner on the same day. So I have one free Sunday between now and December. There is no typical day. We are starting a new capital campaign. So, now I have to give my calendar to the capital campaigns, and say to them, "I will give you one lunch or one dinner time a week that you can have me sit
down and meet with prospective donors." But then, before you schedule
that, check again your calendar because the calendar changes everyday. I
am very active both in the state and national education associations. I am
on the board of another Dominican College. These two are part of my
regular activities but they are not done during my 8:30 to 4:30 regular
office hours."

Using the MBA program she explained a new education program she implemented.
I don't implement things myself, but the emphasis comes from me, and
from the Academic Vice President. I have mentioned the Center for
Excellence in Teaching. The other thing is the move of our graduate
program in Contemporary Management, which was an MS, to now an
MBA.

She went on to use salary compensation as an example of a challenging problem.
One particularly challenging problem is faculty compensation. This
college is a struggling institution. We have really insisted on strong
credentials for our faculty, then comes the problem: the stronger the
faculty, the better compensation you need to have. And for many years,
we recognize that our faculty salary is below that of most people in this
area. This is a very expensive area to live in. We had a faculty group that
developed a scale, which we agreed to 10 or 12 years ago, which over the
course of time will bring us to parity. We worked with them every year,
but it never happened. Our salary remained low. No matter what we said,
the faculty didn’t want to change how they were doing things. So we decided to bring in an outside consultant to work with us and to show us a different way. He came and presented a new proposal. He did finally work with the administrators and the faculty, and the faculty accepted that proposal. We built that 3-year program into our recent strategic plan. We followed it aggressively and so we have a faculty salary increase in our 3-year strategic plan. It is a very expensive challenge we have taken on. We said to the board of trustees, “Yes it is going to cost us a lot of money, but we have to do it if we want to maintain a good faculty, and if we want to attract new faculty.” We had to sit down as an executive administrative body and say, “This is a priority. It is going to cost 200 to 300 thousand dollars extra each year for the next 3 years. We have to look at other areas, where we will not increase spending.” That is one of the hard realities of a small institution, with a small budget which is very much dependent upon tuition.

This president shows how collaborative her leadership style is.

She prayed not to have majority opposition and explained what has been of tremendous help for her.

I hope I will never have a majority opposition. What has kept me and strengthened me is for 9 years I was the academic dean. And in those 9 years I had a good relationship with the faculty, not that they always agreed with me, but that, I think, there is a great respect for me. I carried that with me as a president.

It’s not always easy to make decisions that the faculty will not like, but you have
to make those decisions. And they should hear from you and you make them understand why you made that decision. I think the best way you can ensure effectiveness is by not keeping secrets and by not hiding the reasons why you make the decisions you make. For instance, I have an all-college meeting at the beginning of each semester.

Symbolic frame: Symbolic frame is about the meaning, beliefs, and stories of the organization. President B felt that she had not had a vision critically, but discovered that she had one and is well organized.

I used to say, I am not a visionary, I am a leader, I don’t like the word manager, and “I am a very effective administrator because I am very organized.” I used to say that because my predecessor had great reputation as a visionary, she was our major superior. She was a visionary. She was ahead of her time. She came and became the president of the college and she had a vision, a very different vision for the college because when she became the president of the college, it was in a very bad situation. She decided that a change was necessary so that the college will survive. So she created the vision of going co-educational. I inherited that vision. And I ran with that vision and made it a reality. So, I became the president of this college. I said I needed to lead the college community in a new strategic plan, because the college is changing. I had to lead it through two strategic plans.

So now I have to say to myself, I have a vision. I am a visionary. That’s what the role of the president calls me to be and I also have to be a leader in bringing that vision to reality. You know some people’s concept of a visionary is that they have
this wonderful visionary image, and then it's up to you to make that a reality. I
don't see it that way; rather, I see both of them going hand in hand.

She showed that she made use of the four cognitive frames as she described her role as a
president, the positive and negative aspects of the job:

I think I know most of the things to expect when I came into the job, because I
worked closely with the former president. It is a very positive thing to know that
you can make a difference in what you do. If the college has a success you say.
"That is a success for me." I think it is a boost to know that you can effect change
and that you can bring people along with you to work at that change. The negative
aspect is the schedule, the calendar that controls your life. I guess when the
college is getting a million dollars, getting a new building, getting a good size of
freshmen students, that's positive. However, the next year may be the freshmen
number is not good, maybe it has a construction problem, that's negative. So I
think it is an up and down life that you live.

President C's Background and Career Path

President C was the executive vice president of the same Dominican university
before becoming the president. President C has been president on two occasions. She was
asked by her community in 1977 to serve as an assistant to the president, and she taught
some mathematics courses. Unfortunately, the president became quite ill within 2 or 3
months of her arrival at the college, and she was asked to serve as the acting president for
almost a year. Then she was appointed president in 1979, and she served in that capacity
for 8 years. She came back to Dominican University in 1994 as the executive vice
president and then became the president again in 1997. She has been president now for 8 years.

There was a search in her community when she became president the second time. There were three candidates who were finalists, and the board chose her from among the three. It is a Dominican institution that has a commitment to serve the first generation going to college. Most of their students are first in their family to attend college. About 78% are of traditional age, and about 30% are adult students. The college has close to 2,000 students, and it provides a caring and supportive environment. In terms of the programs they offer, they have tried to meet the needs of the students in their geographical area. This Dominican college has programs in social work, nursing, and health care areas. It is a small to moderate size college, serving people of a particular area, New Jersey and New York. It provides about 30 programs.

Prior to coming to higher education, she taught mathematics in high school and served as a principal of an elementary school in the South Bronx, New York. Originally she came to be an assistant and then realized she had to teach mathematics. Circumstances changed, and she became the president. When she came the second time, certainly she had more experience than the first time. She had experience in administration and in teaching but not in the college level.

**Structural frame.** This president reflected on the roles and responsibilities of leadership as follows:

I would say, it is very important to maintain a vision for the college. It is very important to have a resilient spirit, because it is a challenging position. It is very important to keep your decisions and directions closely tied to the needs of the
students. As president, you spend so much time in meetings internal and external to the college. I find it very important to tap in what is happening in the lives of the students, so that I can stay grounded. In terms of leadership, I think it is important to be in touch with the needs of the community you serve, to be in touch with the trends in higher education and to be in touch with the spirit of the Dominican institution that you serve.

Explaining further, she described how she exercises leadership.

I suppose, in terms of my own work as a president, I tried to have a collaborative style with the vice presidents with whom I worked directly. The college has five vice presidents, the former president serves as a chancellor working especially in the area of fundraising and external presence. I think I tried very much to work with the executive council, vice presidents, and myself I put items on the agenda and then ask them for their input. In terms of my style of leadership, I count very much in working with the people on that level. I tried always to go around the college to get a sense from other people's perspectives about the college. But I would say, with a very heavy schedule, I count very much on the vice presidents with whom I plan things together. I tried to meet them one on one every 2 weeks, and sometimes when we are working on big projects, we meet more frequently. This president explained the need to work collaboratively with other individuals to achieve her goals, and the elements that can detract from a president's ability to be successful.

I think anyone who tries to work alone will be at a great disadvantage. Many times you come to a meeting with your own perspective, but when you listen,
particularly to the administrative council level, the ideas that come out are much more creative than what you get out of conversation style. Another good resource is the board of trustees. As president, we work very closely with an executive committee. We meet on a monthly basis, and then the Board itself meets five times a year. Depending on the project you're involved in, there is ongoing connection with that group of people. For instance, we've been in the process of building a new campus, so there are a lot of conversations with the Board concerning fund raising, conversations with those members of the Board who have engineering or construction background as to get very good advice. I would say that you want a sense of what you want to accomplish, which is growth for the students and broadening of admissions. To accomplish what you want, it is very important that you work with the people you trust, who in fact, share your hopes, dreams, and concerns and thus work collaboratively with you.

**Human resource.** Botmae and Deal 1997 view the human resource dimension as a way of meeting. By being supportive and participative and by helping others to realize their potential, the leader can strengthen the entire organization. Using the analogy of a caring environment, she described the measure of a successful college system.

I suppose that the measure of the success of an institution is based on what you want to accomplish. There are numerous colleges across the country and in the area. It is very important to know the student body that you serve and have a sense of what your mission is. We speak of having a supportive caring environment and yet a challenging one, so that the students who come in at a
certain level, are able to leave at a much higher level. To be successful, you have to have a good sense of the people who work closely with the students and faculty and to judge the success of the institution in terms of what you want accomplished, guided by the mission, and try to be faithful to that mission.

She went further to describe the reality of being a Dominican college president using the elements of Dominican spirituality as an example.

I think that the elements of Dominican spirituality have an influence. I don't know how much everyone in the college would know that. I think people would speak of this institution as a welcoming environment, and I think that has a lot to do with the Dominican commitment to a sense of community. The service elements of the institution are reflected in many of our programs, which prepare teachers, social workers, healthcare professionals with the notion of serving the needs of the people are part of the institution. I believe the Dominican spirit, which calls for a sense of community, and the need to share the fruit of your study and contemplation, would be very much at the heart of the institution. I don't think everybody would say that we lack the four pillars of our Dominican tradition.

Three elements of community, service, and study are very important in our campus. We speak in our mission statement of the type of reflection that calls for a compassionate God. So since we have students and faculty of different religious backgrounds, we also speak more of a commitment to reflective understanding that leads to compassionate involvement, and I think that speaks to the other pillars of the Dominican tradition that involve spirituality that is, prayer.
On a current educational project she initiated, she used the health care professionals to explain how she implemented the program.

We are committed to the education of health care professionals in the college for over 20 years. For this number of years we have provided and trained many nurses, occupational therapists, physical therapists, and those interested in healthcare professions. Most recently we developed a program in physical therapy. We offered it at a master's level. We become aware that the accrediting agencies are looking for the education of entry-level people into the profession at the doctoral level. Even though we are small, moderate institution, when we learned about it, we immediately began to plan the program for the doctoral level. And with the backing of the Board, even though we don't have the approval from the accreditation agents, we began to plan the program to offer physical therapy in a doctoral level. It probably reflects what we at the college say we want to do: providing excellent education to meet the desires of our students, since they have to look for employment after graduation. To have them well prepared is important. The institution wasn't planning to offer doctoral programs, but there was a need that came from outside which said that if we are going to continue to help preparing students to get to that higher level, then we have to act now. So we are gearing up now to get to that higher level.
President C understands the need for collaborative work and shows how these reflect her management style.

We've been working. We just met with director of Institutional Research Review Board. We've been working on the development of strategic initiatives of the college and we began several years ago, working with about seven members of the administrative council, academic leaders, and division directors, those who work directly with students, our technology department and campus ministry. We are currently involved in the development of some strategic initiative from a very broad base of the college community. We try to do it in a way that will encourage the people to bring forth the best thoughts for the future, assessing what has been done and moving that information to the next stage of getting money for support. That constant brainstorming of base, trying to involve as many numbers of people in your decision making, and holding college-wide meetings with faculty and administrators to have a general notion of what the aspirations of the college are all these reflect my management style. We are going to start the second semester in January in the same manner. We try to bring the whole college together twice in one academic year. So much work can be accomplished when people contribute to the vision and be part of it.

Political frame. Political leaders see their role as resolving conflicts and managing scarce resources in order to achieve the mission and goals of the organization. President C explained the importance of tying the activities with the college mission and went further to explain how she spends a typical day.
I try to draw connections between my deepest beliefs and the work I'm involved in everyday. I find that very helpful because the involvements are so enormous and varied, for example the involvement in raising funds, working with the board of trustees and planning to build a campus. In a typical day, I would probably spend a long time with meetings with the vice presidents and conducting university affairs. I try to get to some student activities (e.g., soccer games, or presentations). I spend a good deal of time in contact with our local and state representatives seeking their support for the college. I take a good deal of time asking people to provide the means for the ongoing development of the college. I spend a bit of time going to meetings and having to participate in both the national and state level. As I mentioned, I am engaged in meetings with a number of our trustees on an ongoing basis. How would I break up my day? A third will have to do with administrative work, a third would be involved with the local community working on several boards, serving the local and state communities. The remaining third will be for planning, asking individuals and corporations for assistance especially now that we are putting up a number of new buildings. President D used endowment as an example to illustrate her problem-solving style. The issue of endowment revealed her tendency to meet problems in a straightforward manner and to keep her colleagues and board well informed as to how she is planning to address the problem.

The most challenging problem is the task of large endowment. You are constantly looking for financial help. About 15 years ago, it became evident that for the college to continue to grow, we need additional space, residence hall, facilities,
additional parking space, and academic buildings. That was a big challenge for a college, which has no large endowment. How did we go about it? I spent a great deal of time working with committees of board of trustees, bringing in people from outside to work with us, and explaining to them our vision and that to be able to continue the work the college has done and engaged in over the years, there was a need to establish a new campus. We talked about it and shared ideas with a variety of people around the campus and then started to meet with the executive committee of the board, the advancement committee, and tried to expand out into the outside population who had the potential to help the college especially the state and federal government, as well as corporate people.

Further she reflected on how she would operate if there were majority opposition from her colleagues.

That has not been my experience. I think it is important to keep people well informed about what is going on in the institution. If people have a sense that they are involved in something bigger than themselves, that the institution really is working for the students, that we are together trying to make that educational experience better all the time, it is less likely to have on going significant opposition. Try to be honest with the people who work at the college, to be committed always to increase the salaries to the extent that we are able to do, and to share information with people. Those are the kind of ethics that will enable you to work positively with other people. I guess whenever a problem does arise, it is important not to ignore it. As a president, you will always work through some faculty problem with the academic dean, or one of the division directors. Try to be
willing to move with the individuals. But in terms of the institution, we have not
had a great deal of tangible opposition. When a problem occurs, what is critical is
not to ignore it but to try to get to the background of what happened, and try to
work out a solution within the spirit of the institution in a way that is just to
people.

Symbolic frame. The symbolic frame has to do with institutional cultures, beliefs,
and rituals. This president spoke about the ability to maintain a vision and have
clear goals for the college. She further reflected on the positive and negative
aspects of the job.

The role of a leader is to contribute to a vision and work with those who are closer
with you in articulating and developing the vision. I see my role as providing the
challenge every once in a while with regard to the bigger picture. I see my role as
an enabler, pretty well informed about what is happening in the college. As an
individual, what I find most exciting is that, because of my involvement, in some
small way, i can bring about growth for our people. The positive is when i
complement what I’m doing with growth on any number of levels for the
students. So if they become more active in helping other people, if they go into
graduate school and do very well, if they overcome personal shortcomings and
difficulties, and the institution had something to do with their growth, that’s the
most positive aspect of the job. The negative aspect is that it is immensely time
consuming. You deal with the needs of so many different people, that no one
knows the immediate demands of the work. Because the work has so many
responsibilities and such a huge variety of constituents, it can be quite demanding.
It can be quite enabling because it is nice to meet a large and variety of interesting people. But it is important to bring the integration from within you because there are so many different involvements such as travel, talking to different people. Has the role of a president met or not met your expectations? Personally, I found it a rewarding position. My expectations were that we could form and provide an environment where people can learn and grow, and I think that has happened.

There has been stability among the faculty, which has enabled the institution to continue to grow. We are fortunate to have an increase in the number of students attending the college. I think it is a vehicle for the mission of our Dominicans to continue to have an influence in the life of young people. For all of those reasons, it has been rewarding. Your hopes are that the elements of the mission statement namely: the commitment to excellence, leadership and service, in a fashion that calls for passionate involvement and reflective thinking, would have been learned by the students here so that when they go out, they do likewise to other people.

President C analogically explained the importance for people to work together, and she provided her definition of leadership. It is important to tie your activities closely to the mission of the institution to the extent you are able, and to get to know the people who work at the institution. I say that because you realize that so much of what is accomplished is accomplished when people work together. I think you are aware that you never know where the best idea or the best solution would come from. It is important to trust the people you work with. I think the role of a leader is to be an enabler, a facilitator, and to be open to much of what comes from the group.
President D's Background and Career Path

President D was a provost at a Catholic university in Kansas sponsored by a religious order. The search committee of this college recruited him. He was seeking for employment at other small Catholic colleges, when he learned of this position. He had no previous knowledge about Dominicans. He did not attend any Dominican college or schools. He could not say that he was attracted to this college because it was Dominican; rather, what attracted him was that it was a Catholic institution. The members of this school talk about their college in a Catholic Dominican tradition. That is how they describe it. The language they use now is that they are Catholic and Dominican in philosophy and outlook. That is how they define it in their mission statement. They are integral to the Island, and they help to transform the area. They educate individuals and transform the community. They talk about the fact that they are “transformational.”

President D took the traditional path for college presidency, from what he understands and read in literature. He was Provost, then Executive Vice President for 9 years at a Catholic institution. As Provost, he was in charge of enrollment and allied academic programs, and he did some fundraising for the academic program. Prior to being Provost, he had been a faculty member and chair of an academic department then the dean of enrollment services.

Structural frame. The structural frame speaks about reliance on policies, procedures, goals, and organization. President D reflected on the roles and responsibilities of leadership.

You have to be able to have a good relationship with people so that you can work together. You cannot do it all by yourself. Some presidents make that mistake,
they could be very authoritarian. As a president you are here as a servant, to
serve the students and the goals of the institution. You are here to make sure that
things are working well the best of the institution to come out. The president has
to realize that it is important to work with other people in a collaborative effort, to
build relationships, and build a strong community within the institution. It is much
more important to be a leader than to be a manager. You have to accomplish a
mission and also be financially sound. There is no one answer to that. For us we
are here not because we are Dominican and Catholic. We are here to improve
society. We do that by helping to improve the individual's sense of responsibility.
It is not enough to help the individual get a job, make a living, and feel happy and
successful. That is certainly important but we have to allow them to understand
that they have to give back and create a better and more just society. You have to
realize all the practical things you have to worry about won't be accomplished.

Human resource frame. President D utilized the alumni to explain how college
success was measured.

We draw our success by the contributions our alumni make to the community.
Ultimately that is how you judge your success and the reputation of your
institution and the quality of your programs by the contribution you make to
society. There are certain things about being president that is going to be the same
no matter the type of institution. The financial reality is always part of it,
enrollment, fund raising, and having the resources.
President D described the president's response to the reality of being a Dominican college president and the issues one who heads such institution might encounter is as follows:

One of the real issues in the Church is independence from the Diocesan ecclesial community. When you are called to search for truth, you call the students to have to understand what is happening in the world. You can't always do that in a way that will make everybody happy and content. One of the real challenges is that certain people want you to follow one political litmus test, and if you deviate from that, you receive criticism that you are not Catholic. One of our big concerns as a Dominican institution is how do we respond and be truthful to our mission and institution. It is really very difficult to be a truly Catholic institution at this time. It is even more difficult because you have the alumni and community challenging you that you have to stand up for that. But how can you accept that if they want to polarize the institution to one extreme or the other, when you know that the truth is in the middle, at its best. Truth is always best. That is the biggest challenge as a Dominican institution right now. We are not like the Jesuit institutions. We do not have the same financial leverage, to be able to resist. Some of that is not because we are Dominican, but because a religious order of women found us. We do not have the financial stand to resist. For example, I brought Hilary Clinton to the campus. She is a USA senator, and it will not affect our financial resources as an institution.
Further, President D shared the current educational project he had initiated in this way:

Right now we are working on what we call a Leadership Institute. We have some funding from the local foundation. The aim of the Leadership Institute is to educate leaders among the people of Long Island and to help them to understand how you make a change, and we will do that, with the up coming leaders, middle managers, high school students, and our students, all the way across on this issue of leadership. I believe that that is critical because we need to make people understand that we have to accept the role of a leader and that does not mean you are a boss, but when you are of service to others and you are out there making a difference, you are a leader. You are helping change the community. That's an example of a project that's near and dear to my heart.

Political frame. The focus of the political frame is on strategy, tactics, bargaining, negotiation, and conflict resolution. President D explained the activities that lead to his success as a president and then described how he spends a typical day.

We have developed the sense of providing a public forum. We had several speakers on campus for a dialogue in the public square. We had a symposium on just war, pre-emptive war. We sponsored the full program on immigration on the Island. We run a television show in partnership with Telecom to discuss issues with people. These are examples of what we do. We have come to realize our uniqueness in our discussions and conversations over issues. Some of them are not popular issues. For example immigration, such issue is not going to benefit the institution. But it is an issue that needed a conversation. I think it is important
talking in a society and who we are as an institution. The only thing different is
that we do not have a conversation about whether we are Catholic or not. During
my predecessor's period that was happening. Are we really Catholic? I say we are
Catholic and we can have a conversation of what it means to be a catholic, but not
a conversation as to whether we are catholic or not. My day is probably on
average 50% meetings with individuals, administrators, and faculties towards the
operation of the institution. And the other half will be devoted to interacting with
people from the external community whether it is an initial meeting with someone
or a follow-up meeting; I might be playing golf with someone, dinner, lunch out
in the community.

This president uses the MBA as an example of an innovative program he implemented.

We could use the MBA as an example. I know that when I came to this
institute, I talked with some people in the external community to tell me more
about this college. How could we improve our reputation? They said that our
business program is not well known. "Your nursing and teacher programs are
known but your business is not." Then I talked with the academic vice president
and we realized that we had to bring in additional resources. We spent time with
the faculty and explained to them our need to build up the business program. We
looked at several options. We brought in a consultant with a different point of
view. We then made a decision, that we will start an MBA program. That is where
the faculty wanted to put their resources. I agreed to that, and I have to bring in a
new person to lead the MBA program. Starting this past January, we have two
cohorts of 25 students for the MBA program. It is rather new. It started externally
as a conversation, which I brought internally while I work with the faculty collaboratively to start the MBA program. I was willing to be flexible as long as we are going in the right direction.

He described how he handles conflicts.

One comes to mind. As an institution, one of the challenges of the president is to set the tone. I believe that our institution has a cultural problem. I mean poverty. You know when you are poor you do not believe that you can change the situation. We have people who believe that once we do not have the resources to get better, and we cannot get better. They did not want to come in to say, "I need money to go for a conference, to develop a course," or "Can we use another faculty, or can I use different instructional materials?" We had financial problems. We had to manage the finances so we could make sure we are in good shape. That is the easy part to do; you simply had to manage properly. But then I wanted to make sure that people understood that I would make the resources available if you are doing something of value to the institution. So the more you did for the institution, the more material you got. People come with their own ideas not just my own idea. People come in to say, "We want to start this academic program or we have this vision, or we can teach in a different way if we have some money for modern technology then we can switch this institution from their culture of the poverty." These skills are crucial to conflict resolution and bringing agreement among disparate groups.
**Symbolic frame.** The symbolic frame deals with meaning, stories, and rituals.

When President D was asked to give a metaphor that characterizes his leadership style, he used a music example.

I lead by being right there with the people. I was out with the students for lunch. I try to build a sense of community, a sense that we are working together. In order to do that you have to be conscious of even the little things that relate to them. I believe a lot in the delegation of duties. Leadership is like playing jazz. You bring different people together; you build on their talents and their abilities, build music coming from a certain people's abilities to harmonize. The jazz is like that. It is not linear, it is creative and that's what I am, creative. I can have 20 things going on at the same time, and I know that five of them will never get finished. But that is okay because life is organic, not linear, I like the metaphor of the orchestra.

You come in you play your own piano. You play your own key. It is like jazz. I tell you, you play it right or not right. You bring your own inspiration and creativity into it.

His personal values and commitment are evident when he said:

I enjoyed being a provost. But people tell me that I will be a better president than being a provost. Not that I was a bad provost. It is a privilege to be a president. It is a privilege, because you meet so many interesting people you would never have the opportunity to meet or have conversation with. We have so many opportunities, and so in that way, it is the most rewarding thing in the world I have done. It is also rewarding to be able to work with so many people in building an institution to a higher quality and higher caliber than even some of them
thought were possible. I am very optimistic of what we can do in the next 5 or 7 years. I believe that our next steps will be more challenging than what we have just gone through. The positive aspect of being a president is that you get to see the impact of your creativity and leadership. The results are far more immediate than in some jobs. You get a chance to be influential in terms of redirecting the sense of what an institution is and what it is to become. That is the rewarding aspect. People worry about the negative aspect of the job. It is time consuming. You spend 60 to 70 hours in a week working. You work on weekends. You always work as a president.

President E's Background and Career Path

For President E, it was a calling from God. It is God that brought him there. He was the vice president for student affairs in a Methodist school in Nebraska and had a great relationship with the president there. He was there for 12 years, and the president was going to retire soon. He had wanted him to stay and replace him, but they have never had a non-ordained Methodist as president in that college in Nebraska. The previous president recognized President E's ability to become a college president. At about that time, he had an interview in another college but was not chosen. Right after that, someone sent him a research finding that said for faith-based institutions, Catholic universities and colleges have 99% of their presidents Catholic, Methodist 97%, Episcopalians same, all very high. Most of the people they put in the presidency have the same faith as the institution, and Catholics were the highest. So, he considered applying to some Catholic
intuitions. Soon after, this Dominican University called him. It was the same search committee that was interviewing for the other college. So they knew his background. They called and informed him that there was a new opening in one of the Dominican universities. Would you be interested? He answered yes, although he had never been part of a Catholic higher institution before. It is God’s calling. He read the mission statement and learned about the Dominicans who founded the college, and it resonated with him.

So, he accepted the position.

It was competitive, but he did not know the total number of applicants. Finally, there were three candidates short-listed for the position. Like most search committees, they narrow down the number to three. Campus interviews followed. The college by-laws require that both the Board of Trustees and the Corporate Members of the General Counsel of the Dominicans approve the selection. This Dominican institution, in many ways, is similar to other single-sex Catholic institutions, which were founded by religious orders. It was an all-women college until 1968. This college was founded in 1919 to train teachers. They started graduate education mostly in teaching in the 1950s and then became co-educational in the 60s. This college formed an independent board of trustees at about that time and then moved into degree completion work for adult education. The college is a mission-centered and student-focused institution. He started his college career at this institution as a student affairs officer and then became Vice President of Student Affairs. Prior to his coming to this college, he was an international student adviser and dean of students.
Structural frame. The structural leader champions a pattern of well-thought-out-roles and relationships (Bolman & Deal, 2003). President D’s structural approach is revealed in the following statements.

If you look at the global role, it is to provide vision and direction. The primary mission of leadership is to provide direction, vision, and hope, to keep a positive sense of the future for whatever form of institution it is. I suppose there are so many ways. First is to be present, to be visible and to lead by example, then to represent the institution in and off campus, with dignity, with class, and with pride. I know people think of this institution through me. Someone meets me in the community, and if I had a good impression on them this college looks well. If I had a bad impression on them, that describes the institution. It is not fair. It puts a lot of burden on those of us in leadership positions especially in a small community like this. This town is about 25,000 people. I am very visible in the community. If I go into a grocery store, people know that I am the president of this college. So you are always on duty. I think the primary way of leading is by doing and by showing.

He explained the individual qualities that can advance or detract a president from achieving his or her goals.

I can say that a president can fail either through arrogance or through micromanagement. First is the arrogance of the perks and requisites of the position. You know there is a lot of status associated with the presidency, and I see it as a leadership growth. The dinner you attend, the people you associate with, the nice car, and these are often important symbolisms to represent your
institution's quality. These can go to one's head. The second is that you cannot micromanage complex institutions we have today. You have to have good people and give them room to accomplish their goals.

*Human resource frame.* The human resource frame focus is on needs, skills, and norms of the organization. Reflecting on the measure of a successful college system he stated:

I think the ultimate measure is advancing your mission, though it is not always defined. For us, it is the success of our students, to bring the young or elderly to degree completion, or to bring people through our doors on to cyberspace and to make them better individuals as a result. We add a lot of value to the person who comes in and the changes they make when they leave. I notice a lot of changes with the incoming freshmen that come with undefined goals, and leave the college, as graduates with bachelors in science with B or C average, and then become successful teachers, leaders, and accountants.

He explained the reality of being a Dominican college president and the problems one who leads such an institution might encounter.

I have never been a president of a Jesuit or Sisters of Mercy College. I do not know how to compare them. The average person does not know the history of the Dominican education. They know of the Jesuit and the Holy Cross Fathers because of the University of Notre Dame. Most of our students come here because of the Dominicans or because they have had a relation who attended this University. But they have not heard about the charism of the Dominican tradition. It is good in a sense that they do not come with preformed notion. We have to
educate them because they don’t know. In short, one of our goals this year is to take one of the four pillars of the Dominicans, preaching, and infuse that into our program. We do a lot of things truly Dominican, but we do not name them. Why do we have convocation at the beginning of the year, why do we have a liturgy, why do we pray before special events, why do we call people to pray for peace when there is a national war or tragedy? That is part of our rich Dominican tradition. The challenge is to get people into the roots and tradition of Dominican education. The reality is that if we can teach them the Dominican tradition along the way, that is good, but they do not come here because we are a Dominican institution.

President E shared information about an educational project that showed his educational belief.

I just had a group of students over for a reception, Monday night. They are presidential scholars. These are outstanding high school students who are given half scholarship and the objective is to get them involved in the university and use them to improve the university through their leadership. And I hold four leadership workshops every year for these students. The first one was last night. This was to get the freshmen acquainted. Now we have two leadership workshops this semester with freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors who are presidential scholars. It’s building relationships with these students. They are my window to the university. When I meet with them we do a leadership development, goal setting, time management and conflict resolution. The next
hour, we sit on the floor. I ask them "What do I need to know? What is going on? Who are your best faculty members? What are your concerns? If you were the president what will you change?" The students have excelled on this, and I am proud of it.

Political frame. The political frame deals with the issues of coalition, politics, and conflict management. President E understands the need to build relationships, to develop powerful community coalitions, and to work from this power base is reflected in his statements below.

I think you need to have a large portfolio of skills, most important of which is relationship building. You lead by the coalitions or influence, you do not lead by dictatorial or arrogance whether you are on, or off the campus. You have to have a good relationship with your students, staff, faculty, administrative team, board of trustees, alumni, and your donors. I think successful presidents all know the art of relationship building. You need a lot of energy. Certainly it is a tireless position. You often go early in the morning till late at night, six days a week. In an academic year we probably have events five nights a week. You have to be present, to go to the athletic events, choir, the theatre, and community events. You have to be present to get the pulse of the institution. How can you determine the pulse of the student, faculty, etc. if you never see them outside of their classroom?

He went further to show how he spends a typical day.

A typical day is crowded and always full. Fund raising is a large part of the president's work. People think you are out all the time raising funds, but the time
you spend asking people for money is really very small. It is the cultivation of relations, bringing people in, and building relationships that matter. Then when the time is right, you ask for their support and then you steward that relationship. Yes, meetings take a whole lot of your time. But as much as I could, I keep a portion of the day for exercise.

Next, he described a recent innovative program he started. I do not know if I can say that I started a graduate program. Rather, I am a catalyst and I have encouraged and really asked faculty and deans to get these done. I will describe one, which I think is very innovative. I think I have created a tone and environment that made this happen. We have a group of adults who work in the nuclear power plant section. They would never be able to go back to school because of their work schedule. They work inordinate hours; shifts change all the time. When the nuclear reactor goes down, they work 50 to 60 hours in a week doing maintenance. We created a degree completion program in a cohort way for them. There were 50 of them. We did blend the course; we did the course online, and capped it with a face-to-face meeting. Last week we had a graduation for 11 of them. What we are saying is that we have some special skills in the delivery of education. It does not have to be here, Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays in one-hour blocks. We can be creative, out of the box, and figure out a way to serve the community’s seeds and encourage people to have an innovative spirit.
President E shared a challenging problem he had and analogically illustrated his problem-solving style.

The most severe challenge I had was when we had a financial crisis. In some cases, it was certainly a challenge. Our chief finance officer did some things that I was not aware of it. She got into cash flow problems and withdrew money from our endowment fund without asking. She did what she felt was necessary and she thinks she can cover it up, and then put the money back when things get better. But then things got worse. Then in solving that we had to make personnel change which is always difficult. She left quickly and I sought help from the board members and legal counsel. We have to acknowledge our limitations. I am not an accountant, and I relied on her reports as I do with the deans. Unfortunately, you make decisions based on faulty information. We asked for money from the congregation to hire a forensic audit company to come and look at it, to make sure there was no trace of deceit or fraud of which there was none. She was just over her head. It was close to August, and we were to start school with a million dollar deficit. We explained candidly to the community what happened. I accepted the responsibility because it happened while she was on my watch as the president. I offered my resignation to the board. They said “No, we need leadership now more than ever.” I went to all local trustees to share with them the problem, to tell them what happened from my own perspective. It was amazing and comforting to know that they all said they have faced similar situations. We had to lay off some people. The most important lesson I learned from this experience is that you have to delegate, but you have to monitor closely. We changed our auditors. We had a
15-year relationship with a local firm, and they told us that everything was fine, but they never set their foot into the building for 3 years. We thought we were doing the right thing. We formed a new ad-hoc committee from the Board of Trustees. I learned about sharing problems and communicating honestly. We told the newspapers exactly what happened, we tried not to hide anything. We changed original structures, and we took care of the political structure, too. We try not to make the same mistakes again.

Regarding working with majority opposition, President E presented a realistic view and analogically showed the different group of people you find among the faculty and staff in a university.

If you do not have the support of your faculty, you cannot lead. And so there are ways of trying to change and build coalitions. I think most presidents have their loyal followers as well as their "gadflies." There is always a resistance. Then there is the middle group that you have to be attuned to. They care less what you do. Get them their resources; you are out of their way. Let them do their job, you are fine. Doing things the way you want to do, will always be competitive for the group. But you have to lead; you have to move the Institution forward. It's moving that middle group forward with you, which is a challenge. This job is too burdensome to have a quarrel everyday. I would not do it. I would say I have the ability, skills, which would fit into another institution.
The above statement speaks of the president's ability to prevail in the face of conflict and opposition.

*Symbolic frame.* The symbolic frame refers to meanings, beliefs, myths, and stories. When President E was asked about the metaphor that described his style, he chose sports and the Web.

I like sports, I might be drawn to a sports metaphor to describe the way colleges are, Web, because there are all those connections. We are all strong when all these are together. We are not hierarchical. We are very much a decentralized faculty.

We are a team. Perhaps I can consider myself the keeper of the web. Referring to the complexity of the president's role, he talked about the positive and negative aspects of the job.

I knew what I was getting into because I have worked with presidents closely. I knew the schedules, pace, and the pressures. I came as a student affairs officer, and the long hours of the job were natural to me. I am lucky enough to have lots of energy. One part I did not know was how to raise money. But my mentor told me that it's all by "relationships." He showed me how to build relationships. So the positive is that so many privileges of the presidency far outweigh the negatives and the challenges. Possibly the most unexpected pleasure is meeting people, meetings with alumni, going around the country meeting with people whom the institution has touched and who want to give back. The most negative aspect is the constant pressure for finances. We have a small endowment, and every enrollment cycle is a worry. That is the worst part of the job. We don't have the luxury of $100,000,000 endowment.
President F's Background and Career Path

President F was a philosophy professor and vice president in a Catholic university in Michigan. He never aspired to be something more than a philosophy professor. One day with short notice, the dean of his college resigned. It was in the summertime. The then president thought there was not enough time to inaugurate the search process. He asked F if he could step in temporarily. At that time, F was the chairman of the philosophy department, the president of the faculty senate and had tenure with this institution. He thought about it for a while, and then he decided to give it a try. That turned out to be a permanent position, because after the search for a dean was completed, he was appointed. He was there for 5 years as dean and had already been there 11 years as a professor. He was fortunate enough to receive some available financial assistance to do some research. He talked to an organization, the National Education Center for Higher Educational Management Systems, and they expressed interest in the study. He was interested in the input, they were interested in the output, and so he designed to study both of these together. It was a 3-year study. By then, he was in another small Dominican college. He needed an office to run his finances though. That was one of the requirements of the grant. That was what he did.

During the 3 years, his research was coming to an end, and within the same time frame the dean of this college left. The president said, "I want you to be dean." He decided to accept and to teach as well. For a while he was a dean and also an acting interim president. Since the Dominican institute was interviewing for the position of a president, and he had been interviewed for other positions where he applied, he was given
the position. When he came to this college, it was very small. There were 300 full-time students and a weekend college for people studying part-time with about 850 students. It was a liberal arts college. He arrived on campus just after celebrating their 60th anniversary. It was founded as a 2-year women’s college in 1927. In 1941, it became a 4-year institution, then became co-educational in 1970. It is basically a liberal arts college. Many of the students in the early years were education majors. They were preparing to be teachers. Other young women were learning how to be business secretaries. It was basically a residential college. After 17 years, it has experienced tremendous growth and now has 2,500 students, including 1,500 full-time students. Education, psychology, business, nursing, and biology are still strong areas with education as the largest major. In summary President F’s career path included being a college professor, dean, vice president for academic affairs, and then president.

*Structural frame.* The structural frame encompasses the ability to think logically and base one’s thinking on a careful analysis of data. President F explained the importance of articulating the vision of the institution and following it through as follows:

I think that one of the characteristics of a good president is someone who provides a vision for the institution and the faculty. Where are we, and where are we going? Where do we want to be? The president leads the effort to put that vision together. I suppose I led the effort to articulate a vision. We get people to think about the future. Count them to come in a concrete way what their visions are. Everybody has a vision, but to put together, with different people, you have to get everybody working in the same direction or else you get everybody working in
cross-purposes. So I think whatever contribution I made, it has to do with focusing the people on the future and figuring out what it is you got to do and what it is they got to be. And then do what you can do to get there. A lot of people can dream good dreams. But if you dream without knowing how to make that dream come true, you will never get there. Thus, the president must be able to manage the day-to-day stuff in a way that will move the institution from here to there.

He went on to discuss the elements that can enhance the president’s ability to be successful or distract the president from being successful in his/her role as a college president.

You have to be a very good articulate individual, to be able to reflect whatever someone else is thinking. You have a lot of people: faculty, administration, students, and staff. You have to be able to listen to what they are saying and how they feel. Be able to solicit those things and then make some sense out of it. And then tell them, “This is what you are saying and this is what your vision is. You have to interpret what they are thinking and feeling and put them together in a manageable way so that their vision will be a reality. The qualities we are looking at here would be: the ability to listen, to interpret, to reflect back and articulate what you hear. What detracts from success is if you don’t listen, and if you can’t articulate or reflect back what you hear.
Human resource frame. According to Bolman and Deal (2003) human resource leaders recognize the importance of people. They assist in developing people’s skills and have the ability to be supportive and to be participative. This president used the example of students and the college’s contribution to the society to explain the measure of a successful college system.

In the final analysis, a successful college is one in which the students are successful. But if you measure success in terms of advancing the personal growth and development of the students, I would say that a successful college is one with the proper resources. You have facilities that are conducive to learning, with sufficient classrooms, and equipment. Learning is what makes the difference in students. A successful college helps them to develop skills and undergo professional and psychological growth to eventually become contributing members of our society.

He narrated the reality of being a Dominican college president and the problems one who heads such institution may encounter. President F went on to stress the need to understand the philosophy and special character of a Dominican college.

I suppose that Dominican College would have specific characteristics. We use these models: prayer, study, and action. That is a meaningful phrase. You have to know what it means. And you have to frame most of the decisions you make within that model. I think the problems encountered in heading a Dominican college are very much the same for other colleges. There are a lot of colleges that are non-descript selective colleges, colleges with a small endowment. The problems you encounter in them are how you get the resources to run the
institution. In addition to these, you have enrollment and finances. In addition to these, as a president of a Dominican college, you run into people in the church who are somehow conservative, somehow liberal with their own outlook. So a lot of the problems that will occur have to do with a lot of what a Catholic institution and Dominican college ought to be doing. I suppose you have to understand the special philosophy and character of the Dominican college. For example, let’s consider the play, “The Chena.” From an academic standpoint, faculty and students will argue that you are not to censor it; some will argue that a Catholic college ought not to allow students to perform a gestation work model. I don’t know how they would argue their case. Obviously it is a language problem. The language is vulgar. Then you have another group of people who would argue that it is all right. So, obviously, there is a conflict. Another Catholic issue is on speakers on abortion. There are shady areas that touch on Church doctrine that even the Church may have a problem with. When the colleges raise those issues, we could be calling into question the Church doctrines. Yet that’s the role of colleges: to raise the issues, to study the issues. And so being true to yourself as an educational institution, and being loyal to the Church at the same time is an issue.

He described one such project he initiated in this way:

My belief is that the environment is very important to the process of learning. Almost everyday I have directed my efforts to improving, changing the environment, to make it more conducive to learning. I spend a lot of time in developing the physical plant, library building, faculty offices, classrooms,
laboratories, and parking spaces. All these things, if they are not properly handled, can stand in the way of learning. It is easier to see the negative side of it. If you do not have parking, people are going to be frustrated. And how can you learn with that kind of frustration constantly annoying you? Presidents and other leaders have to remove the obstacles to learning.

Political frame. The political frame is the ability to mobilize people and resources, bargaining, and negotiating. Commenting on what it takes to be a successful president, he mentioned skills in the political arena (e.g., collaboration and problem solving).

To be successful, activities have to be done in collaboration with the faculty, staff, and administration and with students. In order to make the big picture happen, you have to pay attention to details. The president has to make sure that people understand what the details are, and take care of them. Little things that can be irritants can stand in the way of your success. The secret is to have very good people in the key positions, so that you need not do everything yourself. You need to have good people who can get the job done. It is your duty to make that happen. You spend a lot of time motivating, encouraging, problem solving with these individuals. Trusting others is quite essential to success. That is why I spend 20% of my time on them. We meet individually, as well as a group. I pick up the phone and talk to each of them numerous times in a week. I could easily spend 60 hours in a week.
He described how he spends a typical day using a week schedule as an example. We start with a week. I would spend 20% of my time interacting with the top managers of the institution. This college has a structure similar to other smaller colleges. We have academic affairs, student affairs, business, extracurricular, financial and buildings, grounds, counseling and housing. I also spend a considerable amount of time, I would say 20% with each of the directors for enrollment, admission, sales, data processing, and fund raising. Another 20% would be on planning, 20% on other internal relations with faculty, students, staff, and 20% into fund raising and community relations.

Showing his efforts to implement innovation program he explained:

I work with people who are teaching in an area. I figure out what they are doing, what they need in order to go about the task, and find out what is necessary to get the design done. Three years ago, we introduced a doctoral program in education leadership. Although I cannot say that I implemented that, I strongly supported it and encouraged those who were involved in it to move forward. I made sure that there were resources available. I brought people together and did what I had to do to facilitate a good outcome.

He went further to illustrate his problem-solving style, with the issue of insufficient enrollment in their college.

When I came to this college, our freshman class was very small. We had 42 full time undergraduate students. The problem was insufficient enrollment. Our goal was to increase our enrollment to 600 undergraduate students. We needed to have more students, so we set a goal and put up a plan. We raised people's awareness
of our college by breakfast receptions and inviting people in the communities around here to come so that we could talk about our college. We sent out many applications to various schools. The next year we had 75 full-time undergraduate students, and then a hundred. Today, we have 300 full-time undergraduate students. We do this every year. We also send some things to different high schools here. So now we have sufficient enrollment, and we still continue to raise people’s awareness about the college, and every year we come closer to our goal. In the meantime, we got a new library, a classroom, and so on.

As President F works through the many issues that challenge college systems, he is realistic where his term is concerned. If there were majority opposition between he and his colleagues, and thus far there has been none, he takes this realistic view:

If you can change it, change it, but if you cannot then leave, or give it to the faculty. I think if you have constant opposition, something is wrong with the vision, or you have not gotten the vision through to them, or either you or the faculty doesn’t understand the vision. It is complicated. Sometimes people can agree on the vision but disagree on the means to get there. For example, you might agree that you need to be financially stable, but you might disagree that the way to get there is to cut faculty salaries. So you agree on the end but you do not agree on the means. So, I think if you look at the opposition when you do have a conflict, you have to resolve the problem. But if you fail and if you cannot resolve it, in the end the president has to leave.
Symbolic frame. The symbolic dimension of leadership, according to Bolman and Deal (2003), involves the ability to establish and communicate a sense of common purpose, vision and cause others to buy into the mission of the organization. Commenting on his role as a facilitator, he reported:

A leader in many respects is a facilitator. You need to pursue your plan. You have to re-interpret what is going on, you have to articulate, possibly carve the vision out. You have to hold people accountable for what they are doing. You are a part of the facilitation of the design and the process you have set up. You have to make sure that the resources are there, and that things are happening. You are there to thank somebody for his or her extra work. It is a constant interaction with all the people that are involved.

Referring to the complexity of the president’s role he said:

The down side is the all-consuming nature of the job. You are president 24 hours a day. You do not have privacy. If you are good in articulating your vision and inspiring people to reach for that vision in a very concrete way, then you run the risk of people being impatient about reaching that vision, because it takes time, resources, and planning to get there. On the other hand, there are so many rewards which make it easier to deal with the negative side. Burnout does not come from work. It comes from lack of hope. You can work very, very hard as long as you are accomplishing something. That is the fuel which energizes you continuously. When you “spin your wheels,” that is when it gets hot. It's like if your car is standing still or moving in a low speed, then the engine gets hot. You are burned
or when you are not moving, when you are not progressing, or when you are not rejoicing over your successes. The job has both its ups and downs.

He analogically defined leadership and explained his philosophy of what it takes to be a college president.

I think leadership is a way of living, and you do not wake up and say you are going to be a leader. I think the presidency of a college or university would be long hard days if you were not comfortable in the role, if you do not know what you are getting into or if you don’t like people. Most of us in the presidency see ourselves as servant leaders, certainly in our institutions. We can all make more money elsewhere. We are well paid compared with faculty and the population, but we have a huge responsibility. So I think it is all about being authentic. You cannot hide. You are always visible. If you do not love your institution or are not confident in yourself, I do not think you can lead very effectively. The most important thing, I can say, is to be an authentic person and to allow the multiple dimensions of your faith, your physical, emotional, and psychological aspects to be in a very good tuned-up condition, or you will be brought down by the demands of the job.
Analysis of the Six Presidents Using the Four-Frame Work of Bolman and Deal

Structural Frame Dimension

The structural frame emphasizes rationality, efficiency, structure, and policy. The structural frame also deals with the ability of a leader to be analytical and organized. In the rational structuralist system, organizational goals, time lines, roles, and technique are emphasized. Those who score high in the analytical dimension tend to think logically and base their thinking on careful analysis of data. Their management style is realistic. To be effective in solving complex technical problems is how Bolman and Deal (2003) view this style. They rely on policies and procedures, goals and timeliness in order to accomplish their objectives. Structural leaders are highly organized, working from clearly defined goals, and timeliness and they expect it from others.

Human Resource Frame Dimension

The human resource frame dimension is based on the interaction between individual and organization needs. The human resource frame speaks of the ability to work effectively with others through being supportive and participative. This leader responds to others’ feelings and what they think. Leaders who are supportive tend to motivate others through encouragement and recognition for work well done. They generally develop a strong sense of organizational culture and values and through causing others to see. They tend to be good listeners. Their leadership styles are highly participative.
Political Frame Dimension

The political frame dimension focuses on conflict among different groups and interests for scarce resources. Those with high scores are powerful and use their influence to make things happen. They develop friendships. They are frequently analytic and understand the relationships between power, influence, conflict, and politics. They are diplomatic. Their resourcefulness allows them to win over their opposition.

Symbolic Frame Dimension

The symbolic frame emphasizes culture and values. Symbolic leaders are viewed as inspirational and charismatic. They have the ability to establish and communicate a sense of purpose and vision and to cause others to buy into the mission of the organization. Symbolic leaders are an inspiration to others, and they develop strong loyalty and enthusiasm in others. They generally develop a strong sense of organizational culture and values, and through causing others to see the idea, they are able to move the organization forward.

For the Leadership Orientation Questionnaire, (Bolman & Deal, 1990) because of the small number in the sample, I have combined the self and colleagues descriptions of the participants. In showing the variations in the leadership styles between the six presidents, I contrasted only the highest and lowest scores. Here are the results of the combined version 1 and 2 of the Leadership Orientation Questionnaire.

Structural Frame

Presidents A and B had a high mean score of 4.50, followed by President D, with a mean score of 4.47. President E, had a mean score 4.14, and President F scored
3.97; they were followed by President C with the least mean score of 3.66 among the six Dominican college presidents. Presidents A, B, and D appeared to be on the same level, while presidents E and F were a little bit lower, showing that the variation was not much except with President C’s score. This shows that there was a slight difference among the several mean score of combined version 1 and 2 questionnaire on structural frame (See Figure 1).
Figure 1. Structural frame.
Human Resource Frame

President E had a mean of 4.50; President D had a mean of 4.39, while President A had a mean of 4.26. President B had a mean of 3.95, followed by President C with a mean of 3.86. President F had the lowest, with mean of 3.53.

Presidents D and E are almost on the same score level, followed slightly by A, while B and C are within the same level. F's score was lower, showing some slight disparities in their various scores. Questionnaire version 1 and 2 combined results on human resource frame figure showed some differences among the means (see figure 2).
Figure 2. Human resource frame.
Political Frame

President A had a mean of 4.52; President D has a mean of 4.41; President C had a mean of 3.54; and President E had a mean of 3.78. President F had a mean of 3.84. The mean scores of Presidents A and D are almost on the same level followed slightly by B, while Presidents C, F, and E are slightly on the same score level. There are some slight differences among combined questionnaire 1 and 2 results on the means as shown on the graph (see Figure 3).
Figure 3. Political frame.
Symbolic Frame

President A had a mean of 4.63; President D had a mean of 4.33; President E had a mean of 4.12.

President F had a mean of 3.75, while President C had a mean of 3.62. President A had the highest score followed by D, then E, while F and C scores are slightly apart. There were small differences among the means of the combined results of version 1 and 2 of the questionnaire as shown on the symbolic frame graph (See Figure 4).
Figure 4. Symbolic frame.
The analysis of the bar graphs showed that the test was significant, indicating that, little differences exist among the means of the six Dominican presidents.

This finding implies that the six Dominican college presidents vary slightly in their use of the four cognitive frames. In contrast, Presidents A and B scored the highest in the structural frame, E in human resource frame, and A in the political and symbolic frames. President C consistently scored low in structural, human resource, and symbolic frames.

Analysis of Research Questions

Question 1: Do Dominican college presidents utilize the structural frame for leadership and if so how?

The answer to this question was determined from the interview data. The analysis revealed the espoused cognitive frames utilized by the presidents. Presidents A, B, C, D, and E utilized the structural frame in their leadership styles. All the presidents made numerous references to their ability to be good in planning, decision-making, and organization. They have a sense of direction and clear goals. Those who espouse the structural approach look at two aspects of the organization. First is how to divide up the various tasks of the organization, and second, how to coordinate the different units to meet the organizational goals.

Another structural fact of important to educational organization is clear goals and visions. Effective structural leaders share several characteristics (Bolnan & Deal, 2003, p. 352). Based on the criteria for coding frame responses, the structural
frame was used often by the presidents. The presidents in this study understood the importance of good planning and decision-making.

Question 2: Do Dominican college presidents utilize the human resource frame in their leadership, and if so how?

The human resource frame focuses on individual and group behavior. It deals with meeting individual needs and at the same time fostering organizational goals. Also it embraces participative management, job enrichment, and self-managing work teams and shared leadership. From the analysis of interview data, Presidents A, B, C, D, and E espoused the use of the human resource framework. The following key words came from their responses: shared leadership, collaborative styles, and being accessible. They understood the financial situations of their various universities and made a determination on how to resolve them. They also strive to provide for their various universities.

Question 3: Do Dominican college presidents utilize the political framework, and if so how?

The political frame indicates that coalitions are formed when members need each other, that is, when they are interdependent. Statements regarding different constituencies and building alliances reflect the political frame. The interview results indicated that the six Dominican college presidents make use of political frame, when they were referring to negotiation, issues of competing interests and tension among different constituencies. Those responses indicated a political orientation, although Bolman and Deal (1991b)
hold that "the power of a university president is greatly limited because of the work in organizations" (p. 217).

Question 4: Do Dominican college presidents utilize the symbolic framework and if so how?

Presidents A, B, C, D, E, and F, based on analysis of interview data, revealed that they use the symbolic framework.

According to Bolman and Deal (1991b), "Symbolic leaders understand the importance of symbols, rite of initiation, culture and rituals, organizational myths and metaphors." This is evident in their responses to the interview questions when they mention culture, vision, change, and so on. The presidents' emphasis on having vision for their institutions, strategizing with their teams to reach the vision, and raising funds for their universities, need the symbolic frame. They laid emphasis on the four pillars of Dominican education tradition, as their universities were all Dominican. One of the presidents said, "But as Dominicans we talk about the four pillars here. We worry about study, reflection, prayer, and service to the community." Another president commented, "I believe the Dominican spirit, which calls for a sense of community, and the need to share the fruit of your study and contemplation, would be very much at the heart of the institution."
Table 8 shows the cognitive frame usage of the six Dominican college presidents, the results of the Leadership Orientation Questionnaire (Bolman & Deal, 1990) and the interviews across the four frameworks of Bolman and Deal.

**Table 8**  
**Cognitive Frames Orientations by Leadership Frameworks of Bolman and Deal (N=6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Interview Question</th>
<th>Leadership Orientation Frames</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolman &amp; Deal Survey</td>
<td>A, B, D, E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building New Structures**

In the area of building a new structure, President A made a decision to purchase a new campus. This requires making use of the four cognitive frames to enable this to happen. This is evident in this president’s statement.

We are growing as an institution, and we are landlocked. We needed to purchase another campus. Now there are a lot of strategic decisions and deliberations that go into developing the financial capacity to do it. And we did it. We made the decision to purchase a new property down the block.
President B procured a new building that accommodated the new science block. President C said that they are in the process of getting a new building. Depending on the project you're involved in, there is ongoing connection with that group of people. For instance, we've been in the process of building a new campus, so there are a lot of conversations with the Board concerning fund raising, conversations with those members of the Board who have engineering or construction background as to get very good advice.

Presidents D and E did not build any new academic structures yet. The issue of a caring environment was particularly appealing to President F since he stated, "I spent a lot of time developing the physical plant, library building, faculty offices, classrooms, laboratories and parking space."

Starting a New Academic Program

All six Dominican college presidents worked with their colleagues to start new academic programs. President A redesigned the undergraduate curriculum and introduced a series of interdisciplinary seminars. President B developed the Center for Excellence in Teaching and a graduate program in contemporary management, which began as an MS, but is now an MBA. President C facilitated the development of a new graduate program in physical therapy. It was offered at the master's level. President D started a new academic program.

We could use the MBA as an example. I know that when I came to this institution, I talked with some people in the external community to tell me
more about this college. Then I talked with the academic vice president and we realized that we had to bring in additional resources. We spent time with the faculty and explained to them our need to build up the business program. We looked at several options. We brought in a consultant with a different point of view. We then made a decision, that we will start an MBA program. That is where the faculty wanted to put their resources. I agreed to that and I have to bring in a new person to lead the MBA program.

President E created the tone and environment for a group of adults who work in the nuclear power plant section by providing a cohort method for a degree program. President F facilitated the start of a new graduate program in education.

Summary

Chapter 4 presented the results of content analysis of written documents, Leadership Orientation Questionnaire (Bolman & Deal, 1990), and the interview questions. Statistics revealed that there was a significant relationship in their use of the four cognitive frames. The interview questions, Leadership Orientation Questionnaire and content of written documents were analyzed; the results showed multi-frame usage. Chapter 5 will discuss the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
Chapter V

Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

This study examined the leadership styles of Dominican college presidents at 4-year institutions of higher learning. The study was aimed to determine how Dominican college presidents utilize the four cognitive frames of structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames in their leadership styles. Six participants comprised a purposive sample from the currently known Dominican college presidents in the United States. All completed the Leadership Orientation Survey and were interviewed. Their colleagues completed the second form of the Leadership Orientation Survey. Also, institutional reports of the six Dominican college presidents were collected in relation to the four cognitive frameworks.

Two Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation Questionnaires (1990), were used to collect qualitative data on each of the president’s current leadership frames in relation to the following four sections (See Appendix C). Structural: planning, budgeting, coordinating and controlling. Human resource: bargaining, collaboration, and finance. Political: negotiating, coalition, building, and networking. Symbolic: ceremonies, vision, organizational culture, and ritual. This allowed the determination of the number of cognitive frames currently used by the presidents. Bolman and Deal (1991a) said, “The qualitative results particularly indicated that most administrators in higher education
employ only one or two frames." An examination of frames among the presidents showed whether or not there was a common pattern.

The results of the current study are not consistent with Bolman and Deal's (1991b) questionnaire findings. The Dominican college presidents in this study were found to have a multi-frame pattern of leadership styles. The mean score on the Bolman and Deal survey indicated a multi-frame orientation for presidents A, D, and E (See Table 7). One president utilized paired frame and two other presidents utilized slightly the four cognitive frames.

Qualitative data were gathered from interviews to determine how they utilize the four frames. The intent was to prompt the presidents to discuss pivotal actions and experiences in their use of the four cognitive frames. Guided by the interview questions, each president described their initial and current actions (See Appendix E). Analysis of the interview data revealed that the six Dominican college presidents employ a multi-frame usage. The presidents were found to use frequently the following cognitive frames: structural, human resource, political and symbolic (see Table 8). They had no difficult recalling the pivotal events in their tenures as presidents. When describing the roles and responsibilities of leadership, the presidents used these terms: planning, fund raising, management, vision, direction, and good relationship. This suggests what Bolman and Deal 1997 defined as a structural frame orientation leadership style.

Further, in describing the ways they exercise leadership, they used such terms as steward, strategic planning, collaboration, servant, visible, articulate a vision. This supports Evans' definition of leadership "Leadership is an act of creating a vision, developing an overall plan or strategy, enlivening the members of a group or organization
to follow this plan and vision, proceeding to change the culture of the organization” (p. 148).

The institutional report documents collected were analyzed in relation to four frameworks. Twenty frequent terms were chosen and examined from the written documents. The terms leadership, relationship building, decision-making and vision were prevalent in the documents reviewed. These terms expressed an action relating to the four frameworks— structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames.

Comparing the three documents utilized for the study, some slight differences were found between one of the instruments and the other two measures for leadership. More specifically, the difference lied on the interview results and institutional reports of the president and the Leadership Orientation Survey. In the Leadership Orientation Questionnaire, two presidents slightly used the four cognitive frames, while four presidents utilized the four cognitive frameworks. While in the document analyzed and the interview, all the six Dominican college presidents utilized the four cognitive frames. The slight variation between the interview and questionnaire (LOS) may be due to the fact that some presidents were more open to the interview rather than to the questionnaire. Secondly, it could be due to the different challenges that each president faces in their respective colleges. It could as well be due to the presidents’ experiences in life. Thirdly, it could be due to the busy schedule of the presidents that prevented them from taking time to reflect on the questions before responding to the questionnaire.

Leadership discussed by these presidents during the interviews, and in the other documents analyzed, espoused the use of the four cognitive frames. The analysis showed that the responses of the presidents in this study clustered around the conceptual
dimensions of structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. The instruments were
able to predict the presidents as effective as both managers and leaders.

The Dominican college presidents in this study were found to have used multi-
frames in their presidencies. The structural, human resource, political, and symbolic
frames had a common usage. The results of this study are similar to the findings of
Dabney’s (2003) study, where she examined the leadership styles of African American
female university presidents using the Bolman and Deal’s four cognitive frames as a
theoretical framework. The results also support Bensimon’s (1989) findings that
indicated multi-frame views. On the other hand, it is also inconsistent with the conclusion
of Bolman and Deal (1991a) that most administrators use only one or two of the frames.

The presidents in this study previously held administrative positions before
becoming a president of a college, which may have influenced their usage of the frames.
The presidents in this study had self-reported leadership style defined as collaborative
leadership. Another factor affecting frame usage might be the attendance at professional
leadership programs currently being offered for senior administrators where leadership
skills and developments are emphasized, and Bolman and Deal’s work is utilized. Some
of the presidents in this study did acknowledge attending such programs. Thirdly, 90% of
the presidents in this study had their doctorates in educational administration.

The presidents in this study appreciated being well informed and often receive
information from several sources. The presidents saw themselves in a precarious position,
requiring a balance between power and relationship building. The terms the presidents
used to describe the use of the four cognitive frames include: way of living, a package,
enabler, and facilitators. Success as a leader often depends on how well an individual can
judge and balance these varied characteristics. Palestini (1999) reported, “Leaders need to understand their own frame and its limits. Ideally, they will also learn to continue multiple frames into a more comprehensive and powerful style” (p. 53). “As the visionaries of our future, presidents’ success or lack thereof can have serious repercussions for every component of higher education” (Minor, 2001, p. 1). The presidents in this study saw their own roles as leaders to include working on conflict, governance, and public relations. These findings were in keeping with Bolman and Deal’s (1991a) four cognitive frames. They had to address one or more of the following issues – finance, campus structural improvement, new academic programs, and fundraising.

What makes a difference in Dominican colleges and universities is the commitment to the transformation of the individual and the transformation of society. This supports the statement that transformational leadership had to do with process of change and the transformation of the individual. Many presidents of small private liberal arts colleges have been described as transformational leaders (Rice & Austin, 1988). The second is the balance between contemplation and action, which is a priority for all the six Dominican college presidents. The component of the Dominican charisma is also seen in their leadership styles. McNicholas (1990) said, “The communal component of the Dominican charisma focuses on collaboration within the governance structures of Dominican institutions and respectful relationships among Dominican colleagues” (p. 20). The six Dominican college presidents did stress the importance of collaborative work in the governance of a university. For example one president said, “The plan is done collaboratively, with very extensive involvement of the faculty, staff, and students.”
One unique thing about the six Dominican presidents was the incorporation of the four pillars of the Dominican tradition—study, contemplation, prayer, and service into their institutions’ curriculum and administration. One president mentioned, “We try to make sure that this (study, prayer, reflection, and service to community) is visible in our institution.” Another president commented that study, prayer, reflection, and service is part of our rich Dominican tradition. "The challenge is to get people into the roots and traditions of Dominican education."

Conclusion

“Today’s presidents are clearly of great importance, especially during this time of great change” (Duderstadt, 2000). “Undoubtedly, college and university presidents will continue to play a critical role in leading higher education through challenging times” (Minor, 2001, p. 1). As such, the importance of leadership styles cannot be understated. As the visionaries of the future, presidents’ success or lack can have serious repercussions for every component of higher education” (Minor, 2001, p.1).

Leadership is important to any organization, but it is particularly important to institutions of higher education, given the amount of ambiguity surrounding the purpose and direction of colleges and universities. College and university presidents may not be as revered as those of yesteryears, but their role as president seems more important than ever. “As a visionary of higher education, the president is likely to be the most critical component of institutional governance structures. Leadership is especially key to higher
education due to the increasing competition for influence among internal constituents and the ambiguity that surrounds higher education" (Miroz, 2001, p.2).

The presidents in this study were willing to invest in the time required for relationship building to attain the desired goals. With the structural, human resource, and symbolic frames occurring most frequently in the interview data, this finding supports the earlier results of Bolman and Deal (1991a), whose sample of 32 college presidents showed a preference for the human resource frame followed by the symbolic. The incorporation of elements from multiple frames implies that these presidents have more flexible responses to different administrative tasks, because they have different images of the organization and are adept at interpreting events in a variety of ways. Bolman and Deal (1984) suggested, "The distinct differences of colleges and universities shape how situations are defined, thus determining what action leaders take."

Using the cognitive frame analysis and the results of the findings in this study, presidential leadership can be defined as having a sense of direction, vision, building relationships, and competency. Lewis (1989) said "Regardless of the characteristics, leadership is concerned with vision, mission, goals, change, direction and meaning." Good leadership requires careful planning and action that blends the transitional and transformational leadership theories. The emphasis on the structural frame indicates the focus on coordination and control, goal setting, policy making, budgeting, planning, attention to detail, and holding people accountable. This is not uncommon for those presidents who stressed the importance of articulating a vision, since the vision can only be realized through action.
There were slight differences in the results of Bolman and Deal (1990) survey usefulness and the interview questions. One reason might have been that some people tended to be more open to interviews than questionnaires. Also, it may have been as a result of what abound derivations of self-report in answering multiple-choice questions. Fincher (1987) posted, “Contents that the administrative styles of presidents vary and may reflect the inner structure of presidential relationships more than a president’s lack of experience or personal qualifications for the position.” Hitt (1988) stated, “There is no one best leadership styles; it depends on the situation” (p. 4-5). He intimates that style is flexible according to the situation. McGrath (1988) concurred with Hitt, “There is no correct style for leaders” (p. 102).

Bolman and Deal (2003) maintained, “We need to reframe leadership to move beyond the impasse created by oversimplified models. Each of the frames highlights significant possibilities for leadership, but each is incomplete in capturing a holistic picture. Ideally, managers combine multiple frames into a comprehensive approach to leadership. Wise leaders, understand their own strengths, work to expand them, and build teams that can offer an organization leadership in all the four models: structural, political, human resource, and symbiotic” (p. 365).

Hersey and Blanchard (1993) posited that, “there is no best style of leadership, that successful leaders are those who can adapt their leadership behavior to meet the needs of the followers and particular” (p. 148). Bolman and Deal (1992) explained that “different situations require different pattern of thinking” (p. 314). They argue that successful
leaders need to "reframe until they understand the situation at hand" (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 15).

The changing social and economic times of the nation, and indeed the world, are external conditions that have impacted the manner in which the presidents responded to the survey. All six Dominican college presidents in this current study are greatly concerned with fundraising and the small endowment of their colleges. The need to be persuasive and compete with other entities for scarce funds requires actions that relate to the political cognitive frame. They had to develop relationships with diverse groups and constituents served by their different institutions. The political frame, therefore, was the most prevalent because of the impact its action has on the internal issues of the university. One was concerned about the landlock of their campus that had great impact on expansion. This required action that relates to the human resource frame.

The presidents' self reported leadership was participatory and team-oriented, in keeping with previously reported research; the results of the Leadership Orientation Questionnaire (Bolman & Deal, 1990) support these findings. Furthermore, the results of the Leadership Orientation Questionnaire support the Bolman and Deal (1991a) normative reported score. The replication of findings from other similar studies measuring the same qualitative traits as measured in this study supports the assumption that the techniques used in this study are valid and reliable for collecting data about leadership styles.

The presidents' written work revealed an awareness of the leadership issues in higher education. The findings support the assumption that Dominican college presidents do make use of the four cognitive frames of structural, human resource, political, and
symbolic based on the interview questions, institutional reports, and Leadership Orientation Questionnaire (Bolman & Deal, 1999). A further assumption is that their leadership styles are participatory. “Participative leadership refers to leaders who invite subordinates to share in the decision making (Northouse, 2001, p. 220). This study found that the four pillars (study, contemplation, prayer, and service) of the Dominican tradition reflect the presidential leadership style of the six presidents. Secondly, the democratic leadership style of the Dominican order was evident in the collaborative styles of the six presidents. As one president mentioned, “We consult and we did it together.”

The study also found that the following key words occurred often in all the three documents utilized for this study, listening, vision, accessibility, planning, and relationship. It affirms what the literature said with regard to university leadership and leadership styles. “A good number of writers in higher education emphasize accessibility and listening as key elements in leadership style (Boinbaum, 1985; Vaughan 1989). Also it is said, “One sign of a leader is followers. Leaders create strategic visions from their environment. Leaders exhibit integrity and develop relationship built on trust; Leaders integrate participation in the process of carrying out their mission” (Hensley, 1998, p. 53). Furthermore this study affirmed Trow’s 1991 finding that political leadership “is the ability to solve conflicts and meet the demands of different constituencies both inside the college and outside while gaining support for your goals; and academic leadership, recognizes intellectual excellence and excellence in teaching” (p. 355).

Attention has been given to the leadership styles of six Dominican college presidents that is important to higher education and the community, namely structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames. An analysis of the descriptive data,
interpretation, and findings of this investigation has formed the basis for the following recommendations.

**Recommendations**

From the beginning of this study, information about the Dominican education was difficult to find. I suggest six recommendations: this study should be replicated using all United States Dominican college presidents as a sample to see if these findings are consistent throughout the Dominican colleges. Also, replicate study using other Catholic-order-tradition colleges of same size. The findings of this study should be used in leadership training. The results of this study should be communicated to those responsible for educational policy. Educational policy makers should be made aware of the tremendous roles Dominican college presidents play in the history of American higher education. The results of this study should be made available to educational organizations and through professional educational journals. The data from this study will become a part of the research base for better understanding Dominican education. This study shows that holding senior-level administrative positions prior to assuming the presidency is crucial. The results of this study showed that the six Dominican college presidents were first-time presidents.

This study found the participants held a multi-frame view when responding to the situations at their respective institutions. This investigator offers these research suggestions to other colleagues interested in this topic as a preliminary foundation for future scholarly study. All empirical research of this type is fluid and full of new insights.
to be discovered. The field of both higher education leadership, as a situational setting, and the Dominican education are fertile grounds for further inquiry.

The findings of this study are limited to the information the presidents elected to share with the researcher. As a result of the Bolton and Deal (1990) Leadership Orientation Questionnaire, it was possible to determine the cognitive frame usage and make inferences about the frame orientations of the six Dominican college presidents. The design of this study and the selected research framework proved to be useful for examining the leadership styles of Dominican college presidents and how they frame their experiences.


Appendix A

Letters of Solicitation to Use the Instruments
Dear Dr Bolman,

I am Emmanuel N. Ogu, a Doctoral Candidate in the department of Education, Leadership and Policy Studies at Seton Hall University in South Orange New Jersey. I am interested in researching the leadership styles of Dominican college presidents at four-year institutions of higher learning in the United States. As a Dominican myself, this topic interests me greatly. I am writing to get your permission to utilize the "Leadership Orientations Survey" for my study.

My mentor is Dr Joseph Stetar and I have studies with Drs Martin Finkelstein and Shouping Hu. I plan to write my dissertation this fall 2004. If you have any question regarding my research, or myself my telephone number is 301-699-8316 or 301-442-9113. My mentor, Dr. Stetar, can be reached at 973-275-2730. I hope my request will be duly considered.

Sincerely

Emmanuel N. Ogu, OP
Dear Dr Flak,

I am Emmanuel N. Ogu, a Doctoral Candidate in the department of Education, Leadership and Policy Studies at Seton Hall University in South Orange New Jersey. I am interested in doing my research on the Leadership styles of Dominican college presidents at four-year institutions of higher learning in the United States. As a Dominican myself, this topic is interest me greatly. I am writing to get your permission to utilize your interview question for your dissertation for my study.

My mentor is Dr Joseph Stetar and can be reach at 973-275-2730. I plan to write my dissertation this fall 2004. If you have any question regarding my research, or myself my telephone number is 301-442-9113 or 301-699-8316. I look forward hearing from you.

Sincerely

Rev. Emmanuel N. Ogu, OP.
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Letters of Consent to Use and Reprint Instruments
April 28, 2003

Mr. Emmanuel N. Ogu, OP
St. Leo’s Rectory
103 Mystic Avenue
Irvington, NJ 07111

Dear Mr. Ogu:

Thanks for your interest in the Leadership Orientations instrument. I am pleased to offer you permission to use the instrument in your doctoral research, subject to the following conditions: (a) you agree to provide us a copy of your thesis and of any publication that reports data based on the instrument, and (b) you agree to provide, if we request it, a copy of your data file.

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

http://hsbap.umkc.edu/classes/bolman/leadership_research.htm

Best wishes in your research.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Reverend Emmanuel N. Ogu, O.P.
St. Leo's Rectory
103 Myrtle Avenue
Irvington, NJ 07111

June 22, 2003

Dear Reverend Ogu:

By copy of this letter I give you my permission to use the interview questions from my doctoral dissertation, *An Inquiry into the Leadership Orientations of Selected Women Superintendents*, in your doctoral research.

I hope that your research will help to answer your questions, and that it will make a significant contribution to the body of research on leadership styles. If I can be of further assistance please do not hesitate to call on me.

Best wishes for a successful completion of your doctoral studies.

Sincerely,

Theresa M. Fak

Theresa M. Fak, Ed.D.
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Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation Questionnaire
LEADERSHIP ORIENTATIONS (SELF)

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

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

1. Behaviors

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

Please use the following scale in answering each item.

1 2 3 4 5
Never Sometimes Occasionally Always Often

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.

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

II. Leadership Style

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

1. My strongest skills are:
   _____ a. Analytic skills
   _____ b. Interpersonal skills
   _____ c. Political skills
   _____ d. Ability to excite and motivate

2. The best way to describe me is:
   _____ a. Technical expert
   _____ b. Good listener
   _____ c. Skilled negotiator
   _____ d. Inspirational leader

3. What has helped me the most to be successful is my ability to:
   _____ a. Make good decisions
   _____ b. Coach and develop people
   _____ c. Build strong alliances and a power base
   _____ d. Energize and inspire others

4. What people are most likely to notice about me is my:
   _____ a. Attention to detail
   _____ b. Concern for people
   _____ c. Ability to succeed, in the face of conflict and opposition
d. Charisma.

5. My most important leadership trait is:
   a. Clear, logical thinking
   b. Caring and support for others
   c. Toughness and aggressiveness
   d. Imagination and creativity

6. I am best described as:
   a. An analyst
   b. A humanist
   c. A politician
   d. A visionary

III. Overall rating

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

1. Overall effectiveness as a manager.

   1  2  3  4  5
   Bottom 20%  Middle 20%  Top 20%

2. Overall effectiveness as a leader.

   1  2  3  4  5
   Bottom 20%  Middle 20%  Top 20%
IV. Background Information

1. Are you: ___ Male ___ Female

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

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

Name of person described: __________

Group code (if any): __________

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATIONS (OTHER)

© 1990, Lee J. Babson and Terrence L. O’Reil, all rights reserved

This questionnaire asks you to describe the person that you are rating in terms of leadership and management style.

1. Leader Behaviors

You are asked to indicate how often each item is true of the person that you are rating.

Please use the following scale in answering each item:

1  2  3  4  5
Never Sometimes Occasionally Often Always

So, you would answer "1" for an item that is never true of the person you are describing, "2" for one that is occasionally true, "3" for one that is sometimes true, and so on.

1. ___ Thinks very clearly and logically.

2. ___ Shows high levels of support and concern for others.
3. ____ Shows exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.

4. ____ Inspires others to do their best.

5. ____ Strongly emphasizes careful planning and clear time lines.

6. ____ Builds trust through open and collaborative relationships.

7. ____ Is a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.

8. ____ Is highly charismatic.

9. ____ Approaches problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.

10. ____ Shows high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.

11. ____ Is unusually persuasive and influential.

12. ____ Is an inspiration to others.

13. ____ Develops and implements clear, logical policies and procedures.

14. ____ Fosters high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.

15. ____ Anticipates and deals adroity with organizational conflict.

16. ____ Is highly imaginative and creative.

17. ____ Approaches problems with facts and logic.

18. ____ Is consistently helpful and responsive to others.

19. ____ Is very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.

20. ____ Communicates a strong and challenging vision and sense of mission.

21. ____ Sets specific, measurable goals and holds people accountable for results.

22. ____ Listens well and is unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input.

23. ____ Is politically very sensitive and skillful.
24. ____ Sees beyond current realities to create exciting new opportunities.

25. ____ Has extraordinary attention to detail.

26. ____ Gives personal recognition for work well done.

27. ____ Develops alliances to build a strong base of support.

28. ____ Generates loyalty and enthusiasm.

29. ____ Strongly believes in clear structure and a chain of command.

30. ____ Is a highly participative manager.

31. ____ Succeeds in the face of conflict and opposition.

32. ____ Serves as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.

I. Leadership Style

This section asks you to describe the leadership style of the person that you are rating. For each item, give the number "4" to the phrase that best describes this person, "3" to the item that is next best, and so on down to "1" for the item that is least like this person.

1. The individual's strongest skills are:
   ____ a. Analytic skills
   ____ b. Interpersonal skills
   ____ c. Political skills
   ____ d. Ability to excite and motivate

2. The best way to describe this person is:
   ____ a. Technical expert
   ____ b. Good listener
   ____ c. Skilled negotiator
3. What this individual does best is:
   ___ a. Make good decisions
   ___ b. Coach and develop people
   ___ c. Build strong alliances and a power base
   ___ d. Energize and inspire others

4. What people are most likely to notice about this person is:
   ___ a. Attention to detail
   ___ b. Concern for people
   ___ c. Ability to succeed, in the face of conflict and opposition
   ___ d. Charisma

5. This individual's most important leadership trait is:
   ___ a. Clear, logical thinking
   ___ b. Caring and support for others
   ___ c. Toughness and aggressiveness
   ___ d. Imagination and creativity

6. This person is best described as:
   ___ a. An analyst
   ___ b. A humanist
   ___ c. A politician
   ___ d. A visionary
III. Overall rating

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

1. Overall effectiveness as a manager.
   
   1  2  3  4  5
   Bottom 20%  Middle 20%  Top 20%

2. Overall effectiveness as a leader.
   
   1  2  3  4  5
   Bottom 20%  Middle 20%  Top 20%

IV. Background Information

The following information will not be provided to the ratee, but will contribute to our efforts to understand how perceptions of leadership styles are influenced by the relationship between rater and ratee.

1. Are you: ___ Male  ___ Female

2. Which of the following best describes your work relationship with the ratee:

   ____ The ratee is at a higher level in the organization than I am.
   ____ The ratee and I are at about the same organizational level.
   ____ I am at a higher level in the organization than the ratee.
   ____ I am a client or customer of the ratee's organization.
   ____ Other. Please specify: ____________________________
Appendix D

Interview Protocol
1. I am interested in knowing how you became the president of ___college. (a) When were you appointed as president of this college?
   (b) How were you selected for the position?
2. What is the approximate student enrollment of this college/university?
3. Would you characterize the college/university as rural, suburban, or urban?
4. Can you tell me, please, what path your career followed to the role of president?
5. What are the roles and responsibilities of leadership?
6. In what ways do you, as a president, exercise leadership?
7. What individual qualities in a president can advance or detract from the achievement of his/her leadership goals?
8. What is the measure of a successful college/university system?
9. Will you describe for me the reality of being a president of a ___college/university? What kinds of problems might a president who heads a ___college/university encounter?
10. What sorts of activities lead you to your success as a president? If you could represent your typical day’s activities with a pie chart, how much of your day would you devote to various activities?
11. What metaphor would you use to characterize your leadership style?
12. Please describe a current educational project, which you initiated that would help describe your beliefs about education.
13. Please describe a recent innovation program that you implemented that would reflect your management style.
14. Please describe a particularly challenging problem which you have encountered as a president, and describe how you went about solving it?

15. How has the role of a president met / not met your expectations? What are the positive and negative aspects of the job?

16. If, as a president, you have the experience of working with a faculty where there was consistent or regular majority opposition, what are some ways to ensure effectiveness under these circumstances?

17. Is there anything else I have forgotten to ask about leadership is the role of a president?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsidiary Question</th>
<th>Items in interview protocol that will gather the data needed to answer this question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background #</td>
<td>Questions 1, 2, 3, 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub # 1 structural</td>
<td>Items (e.g., questions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub # 2 human</td>
<td>Questions 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub # 3 political</td>
<td>Questions 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub # 4 symbolic</td>
<td>Questions 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Approval letter from Institutional Review Board to conduct Research
December 8, 2006

Rev. Emmanuel Ogu
C/o Dr. M.O. Ume
EOF Department
Alfaro Hall, Seton Hall University

Dear Father Ogu,

The Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board has reviewed the information you have submitted addressing the concerns for your proposal entitled “Leadership Styles of Dominican College Presidents At Four-Year Institution of Higher Learning”. Your research protocol is hereby approved as amended through expedited review. The IRB reserves the right to recall the proposal at any time for full review.

Enclosed for your records are the signed Request for Approval form, the amended original Consent Form and Letter of Solicitation. Make copies only of the stamped documents.

The Institutional Review Board approval of your research is valid for a one-year period from the date of this letter. During this time, any changes to the research protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to implementation.

According to federal regulations, continuing review of already approved research is mandated to take place at least 18 months after the initial approval. You will receive notification from the IRB Office for the several months before the anniversary date of your initial approval.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mary J. Reigels, Ph.D.
Mary F. Reigels, Ph.D.
Professor
Director, Institutional Review Board

Joseph Sutor, Ph.D.
Office of Institutional Review Board
President's Hall
Tel: 973-321-4394 • Fax: 973-321-9796
400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey 07079-0343

CHING THE MIND, THE HEART AND THE S
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Solicitation Letter to the Presidents
St Leo’s Rectory

103 Myrtle Avenue
Irvington NJ 07111

Dear President,

My name is Rev Emmanuel N. Ogbu, a Doctoral student at the College of Education and Human Services, in the department of Education Leadership, Management and Policy at Seton Hall University in New Jersey.

The purpose of my research is to examine how Dominican college presidents utilize the four frameworks namely structural, human, political, and symbolic frames in their leadership experiences.

You will be asked to complete a survey questionnaire asking about your leadership orientations. As part of this study, I will be contacting some selected members of your college/university community as part of the data gathering process. However, to preserve confidentiality of process the persons in the university community contacted and those who respond will not be disclosed.

The expected duration of your participation will be about 80 to 90 minutes. The questionnaire will take twenty minutes to complete. The interview will last for approximately one hour.

The study requires that you provide me with your biographical statement or vitae stating your educational background, career path and experience. As part of this study, I
would like to schedule an interview with you. During the interview, you will be asked to discuss a variety of topics related to your leadership styles. With your permission, the interview will be audio-recorded. You have the right to have the audio tape recorder turned off at any time you choose.

In what follows, I would like to describe my questionnaire further. Lee Bolman and Terence Deal developed the leadership orientations survey in 1991. It is designed to measure eight separate dimensions of leadership—one for each of the four frames of human, political, structural and symbolic resources. The survey will determine which of the four frames defined by Lee Bolman and Terence Deal best describes your leadership style.

The interview questions are seventeen in number, and examples of some of the questions are as follows: (a) what are the roles and responsibilities of leadership? (b) In what ways do you, as a president, exercise leadership?

It is not likely that you and some selected members of your college community will experience any risk or discomfort in completing the survey questionnaire. The information you provide will be analyzed in conjunction with that of the selected members of your college/university community to identify themes and issues relating to your leadership styles.

Please be informed that participation in the interview process and completing the leadership orientations survey is voluntary. You are free to withdraw from participating in the study at anytime without any adverse consequences.

I assure you the confidentiality of your responses and that of those who work with you in completing the survey. The questionnaire will be coded so that no other person
except the researcher will know to whom the questionnaire was sent and who may have responded. Your name and other identifiable responses (e.g. names and address) will not be included in the dissertation.

The data of this study will be kept in a locked file so that only the researcher will have access to it and confidentiality will be maintained. The data from this study will be destroyed after three years.

This research will contribute to the understanding of the leadership styles of Dominican college presidents at four-year institutions of higher learning in the United States. This is a pioneering work and as a leader of your institution, your participation is essential. In appreciation for your assistance, I would be more than happy to provide you with a copy of my dissertation. I plan to complete my research by December 30th 2005.

If you have any questions or concerns about this research study, or myself, please feel free to contact me at 973-761-9397. Professor Joseph Stetar is my mentor and chief reader, and can be reached at 973-275-2730. Thank you for your consideration of participating in this study.

Sincerely in St Dominic
Rev Emmanuel N.Ogu, OP
Appendix G

Informed Consent Form to University Presidents
To University Presidents

Informed Consent form

I am Rev. Emmanuel N. Ogo, a Doctoral student at the College of Education and Human Services, in the Department of Education Leadership, Management and Policy at Seton Hall University.

The purpose of this research is to examine how Dominarian college presidents utilize the four facets: structural, human, political, and symbolic in their leadership experiences.

The expected duration of your participation will be about 60 to 90 minutes. This will entail taking twenty minutes to complete the leadership orientations questionnaire (self), and provide me with your curriculum vitae. You will be interviewed precisely for one hour. The interview will consist of open-ended questions asking you to describe your leadership styles. Examples of these interview questions are as follows: (a) What are the roles and responsibilities of leadership? (b) In what ways do you, as a president, exercise leadership? This process will also include your permission for me to contact some selected members of your college University to complete the leadership orientations survey "other".

Lee Balzurn and Terence Deal developed the leadership orientations questionnaire in 1991. It is a thirty two-item questionnaire asking the respondents to describe their leadership styles by indicating how frequently a behavior is true for them, and it also measures the individual's orientation toward leading through each of the four facets - structural, human, political and symbolic. The interview questionnaire will ask you to describe your leadership styles. Please be informed that your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to withdraw from participating in the study at any time without any adverse consequences.

Your responses and those of your colleagues will be strictly confidential. All data associated with this research will be locked in a file, which only I will have access. The data from this study will be destroyed after three years.

There are no foreseeable risks in the completion of the questionnaire or in the interview. I am asking your permission to have the interview audio-recorded. You have the right to have the audio tape recorder turned off at any time you choose.

In appreciation for your participation in this study, I will be more than happy to provide you with a copy of my dissertation at the completion of this study.

If you have any questions or concerns about this research study, please feel free to contact me at 973-761-9371, or at College of Education and Human Services, Department of Education Leadership, Management and Policy, Seton Hall University, 400 South Orange Avenue, South Orange NJ 07079. My mentor, Dr. Joseph Stabar can be reached at 973-761-7208.

A copy of the signed and dated consent form will be given to you.

Signature and date

College of Education and Human Services
Department of Education Leadership, Management and Policy
400 South Orange Avenue - South Orange, New Jersey 07079

[Signature]
[Date]

APPROVED
DEC 08 200

Seton Hall University
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Appendix H

Solicitation Letter to some Selected College/University Community
Dear

My name is Rev Emmanuel N. Ogu, a Doctoral student at the College of Education and Human Services, in the Department of Education Leadership, Management and Policy at Seton Hall University in New Jersey.

My dissertation research is focused on the Leadership Styles of Dominican college presidents at four-year institutions of higher learning in the United States. The purpose of this research is to examine if Dominican college presidents, in leading their different colleges use the structural, human, political and symbolic frames as explained by the theorists Bolman and Deal.

I am writing to request that you help complete and mail back the enclosed questionnaire for my dissertation. Your president is aware of this study, and will participate in the study, but has no knowledge who will be contacted or who has been chosen to respond.

Your participation will take approximately twenty minutes. The procedure for this research will entail completing the “Leadership Orientation questionnaire” developed by Lee Bolman and Terrence Deal. It is designed to measure eight separate dimensions of leadership, two dimensions for each of the four frames of human, structural, political, and symbolic resources.

Please know that your participation in this survey is voluntary. Your responses will be strictly confidential. Your name and other identifiable responses (e.g. name and address) will not be included in the dissertation. All responses will be kept in a locked file at the end of the study, which only I have access. After three years, all responses will be destroyed.

If you agree to participate, please find enclosed an addressed and stamped envelope for mailing back the completed questionnaire to me. If you have any questions or concerns about this research study, please feel free to contact me at 973-761-9397, or at College of Education and Human Services, Department of Education Leadership, Management and Policy, Seton Hall University, 400 South Orange Avenue, South Orange NJ 07079. My mentor, Dr. Joseph Stetar can be reached at 973-275-2730. Thank you for your consideration of participating in this research study and I look forward to receiving your survey.

Sincerely,

Rev Emmanuel N. Ogu OP
Appendix I
Informed Consents to some Selected University/College Community
Informed consent to some selected University/College community.

I am a Doctoral student at the College of Education and Human Services, in the Department of Education, Leadership and Management and Policy at Seton Hall University. The purpose of my research is to examine how Dominican college presidents utilize the four frames of structural, human, political and symbolic in leading their respective colleges. The expected duration of your participation will be about twenty minutes. This will entail completing the Leadership Orientations questionnaire (check).

Lee Bolman and Terrence Deal designed the Leadership Orientation questionnaire in 1991. It is a thirty-item questionnaire, designed to measure eight separate dimensions, two each of the four frames of human, structural, political and symbolic resources. Please note that your participation is voluntary. The presidents will not know who will be contacted or who will participate in the study. Your responses will be strictly confidential. All responses will be kept in a locked file at the end of the study, which only I have access. After three years, all responses will be destroyed. There is no compensation for participating in the study.

If you have any questions or concerns about this research study, please feel free to contact me at 973-761-3637, or at College of Education and Human Services, Department of Education, Leadership, Management and Policy, Seton Hall University, 400 South Orange Avenue, South Orange, NJ 07079. My mentor, Dr Joseph Steier, can be reached at 973-761-2700. A copy of the signed and dated consent will be given to you.

__________________________
Signature

__________________________
Date

APPROVED

DEC 08 2001

SETON HALL UNIVERSITY

College of Education and Human Services
Department of Education, Leadership, Management and Policy
(formerly Division of Human and Social Services, and Administration)
400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey 07079-2685
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Appendix J
List of the twenty chosen term / words