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ABSTRACT

The Self-Perceived Leadership Style and Comprehensive Profile of African American Women in the Role of the President at Four-Year Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) in the United States

The purpose of this dissertation was to research the self-perceived leadership styles utilized by 18 permanently appointed African American women presidents of HBCUs as of November 2004. In addition to examining the leadership styles, the researcher assembled a demographic profile of this group. The profile detailed an overview of the personal, educational, and professional backgrounds of this cohort of leadership. Upon completion of the demographic profile, a comparison between the studied group and all presidents of colleges and universities, all HBCUs presidents, and all women college presidents was completed. This comparison permitted a clearer understanding of the educational and professional backgrounds of HBCU presidents who are African American women.

The survey instrument was formed from merging two previous surveys, Brown (2000) and Bolman and Deal (1991). Data were analyzed by descriptive analysis, correlation, independent t test, and effect size. Results revealed there was a strong correlation between years of service as president and the number of Bolman and Deal frames used in the position. In addition, it was discovered backgrounds of this surveyed group do not coincide with literature in relation to their career path, birth order, and family environment.

While this study was focused on only African American women at HBCUs, it would be advantageous for the population to be increased to all HBCU presidents. The population of African American women in leadership is high at these institutions, but it is suggested
all African American women presidents, regardless of institutional identification, should be the focus of research.

African American women, regardless of the position or institution’s Carnegie Classification, have been rated last. With affirmative action and the women’s movement, their voices have been at least heard. This study was the opportunity to begin research and discussions on their importance, at least, at HBCUs.
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Chapter I

Introduction

Introduction

American higher education has many groups invested in the development of a strong institution. These groups include students who attend the institution, faculty members who perform research and teach at the institution, and administrators who lead the institution. The single pivotal person, however, with the charge of creating direction for the college or university, is its president.

The purpose of this dissertation was to research the self-perceived leadership styles utilized by 18 permanently appointed African American women presidents of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) as of November 2004. In addition to examining the leadership styles, the researcher assembled a demographic profile of this group. The profile detailed an overview of the personal, educational, and professional backgrounds of this cohort of leadership. Upon completion of the demographic profile, a comparison between the studied group and all presidents of colleges and universities, all HBCUs presidents, and all women college presidents was completed. This comparison permitted a clearer understanding of the educational and professional backgrounds of HBCU presidents who are African American women.

HBCUs were originally founded with the mission to educate freed slaves during the post-Civil War era. This section of the American higher education system has collectively transformed. The initial purpose of the HBCU was to teach recently freed slaves to read the Bible and to learn a trade, such as carpentry, teaching, or ministry
(Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 1997). The mission of the HBCU has transformed to include the development of research in all fields of study, from theology to biomedical engineering. The current system of HBCU institutions, which operate on budgets from private and public funding sources, include 2-year, 4-year, specialized disciplines, and single-gender serving institutions.

Current research journals, scholarly discussions, and national conferences have limited scope with regard to the primary focus of HBCUs. Previous literature had been centered on HBCUs in relation to students' selection to attend these institutions. The literature continued to examine retention and graduation rates and historical overviews of HBCUs. The research also addressed faculty roles in the development of students and organizational support (Johnson & Harvey, 2002). However, there had been a limited failure to address the president's role. Apart from entertainment articles and small sections of reports concerned with demographic analysis, there has been a growing gap in the research associated with administrators, based on both gender and ethnic group, who have labored to keep HBCUs flourishing during prosperous and difficult times.

According to Mosely (1980), the current array of literature, studies, and research with a focus on African Americans in higher education as a field had been from the African American male's viewpoint. Thus, it provided slim or null resources for information on African American women.

According to the Digest of Education Statistics (NCES, 2003), only 14% of the undergraduate enrollment in higher education institutions was African American students in the 1999 - 2000 academic year. In stark contrast, during the same academic term, nearly 25% of African Americans who earned a bachelor's degree earned it at a HBCU
NCES, 2003). These institutions only constituted a small proportion of 4-year institutions, both private and public, that conferred bachelor’s degrees. In comparison, the proportion of 4-year HBCUs, which are 87 institutions that conferred degrees to African American students, was larger than the entire American higher education system, which comprised over 3,000 institutions. Bass (1990) stated African American leaders are more likely to run an organization that is financially under subsidized than other racial group. Such a high graduation rate for one race or ethnic group poses the question: How are HBCUs able to obtain high graduation rates for African American students with unequal funding? In doing so, African American leaders' potential to increase the outreach of the institution is limited. There are many factors that contribute to the proportion of high graduation rates, such as faculty members' dedication to teaching, determination to foster lifelong learning, establishment and continuation of mentorships with college students, overall cultural empowerment and enrichment on HBCUs' campuses, and traditions and folklores that reaffirm the history of HBCUs' collective ideals of community and prosperity (Allen, 1996). Another factor worthy of investigation is the administration of HBCUs, and more specifically, their executive leaders serving in the role of president.

Prior to the Great Depression, White males dominated presidencies at HBCUs. Many HBCUs were founded and managed by White administrators (JBHE, 1997). This was due to the financial support they were able to generate for these postsecondary institutions. Since most HBCUs are located in the southern region of the United States, support was primarily from the northern region of the United States. The northern population was more likely than the southern population to donate and support the local
HBCU institutions. Several institutions, founded as private entities, depended heavily on their religious affiliations and White philanthropic foundations from the North. The memberships of those in control, the governing boards, faculties, and administrators, especially the presidents, were majority White (JBHE, 1997). Thus, the responsibility of the selection and employment of president at HBCUs was held by an all or majority White governing board. Due to substantial contributions generated from White patrons, policy decisions, direction, and governance, were the primary duties of White individuals. Consequently, presidents, who were mostly White males, reflected the ethnic composition of the board membership during the pre-Great Depression era. When the Great Depression began, it forced northern churches to reduce or to terminate financial contributions to HBCUs. This historical event changed the leadership of institutions. The complexion of individuals in the presidential role at HBCUs changed from being White males, in most instances, to African American males. This shift of leadership began at the conclusion of the Great Depression and continued until 1971. At this time, Paine College, located in Augusta, Georgia, selected Dr. Lucius H. Pitts as its first African American president. The beginning of Dr. Pitts’ tenure as president signaled the end of White males’ presidencies at HBCUs (Johnson & Harvey, 2002).

Presidential leadership at HBCUs experienced two phases of change. The first phase was the transformation of the position from White males to African American males, which was a movement of leadership from one ethnic group to another ethnic group. The second phase was the evolution of the presidency at HBCUs from African American men to African American women, which was a change from one gender to another gender in the same race/ethnic group. Though Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune at
Bethune-Cookman College located in Daytona Beach, Florida, was president in 1936, the actual succession did not fully begin until 1991. The appointment of Dr. Sebeta Jenkins at Jarvis Christian College in 1991 was the beginning point for recent appointments. Since Dr. Bethune’s presidency, other women have lead HBCUs, such as Dr. Willa B. Player as President of Bennett College in 1956 and Mable Parker McLean at Barber-Scotia College in 1974, institutions located in Greensboro, North Carolina, and Concord, North Carolina, respectively (b-sc.edu, 2004; bennett.edu, 2004; bethune.cookman.edu, n.d.).

Of the 87 four-year HBCU institutions in November 2004, 19 have African American women as president. Also, an African American individual or a group of African Americans founded approximately 20 of the 87 four-year institutions¹. Of these 4-year institutions, two African American women established institutions for higher learning. These institutions are Bethune College by Dr. Mary McCloud Bethune and Xavier College by St. Katharine Drexel. Spelman College’s history denoted being founded by two White women, Sophia B. Packard and Harriet E. Giles² (bethune.cookman.edu, 2004; spelman.edu, n.d.; xula.edu, n.d.). Dr. Bethune and St. Katharine were prominent and heavily involved in the mission and the direction of their respective institutions, but Dr. Bethune was the only one to hold the position of president. Both Miss Packard and Miss Giles were presidents of Spelman College, respectively.

¹ Histories of HBCUs were gathered via Web sites constructed and maintained by each respective institution.
² Bethune College merged with Cookman College in 1936 to create Bethune-Cookman College. Dr. Bethune assumed the presidency of Bethune-Cookman College at that time. St. Katharine Drexel and Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament founded College, with primary financial support from St. Katharine’s father, Francis Drexel. St. Katharine was canonized a saint in October 2000 (bethune.cookman.edu and xula.edu, 2004).
In November 2004, there were 19 African American women serving as president of an HBCU: Four of these women are not the first African American women to serve their institution as President. This revealed that 14 (74%) of African American women serving as president of a HBCU were the first women to serve their institution since its founding. The majority of the African American women presidents were elected to their current position over the past 10 years. The emerging trend of the consideration and appointment of African American women as presidents had been growing.

According to the American Council on Education’s 2002 Report titled, *The American College President*, the average college president in 2002 was a 58-year-old White man with an earned doctoral degree who has served as a president for an average of 7 years in his current presidency. Prior to accepting his current presidency, he served as faculty member and in the position of president or senior administrator in institutions of postsecondary education (American Council on Education, 2002).

The same report stated that the proportion of women presidents had doubled from 10% in 1986 to 21% in 2001. During the same year, the faculty appointment and senior-level administrative leadership of women was over 40%, according to NCES (2003). The low percentage of women presidents, along with the high number of women in the middle-level management and faculty, further demonstrated a gap in the upward movement of women to the CEO position.

The institutional employment choices for African American presidents, regardless of gender, are strongly linked to institutions whose missions are reflective of their race/ethnic group. In 2001, African American presidents were more likely to lead institutions with special missions (e.g., HBCUs) than those without special missions
(56% and 10%, respectively). Statistical data revealed some strong factors for HBCU presidents. They are more likely than their counterparts, regardless of ethnic/race group, to be older in age (average of 71 years of age). Also, tenure in the position of president was longer than their peers (average term of service is 8 years). This illustrated that African American presidents were more likely to serve as president at minority-serving institutions and served longer terms. In turn, the number of African American women presidents increased from nine (7.4%) of the respondents of the ACE study in 1986 to 36 (24.2%) of the respondents in 2001. This is an increase of 27 respondents (25%) of African American women who lead as president of a college or university in the United States. In comparison, based on the respondents of the ACE study, African American women (25%) were more likely to perform duties as president than their White counterparts (21%) (ACE, 2002). Therefore, a woman minority president was more likely to serve at special-mission institutions than her women contemporaries. A more detailed overview drawn from relevant literature of their career path, education, job responsibilities, and institution type in the presidency is provided in chapter 2.

The focus of this dissertation was to investigate the self-perceived leadership styles of African American women presidents and to compile a comprehensive demographic profile of this cohort. Data were collected using a single instrument merged from two established surveys, Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation (Self) survey (Bolman & Deal, 1991) and Brown's demographic survey (Brown, 2000). The intention was to conduct a study, which yielded results that reveal personal, professional, and educational backgrounds of African American women presidents at HBCUs. Research gathered by this dissertation facilitated the understanding of African American women
presidents’ contributions to the HBCU system of higher education and the overall national higher education system. African American women presidents have established and developed, during their tenure, a leadership style that can offer much insight on leadership practices in the field of higher education and their implications on the future of HBCUs in American higher education.

Research Problem

Wilson (1989) noted that HBCUs play key roles in the development of women of color in administrative leadership positions. The Carnegie Commission of Higher Education Report in 1973 reflected on women’s senior-level development by stating that women are members of faculties but not in traditional fields of power, are represented in lesser numbers on higher levels, and then the pipeline for career development has not been established. Linking the ideas of Wilson and the Carnegie Commission, the presence of African American women are less likely to be seen as senior-level administrators but as middle-management administrators. According to the Digest of Education Statistics (NCES, 2002) in Fall 1999, African American women held only 5% (7,887) of the 159,888 executive, administrative, and managerial positions in institutions of higher education. This shortcoming is not only found in the career opportunities, but also in literature and data collection with African American women in higher education as the focus (Collier-Thomas, 1982; Dabney, 2003; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Perkins, 1990; Smith, 1982). Moreover, the research center on African American women as administrators, especially as presidents, is even more limited (Mosley, 1980).
The limited scholarly works on African American women in higher education, and more narrowed in leadership position of presidents, has established a much-needed spotlight focused on African American women presidents in the HBCU setting. The importance of looking at the president of a higher education institution is best described in the duties and responsibilities of the position. According to Cowley’s Presidents, Professors and Trustees (1959), the duties of presidential affairs are separated into two divisions: internal and external affairs. During colonial times, the founding of the first colleges in America appointed a president as the only administrative officer and was a White male. The president dealt with boards of trustees, professors and tutors, taught heavy schedules of courses, and recruited new students for the institution. He was involved with fundraising and conducted the college correspondences. In addition to the daily administrative work, he was responsible for the religious activities. The duties of the religious leader extended to the external affairs and the community. He presided over most of the twice-daily sessions of chapel for the institution and was the speaker at Sunday services.

Despite the fact that Cowley’s reflection was centered on colonial times, Prayor (1963) looked at the evolution of the modern presidential role. The duties have expanded to include the formation of an executive team to support the direction of the institution. The president formed the strategic plan for the institution, which is involved in the reviews of the departments and school/college divisions, as well as formulation of the policy recommendations to the board and conveyed the board’s decisions to the institutional community.

2 Colonial colleges of the United States are Harvard, the College of William and Mary, Yale, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, Columbia University, Brown University, Rutgers University, and Dartmouth College.
Research Questions

1. What is the demographic profile of the current cohort of African American women serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States as of November 2004?

2. What are the leadership characteristics of African American women presidents serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States utilizing Bolman and Deal’s Reframing Organization leadership model as of November 2004?

Subsidiary Questions

1. What professional development opportunities do African American women employ in order to advance to the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States?

2. What are the professional backgrounds of African American women serving as president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States as compared to all presidents of colleges and universities, all HBCU presidents, and all women presidents of colleges and universities in the United States?

3. What are the personal backgrounds of African American women serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States as compared to all presidents of colleges and universities, all HBCUs presidents, and all women presidents of colleges and universities?

4. Is there a significant difference in the leadership behavior and style of African American women presidents, according to Bolman and Deal leadership model, compared to the established data set of other education and business leaders?
5. What is the most dominate leadership style exhibited by this cohort of African American women presidents at 4-year HBCUs in the United States?

6. What is the least common leadership style among African American women presidents at 4-year HBCUs in the United States?

7. How many frames, from Bolman and Deal leadership model, African American women serving in the position of president at a 4-year HBCU in the United States engage during their administration?

8. What is the number of frames, from the Bolman and Deal leadership model, African American women serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States use compared to other education and business leaders?

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this study are associated with the comparison analysis between the African American women presidents and all presidents as a whole, all HBCU presidents, and all women presidents of colleges and universities. The data file from this study was compared to the American Council on Education's Report entitled *The College President* published in 2002 and Lee Bolman's established database of education and business being maintained on his Internet Web site. To ensure equal comparison between the current data set and the established data sets, analysis was performed on selected questions. Those questions are questions 1, 7, 9, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 24, and 25 from sections one, two, and three and the complete sections of four and five comprised the survey instrument of this study. The hypotheses are presented below.
H₁: There is no difference between all presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the position held prior to their current presidency.

H₂: There is no difference between all women presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the position held prior to their current presidency.

H₃: There is no difference between all HBCU presidents and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the position held prior to their current presidency.

H₄: There is no difference between all presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the method they used to become a candidate for their current position.

H₅: There is no difference between all women presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the method they used to become a candidate for their current position.

H₆: There is no difference between all HBCU presidents and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the method they used to become a candidate for their current position.

H₇: There is no difference between all presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the total number of years served as college president of their current institution.
H6: There is no difference between all women presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the total number of years served as college president of their current institution.

H7: There is no difference between all HBCUs and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the total number of years served as college president of their current institution.

H10: There is no difference between all women presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in age during presidency.

H11: There is no difference between all presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in age during presidency.

H12: There is no difference between all HBCU and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in age during presidency.

H13: There is no difference between all presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the number of and types of external boards upon which they served.

H14: There is no difference between all women presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the number of and types of external boards upon which they served.

H15: There is no difference between HBCU and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the number of and types of external boards upon which they served.
H₁₄: There is no difference between all presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the total number of presidencies held.

H₁₅: There is no difference between all women presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the total number of presidencies held.

H₁₆: There is no difference between all HBCUs presidents and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the total number of presidencies held.

H₁₇: There is no difference between education and business leaders and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the leadership style frame exhibited during their current employment.

H₁₈: There is no difference between education and business leaders and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the leadership behavior frame exhibited during their current employment.

**Definition of Terms**

1. Historically Black Colleges or Universities (HBCU): They are: (1) The institution of higher learning was established before 1964; (2) the mission statement in previous years must have been directed towards the direction of educating African Americans; (3) the current principal mission must be the education of African Americans; and (4) the institution must be accredited, or making progress toward accreditation, by an approved accrediting body (Provasnik & Shafer, 2004; Smith, 1982).
2. **Black (African American)**: refers to people having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa. It included people who indicated their race or race as “Black, African American, or Negro” or self-recognized as African American, Afro-American, Nigerian, or Haitian (McKinnon & Bennett, 2005).

3. **Bolman and Deal leadership model**: a theoretical model based on the premise that all organizations, regardless of mission statement, size, and other external traits, are led and managed under four various views or frames. These frames are structural, human resources, political, and symbolic. An examination of the four frames of Bolman and Deal are discussed in chapter 2 (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

4. **Double jeopardy/double whammy**: racism and sexism experienced by African American women differentiating them from African American men and from White women (Mosely, 1980; Smith, 1982).

5. **Middle-level management**: positions of employment in postsecondary education with the title prefix “associate” and “assistant.” For example, associate dean or assistant dean of a college or school and associate vice president or assistant vice president of a division.

6. **Multiple research methods (also known as multiple-method)**: the use of multiple research methods to study a problem by taking advantage of the particular strengths of each method and using those that complement each other (Krathwohl, 1998).

7. **Multi-frame presidential leadership style**: two or more leadership frames of the possible styles or frames, structural frame, human resources frame, political frame, and symbolic frame, utilized by a president as determined by the score on
the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation (Self) survey instrument (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

8. **President**: The chief administrative officer of institutions of higher learning. Another title compatible to president is chancellor.

9. **Paired frame presidential leadership style**: The two leadership styles of the four possible styles or frames, structural frame, human resources frame, political frame, and symbolic frame, utilized by a president as determined by the score on the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientations (Self) survey instrument (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

10. **Single frame presidential leadership style**: The one leadership frame of the four possible frames, structural frame, human resources frame, political frame, and symbolic frame, utilized by a president as determined by the score on the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation (Self) survey instrument (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

**Significance of the Study**

According to Bass (1990), over 7,500 studies have been conducted on leadership, and a smaller number of studies have been specifically directed toward higher education. More specifically, studies centered on African American women in the position of president at HBCUs have yet to be performed in proportional numbers. Smith (1982) and Perkins (1990) further addressed the point by stating there has been a lack of research in relation to African American women in senior-level management positions. This perceived research gap between this group and leadership opportunities guided this dissertation study. The intention of this study was to bridge the gap between the
established research of women presidents in certain settings, such as women’s colleges, community colleges, and other institutional settings and those who have chosen to serve in the HBCU environment.

There are dissertations and books concerning individual African American women who previously served as presidents at HBCUs. But there has not been a concerted effort to research a cohort of current African American women serving at HBCUs. The lack of focus on this particular cohort of leaders could stem from the traditionally smaller numbers of African American women in leadership roles. This single point of the less than desirable population has been a deterrent for most scholars. Conversely, this small population and the increase in presidential appointments are what is of interest to the researcher, especially for HBCUs.

According to Dabney (2003), literature traditionally placed African American women presidents in research studies under two categories, either African Americans or women. These subheadings directed responses and focus into either of two subgroups. When African American women are placed into the category of African Americans, then their views or perceptions are intertwined with African American men. When African American women are grouped in the category of women, their views are expressed as a collective gender, with White and other minority women. The need for African American women to establish their own category as both African American and women

---

4 Wilberforce University’s first African American woman president was the subject of Sharon Brooks’ dissertation entitled A Case Study of the Presidency of Dr. Yvonne Walker-Taylor: The First Female President of Wilberforce University. Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, the first African American woman president of Bethune-Cookman College, was the focus of Audrey Thomas McClusky’s dissertation entitled Mary McLeod Bethune and the Education of Black Girls in the South, 1904-1923.

5 This low number of desirable population is based on the central limit theorem. According to Srinathall (1997), the central limit theorem is a theoretical statement that set forth that when sample means are selected randomly from a single population, the means will distribute as an approximation of the normal distribution, even if the population distribution deviates from normality. The theorem assumes that sample sizes are relatively large (at least 30) and that they are all randomly selected from one population.
was one of the main foci of this study. This study contributed to the field of
postsecondary education by capturing the underrepresented views of African American
women in the role of president.

The leadership of HBCUs by African American women began with Dr. Mary
McLeod Bethune in 1936 and continues with the recent appointment of Dr. Joanne W.
Haysbert as President of Langston University in May 2005. These women were entrusted
to give vision and leadership to the governing boards, alumni, faculty, and local
community leaders and charged with an array of responsibilities. In addition to
addressing the needs of constituents, they must balance their dedication to the special
mission of a HBCU and continually spur growth in the educational and financial
foundations of their institutions. It is evident responsibilities and duties of strategic
planning, generating growth toward stronger curriculums, improving financial
projections, and to continuing the historical legacy of HBCUs has been placed on the
forefront of the administration of African American women presidents.

Limitations

This study was limited to studying African American women as presidents at
HBCUs. The gender and ethnic/racial group associated with this study was an additional
limitation. Another is the institutional environment in which the research data is being
collected. Participants of the study are presidents at HBCUs. The mission statement and
student population of HBCUs narrowed the focus of the type of institutions that were
surveyed. Consequently, locations of HBCUs led by African American women were
located in the eastern region of the United States was also limitation. Those states are
from Virginia and North Carolina to Texas. Furthermore, the small number of participants in the study was a limitation. At the commencing of the study, there were 108 HBCU institutions, 88 are 4-year institutions, and African American women lead 19.

As previously stated in the introduction, the slow advancement of African American women to the position of president was a factor that affected the population size. The final limitation was the method used in the collection of data. Presidents we asked to self-report information and this could have produced a “halo effect.” This effect is when a person considers oneself in a more than normal positive standing and may affect the outcome of the study. The limitations of this study did not hinder the ability of the research to be adapted for other institutions, based on ethnic and gender groups.
Chapter II

Literature Review

In order to have a clearer understanding of African American women in the role of president, it is necessary to reflect on the literature presented on the topics at the center of this dissertation. Presented in chapter 2: the history of HBCUs in the United States; presidents and their institutions; presidents at HBCUs; women as administrators; African American women administrators in higher education; African American women at HBCUs; the career path to leadership positions; differences between genders administratively; and Bolman and Deal: looking through the four frames.

The history of HBCUs in the United States presented an overview of the collected institutions during various stages of American history. Looking at American history in concert with the evolution of the institutions showed the utility of this assortment of postsecondary organizations.

Presidents and their institutions examined the duties and responsibilities of the president. An expansive understanding of the role of the president in the institutional setting, interaction with other valuable participants in the functioning of a college or university, and prevailing characteristics of those serving as president are summarized in this section. Another section was the presidents of HBCUs; this section narrowed the synopsis of the presidents during their tenure at a HBCU. Unlike their counterparts at other institutions, as previously presented in chapter 1, they are more likely to have specialized experience. In doing so, their experiences, career paths, and educational background differed from the presidents in the aforementioned section of the literature review.
The demonstration of the contributions made by women as a collective group, especially on the senior level, occupied the center of the section titled Women as Administrators. A historical perspective of the women referenced the leadership that women have provided in higher education at all levels. The vital point of this dissertation study was the analysis of the literature of African American women as presidents. To fully comprehend African American women in this role, a wider perspective of women in higher education must be explored. The section discussed the early women pioneers in higher education, their accomplishments in the field of higher education, and how the role of women in higher education has changed over the years. The above topics served as a foundation to the discussion of women as administrators.

African American women administrators in higher education were another topic in the literature section. During this section of the literature review, the scope of the study narrowed to review African American women administrators in higher education. These women led institutions with various characteristics, such as student enrollment, faculty membership, Carnegie Classification, and institutional endowment.

African American women administrators at HBCUs were the central point of this study. Other institutions led by African American women as administrators were discussed in the previous sections. The purpose of this section was to better understand the literature of this group of women serving as administrators. Due to the lack of precedent, a detailed look at African American women as administrators was necessary to address. The dearth of available research was revisited in this section.

The issues dealing with gender and the presidency were the next section. Literature in this section focused on the direct correlation between gender and the
The previous sections of the literature presented a picture of the ethnic and gender of the group. In contrast, this section limited the scope of the study to only gender, which gave different viewpoints of leadership characteristics. The next section was concerned with differences between genders administratively. The final section of the literature review described leadership on the postsecondary level in relation to the Bolman and Deal leadership styles looking through the four frames. This section looked at the Bolman and Deal leadership model for analysis, other leadership styles used by higher education management, and how the models recognize good leadership.

The History of HBCUs in the United States

Historically African American Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) are institutions that have unique functions and mission statements that have evolved since their founding. HBCUs, unlike predominantly African American colleges and universities, are institutions founded prior to 1964 and have the expressed mission of serving the African American population through postsecondary studies (Brown & Freeman, 2002; Roebeck & Komanduri, 1993). Predominantly African American colleges and universities are institutions with more than 50% of the student population from African descent and may or may not have been established before 1964 (Brown & Freeman). According to Brown and Freeman, there are 103 HBCUs in the United States. These are church-affiliated, private, public, 4-year, 2-year, coeducational, and single-sex serving institutions. The majority of these postsecondary institutions are located in the southeastern region of the United States: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana,
Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia (Brown & Freeman). Clement (1966) stated that the two major reasons for HBCUs being founded in the southern region of the United States were: a) the majority of newly freed slaves and freemen slaves continued to live in this region and sought education close to where they resided, and b) "an invisible and unannounced quota system often was operative even on many campuses which theoretically had no color qualification for admission" (p.302).

Brown and Freeman (2002) further illustrated the reach of HBCUs by reflecting on the various dimensions of the institutional system. As of 2002, these institutions enrolled approximately 300,000 students and employed approximately 60,000 persons on varying levels. They awarded 28% of bachelor's degrees, 16% of professional first degree, and 9% of doctoral degrees to African American students (Brown & Freeman).

The evolution of HBCUs noticeably paralleled societal change. According to Harris, Figueroes, and Carter (1975), the development of HBCUs is divided into four periods of change: pre-Civil War, from the Civil War to 1895, from 1896 to 1953, and 1954 to the present. These frames of time are based on the early limited access to higher education for African Americans, then the classical training of ministers and teachers, and continuing to current modern curriculums used in postsecondary institutions. The discussion of the history of HBCUs in the higher education setting was separated in two subheadings, pre-Civil War and post-Civil War founding of HBCUs.

Pre-Civil War founding of African American institutions of higher education. Prior to the Civil War, the educational system, including primary, secondary, and postsecondary levels, did not accommodate enslaved African Americans and forbade
them to read and write. While they were not welcomed to pursue primary and secondary education, some were allowed to pursue a postsecondary education. According to Clement (1966), the first reported African American to graduate was John Brown Russwurm from Bowdoin College, Maine in 1826. He was the editor of the first African American newspaper in the United States, Freedom’s Journal. However, since Clement’s research, it was discovered that an African American man named Alexander Lucius Twilight was the first African American citizen to earn a bachelor’s degree in 1823 from Middlebury College in Vermont (AfricanAmerican.com, 2005; middlebury, n.d.). To avoid being dismissed from college or worse, African Americans often, when possible, blended into the student population. After graduation, the racial identification would be discovered. By 1860, about 28 persons of known African descent had graduated with a baccalaureate degree in the United States. There are two factors that contributed to such a low number: The Emancipation Proclamation had not been signed giving slaves their freedom, in turn, a low number of freed men were allowed to be educated; and a small number of colleges allowed African Americans to attend on a continuous basis, except for Oberlin and Berea (Harris et al., 1975). However, years before the Civil War, many HBCUs were planned or established.

Despite these experiments to foster learning among African Americans, only three institutions remained in their original location and stated their missions to educate the community (Bowles & DeCosta, 1971). The three institutions that remained were the foundation of the current system of the HBCUs system of education. According to Clement (1966), these institutions were Cheyney University in Pennsylvania in 1847, Lincoln University in Pennsylvania in 1854, and Wilberforce University in Ohio in 1856.
Lincoln University was established under the name Ashmun Institute with the mission statement “to train ministers and missionaries for Africa” (p.300). Wilberforce University, the oldest private HBCU, was a stop on the Underground Railroad and adopted the mission statement “to provide a route from physical bondage, the University was formed to provide an intellectual Mecca and refuge from slavery’s first rule: ignorance” (wilberforce.edu, 2005). Cheyney University, the oldest HBCU in the United States, was founded as the Institute for Colored Youth. Their founder, Richard Humphreys, stated that the purpose of the Institute was “to instruct the descendants of the African Race in school learning, in the various branches of the mechanic arts, trades, and agriculture, in order to prepare and fit and qualify them to act as teachers” (cheyney.edu, 2005). Cheyney, Wilberforce, and Lincoln (PA) Universities were the solid foundation of HBCUs and were located in the “free territory” of the United States. States to abolish slavery were termed free territory. Most of these states were in the northern region of the newly created United States.

Post Civil War Founding. At the conclusion of the Civil War in 1865, more institutes, colleges, and universities opened their doors to serve recently freed slaves. These postsecondary centers of learning were predominantly located in the southern region of the United States. According to Clement (1966), some of those schools were Atlanta University, Virginia Union University, Shaw University, Fisk University, Talledega College, Morehouse College, Scotia College (now Barber-Scotia College), Fisk University (now Johnson C. Smith University), Howard University, St. Augustine College, Walden College, Clark College in Atlanta, GA, Straight College, Morgan College (now Morgan State University), Tougaloo College, Lincoln University (MO),
Claflin College (now Claflin University), and Hampton Institute (now Hampton University). Straight College later merged with New Orleans University to create Dillard University in 1930. Tillotson College also merged with Samuel Huston College to create Huston-Tillotson College in 1952 (now University). Although these institutions used “college or university” in their name, most did not have a curriculum that included postsecondary studies. Most schools were teaching primary and secondary level courses (Harris et al., 1975). As previously stated, the leadership and financial support of HBCUs came from White northerners who traveled to the South to perform missionary work (Clement, 1966). Missionaries were most likely to be part of a larger organization to perform their work, such as the American Missionary Association, Presbyterians, Quakers, Congregationalists, Baptists, and Methodists (Harris et al., 1975).

In the next two decades, additional colleges and universities were established. According to Clement (1966), some of these were Tuskegee Institute (now University), Benedict College, New Orleans University, Lane College, Bennett College, Wiley College, Bishop College, Knoxville College, Livingstone College, Morris Brown College, Tillotson College, Rust College, Spelman College, Paine College, LeMoyne College, Samuel Huston College, Texas College, Bethune-Cookman College, and Allen College. Mission statements for these schools were centered on increasing learning to produce ministers and missionaries to serve other freed slaves or to work in Africa (Clement, 1966).

There was a change in mission statements of HBCUs during the 1880s fashioned from the Washington-DuBois National Debates. Booker T. Washington, President of Tuskegee College, and W.E.B. DuBois, Professor of Sociology at Clark University in
Atlanta, GA, deliberated on the direction of the category of education that would be useful for the African American population. Washington set forth the idea that African Americans should become laborers and skilled artisans to advance this ethnic group. DuBois challenged Washington in his published work, *The Talented Tenth*. DuBois (1903) stated the leadership and economic growth of this ethnic group would take place by a small number of African American men. He further outlined the objectives as:

Men we shall have only as we make manhood the object of the work of the schools-intelligence, broad sympathy, knowledge of the work that was and is, and of the relation of men to it-this is the curriculum of that Higher Education, which must underlie true life. (p.551)

Washington’s stance of mechanical and agriculture education and DuBois’ standpoints of education would be the foundations of life circumstantiated and the creation of new colleges with a different curriculum. Public groups were entrenched with Washington’s philosophy forged agricultural and mechanical institutes, while other public groups developed normal institutes in line with DuBois ideology. As the debates between Washington and DuBois continued, every state in the South created one type of these postsecondary schools. Some examples of these are Florida A & M University, Morgan College (now Morgan State University), Texas Southern University, Lincoln University (MO), Virginia State University, National Religious Training School and Chautauqua, Kentucky State University, Southern University, and Tennessee A & I Colleges and Universities (Clement, 1966). Previously mentioned, Morgan College and Lincoln University were founded as private institution and later transitioned into a public institution. The National Religious Training School and Chautauqua founded in 1910 by
Dr. James E. Shepard as a private school for African Americans and Native Americans. The institution is currently named North Carolina Central University, the first state-supported liberal arts institution in the nation.

The Morrill Act of 1890 acted as a catalyst to increase the presence of HBCUs. The Morrill Act of 1862, the precursor to the Morrill Act of 1890, provided federal resources to the creation of land-grant institutions (Goodchild & Wechsler, 1997). The Morrill Act of 1862 stated that at least one college should be founded in each of the states and monies raised with the selling of the land should be used in a particular fashion. Below are the requirements of land-grant institutions of 1862. According to Goodchild & Wechsler,

The benefit of this act, [is] to the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislature of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes. . . .

Establishing these institutions in each state gave African American citizens greater access to higher education. During this time, the separate-but-equal doctrine, forged out of the *Plessy v. Ferguson* court case in 1896, became another strong factor in postsecondary education. To accommodate individuals of color in colleges and universities, the Morrill Act of 1890 was established and increased the number of HBCUs (Harris et al., 1975). Of the 107 land-grant institutions, 19 were created as HBCUs.
Both the Washington-DuBois debates and the Morrill Act of 1890 were major factors in the rise of the number of HBCUs in the latter part of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century. While providing resources for the development of these institutions, both also provided guidelines for the curriculums of the institutions.

Economic change. As previously stated in chapter 1, higher education of African Americans was very dependent on individuals and small groups of White northerners for financial contributions. Nevertheless, with the emergence of the 20th century, another group of philanthropic investors became prominent. According to Clement (1966), these groups became very committed to the development of African American colleges and universities. They were primarily located in the North with a substantial amount of funding. Examples of groups that contributed to HBCUs were General Education Board, Rockefeller Foundation, The Carnegie Corporation, The Rosenwald Fund, The Danforth Foundation, The Ford Foundation, The Foundation for the Advancement of Education, Taconic Foundation, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, The Sloan Foundation, The Avalon Foundation, The Merrill Trust, The Reynolds Trust, The Field Foundation, The Duke Charitable Trust, The Mellon Charitable Trust, The Kresge, The Kellogg, and numerous other corporations and companies. According to Harris et al. (1975), the George Peabody Fund investment in HBCUs was a contribution towards the “founding of permanent systems of education for African Americans and whites” (p.60). The Slater Fund, established in 1882, echoed the development of HBCUs and was committed to accelerating the education of African Americans (Leavell, 1938). The mission of General Education Board, established in 1902 by John D. Rockefeller, was “to promote a variety of educational activities in the United States, without distinction of race, creed, or sex”
(Harris et al., 1975, p. 60). Just as churches were deeply invested in the development of HBCUs, corporations were equally interested in contributing financially. The support given to HBCUs prior to and after the Civil War served to advance the curriculum of institutions, but this support conversely influenced their leadership and administration. Leadership mirrored contributors and, in turn, augmented the objectives of the institution.

Another example of the financial influence of the White population on the direction of HBCUs can be understood by reviewing the history of Lincoln University. According to Harris et al. (1975), the Board of Trustees and President, who were White, were petitioned to have representation on the Board from alumni, who were majority African Americans. Over 15 years of petitions, the Board of Trustees responded that the time was not present for change and announced that leadership of Lincoln University was “God’s work of White men for Negros” (p. 64). Alumni and current students continued to protest, and change came in the 1930s when the first African American trustee joined the Board of Trustees, and the first African American faculty member was appointed. In 1945, the Board of Trustees appointed the first African American president to begin his tenure at the Lincoln University, Horace Mann Bond.

Another example of the contributor’s influence on HBCUs is evident in institutional name changes. According to historical records of Johnson C. Smith University (2003) in 1867, it was originally founded as the Colored Presbyterian Church and School of Charlotte. In the same year, Mrs. Mary Biddle donated a “large sum of money to the school” (p. 2). Once the community around the institution heard of the donation, they decided to change the name to Henry J. Biddle Memorial Institute. This was to honor the husband of Mrs. Biddle, the late Major Henry Biddle. The school
retained this name until 1924 when it changed its name once more to Johnson C. Smith University. This name change honored the late husband of Mrs. Jane Berry Smith, Mr. Johnson C. Smith. Over the subsequent years, and until her death, Mrs. Smith bequeathed over $700,000 of her husband’s estate to the University. Thus, the name of the institution has remained.

It is very apparent that the survival of HBCUs was dependent on philanthropic commitments. At the founding of these institutions, churches and wealthy individuals were the primary source of financial support and economic growth. However, the decline in church donations caused HBCUs to look for other sources, including trusts, endowments, and corporations.

A large majority of HBCUs were founded prior to the Civil War, and few continue to thrive in adverse conditions. The first three institutions established in “free territory” were Cheyney, Lincoln, and Wilberforce Universities. These HBCUs were founded with the mission to train missionaries and ministers for people of African descent. Cheyney, Lincoln, and Wilberforce Universities remained the pioneers in educating African Americans. At the end of the Civil War, a large number of churches opened their doors or started independent schools on former plantations. These schools were also founded on the premise of missionary work but included educating the newly freed slaves to read and write on the secondary level. Churches and missionary groups largely financed them. This opportunity increased their service to their community.

The expense of operating the growing number of HBCUs had become a common concern. At the conclusion of the Civil War, missionary groups from the northern regions of the United States and the Federal Government Freedmen’s Bureau financed
many institutions. By the beginning of the 20th century, the Freedmen’s Bureau was discontinued, and missionary funding had disappeared. Thus, the beginning of philanthropic groups commenced with endowments from estates, corporations, and trusts. While financial resources stemmed from various sources, Whites remained in control of the boards and presidencies.

*Presidents and Their Institutions*

Presidential leadership has changed over the decades. This transformation of the presidency was a reflection of American higher education. They led colleges and universities with directives for raising money, instructing of courses, and responsibility for other religious activities (Cowley, 1959). The next phase of leadership was the emergence of the modern president. These individuals included the roles of directing of religious activities and class instruction. However, they added assessment of school/college divisions and strategic planning for the institution (Prayer, 1963). The constant task from the colonial president to the modern president has been fundraising. The interaction between the president on campus and the internal and external constituents was reviewed. Also, research studies compared demographic backgrounds of presidents from different ethnic and gender groups to measure effective leadership of these institutions was included.

The evolution of the presidency has taken place over the past 50 years (Kerr & Gade, 1987). American society has led the presidency. There are two major shifts in American society that have caused the position of president, regardless of the institution, to follow suit. The first was World War II and then the Vietnam War. Both wars had distinctive effects on the federal government and the administration of colleges and
universities. The Second World War brought on an increase in research funding, student aid, and affirmative action. The Second World and Vietnam War created special groups and student revolts (Kerr & Gade, 1987).

The external conflicts of institutions were founded on the idea that federal monies influenced the direction of the institution indirectly. Kerr and Gade (1987) deduced that large amounts of money placed into the institution meant that the federal government had more input into curriculum. The link between the increased flow of money and politics were more noticeable at this time. This was in tandem with minorities and women seeking and gaining access to higher education, for both students and faculty members. Also, rapid development of state coordination of higher education was a signal for change. During the 1940s and 1950s, only one state had state coordination of higher education but, as of 1987, every state except Michigan had such a division.

Developments for change from external contributors were noticeable by internal observers.

Internal influences had similar affects on the institutional culture as external influences. The student revolts were instrumental in demonstrating students ultimately had the power to remove presidents. They wanted a leader from the pre-World War II era that was virtuous and connected with students. At this time, presidents were removed from their moral pillar. The increase in financial aid for students motivated them to change their perspective from student to consumer. The transformation for the students gave rise to their power and the fall of the traditional presidential leadership.

The students were not the only group who changed during this time period. As more students entered college, the number of faculty members increased. Faculty grew
and the need for management of faculty members created departments and divisions. The large body of faculty members called for chairmanships and deanships to form. They were the liaison between the faculty members and administration and handled the management of courses and other middle-level duties. As growth continued, faculty made one request and one demand from the president: the creation of a provost position (request) and unionization (demand) (Kerr & Gade, 1987). In turn, the president was indirectly addressing the needs of the government and directly addressing the needs of faculty and students.

To lay the foundation of this section, a review of a research study performed by Fisher and Koch in 2004 is presented. It defined and compared 713 presidents, 371 “effective presidents” against 342 “representative presidents.” Fisher and Koch explained effective presidents were persons who transformed an institution, had the support of the board, took risks and are socially distant, spoke to the national and international climate of higher education, then moved the issues to their single institution. They are open-minded and are teachable in the office. Representative presidents are those figureheads of the institution in management, academic and financial forms, and are not active leaders in the vision and direction of the institution. This study had the largest sample size representing all levels of the Carnegie Classification, but the response rate for minority presidents was low.

Fisher and Koch (2004) performed comparison analyses among subgroups of the 713 presidents, women against men respondents and all minorities compared to all non-minority respondents. The researchers had a small number of respondents from other minority groups beside African Americans, 3 Asian Americans, and 33 Hispanic
American presidents. The findings of this study revealed women are perceived to be less effective than men \( (p = .000) \). The significance level verified the hypothesis that women's personal background and employment experience does have an effect on their perceived effectiveness in their institutions. In the study, women were younger, less likely to have a doctoral degree, had fewer years in the service of higher education, fewer years as a president, and newer to their current presidency than men. They also published fewer books and published in refereed journals. Experts in higher education were asked to nominate effective presidents for further research focus. They suggested a smaller number of women than men.

The marital status of women presidents was also a disadvantage. According to Fisher and Koch (2004), married women presidents were less likely to involve their spouses or significant others in campus and athletic activities. Spousal support for men has a positive influence on the effectiveness of their presidency. More importantly, women do not value the involvement of the husband or significant others in campus functions. Regardless of ethnicity, an unmarried or single woman president does not have a negative influence on their presidency. Fisher and Koch reinforced that wives are more helpful for men in the presidency than husbands for women in the presidency, which affected their leadership behavior.

Kerr and Gade (1987) also stated that because of changes in American society, the partnership of the president and the presidential spouse has changed. They focused primarily on the presidential spouse as a woman, discussed her roles, and her affect on the institutional culture and the surrounding community. The feminist movement and the increase of employment directly affected the shift in the role of spouse in the presidency.
for women. The feminist movement in the 1960s and 1970s revisited the campus' view of the spousal role as unnecessary for involvement of campus activities. The researchers revealed there are more professional white-collar jobs for women in recent society. This increase of employment for women outside of campus has drawn the spouse from the traditional role. Maintaining a household, hosting social events, serving as the sole confidante, and the psychological and emotional support system for the male president were expected duties from the traditional female presidential spouse.

Currently, the presidential role has transformed into the presidential spouse choosing to serve as the campus' official host. The choice to serve in this capacity was formerly an expected position. However, spouses who chose to support their president are confronted with many obstacles. They are faced with insufficient household support and secretarial help with no salary or budget for institutional events. Kerr and Gade (1987) provided an example of non-support of a spouse having a yearly dinner for the largest donor of the institution. At the conclusion of the meal and the donor's departure from the home, most of the silver, table linens, and other household items were gone.

Another deterrent for spouses' involvement in the presidency has been the loss of anonymity. Privacy for spouse and children are often nonexistent when a person assumed the presidency. They were unable to have transgressions of any sort. Examples were a ticket for failing to yield, and children are to be well behaved at all times. The public's perception of the president does not end with how to act; it also continued with what to wear. Kerr and Gade (1987) added that one wife was asked to restore an old rule that all women entering the presidential residence had to wear white gloves. Another wife was asked to discontinue attending classes at another institution because someone
might get sick and yet services might be needed. Finally, it was suggested a wife contemplate cosmetic surgery, a face-lift, for the betterment of the institution. The traditional role of the president was for two persons, but with the emergence of the feminist movement and the ability of more professional job, society has transformed the presidency into a one-person job with an optional supportive spouse.

Women presidents identified more support from faculty senates. Fisher and Koch (2004) added women believed that they were more assertive and colorful. Nonetheless, they perceived their decisions were not final to affect the institution. Researchers suggested presidents' self-perception was in line with personality studies associated with women leaders, for example Chliwniak (1997) and Auberdene and Naishitt (1992). This overview of demographic and personality traits was considered to be negative for the women presidents.

Another negative concern for women presidents was their heavy usage of computers, Internet access, and cell phone use. Fisher and Koch (2004) acknowledged effective presidents were less reliant on technology than representative presidents. Thus, presidents classified as representative were majority women, who relied on technology. Heavy preferences for technology led researchers to hypothesize women's desire to have a reduced number of one-on-one meetings.

Comparisons between genders were not the only analysis for Fisher and Koch (2004). They also compared minority presidents and non-minority presidents. Minority presidents were less likely to have served as president at previous institutions, earned their baccalaureate degrees at public institutions, and were less likely to have published books or publish in refereed journals. Yet, they belonged to national higher education
organizations and served as officers, were democrats, practiced the Roman Catholic faith, and were married. Their spouses or significant others worked and depended on technology. Fisher and Koch illustrated presidential spouses or significant others are commonly involved in campus activities, and minority presidents were active in national organizations.

The difference in leadership did not conclude with spousal involvement. In comparison with other presidents, minority presidents sought counsel from peer CEOs in order to improve institutional culture and desired a mentor for counsel. They also maintained stereotypical male leadership styles. Fisher and Koch (2004) defined the male leadership style of being "hard-nosed, confident, often assertive and do not believe they make mistakes" (p.98).

Presidential leadership is an amalgamation of a host of tasks, duties, and responsibilities. However, incidentally absent from these tasks are the management roles these presidents are required to possess. Walker (1979) advised presidents to review their position, and more critical, their leadership periodically. The administration should not begin, continue, or end in a constabulary or policeman-like manner. The researcher added three purposeful reasons for the suggestion: ineffectiveness, expense, and promotion of a negative institutional culture. An administrator who employs the policeman method for leaders risks incorrigible results.

Another term commonly used with constabulary practices, but more in line with management theories, is micromanagement. Practices categorized as policing endanger the president directly by continual follow up. When supervisors constantly follow up every decision, he or she was less likely to cover every topic area. Thus, the desired
outcome was never met and they became ineffective presidents. The next point in using the policing method was the amount of resources, manpower, and monies expended to maintain the system. When all decisions are funneled to one individual, a number of delays and miscommunications may have occurred. This caused setbacks and delays for the entire institution. The final point, stated by Walker (1979), was the affect on the institutional culture by policing. The climate of the policing by the president most likely gave the students, along with administrators, a reason to mistrust the president. Those individuals who have experienced policing have the perception that they are “bad” and must be under surveillance at all times. Combining these three ideals for presidential leadership eventually gave way to an unstable institutional climate for the students and other administrators.

Walker (1979) suggested overcoming the urge to become a guardian, use realistic theories, and forget the notion that he or she is “super” president. In addition, the president should always be mindful of the institutional history as it is important to the new administration. If the president failed to consider the history, new objectives and initiatives would fail to be accepted by the community. Walker also noted that the president should serve as the long-term planner and chief architect. Serving in these posts creates the opportunity for growth, but they place the president in more difficult situations.

In order for the future to be productive, a president should also be the decision maker and a “muscle administrator.” Walker (1979) introduced the notion that the president must make decisions that benefit the institution. While this would be a common purpose of a president, most explained they delegated problems to other
individuals. When presidents that gave the responsibility to make decisions to another person, they allowed others to direct the course of the institution. Walker advised that delegation of decisions is a positive direction, but the president must be mindful to have operated between micromanaging the institution and allowing others to direct the progression of the institution.

After the decision has been made, it is necessary for the president to follow through with the decision. Walker (1979) categorized possible outcomes for the president: (a) to be a president that speaks harshly and operates softly, (b) talking forcefully and forgetting about it later, (c) moving forcefully with little disregard for others, (d) being tough on "non-critical issues" (i.e., being timely for meetings) and moderate on important issues (i.e., whether to building another residence hall), (e) to function as tough both in communication and operations, and finally (f) to be aggressive to external individuals and to internal members. The president has the immense task of setting forth an idea and then ensuring that it is completed. The previously presented ideas were possible perspectives presidents could use in the management of their institution. The behavior chosen by the presidents will reflect on the overall campus (Walker, 1979).

The research study performed by Walker addressed the linkage of the presidency to the university community. However, another key relationship often overlooked is the one between the president and trustees. Walker recommended that: (a) a good relationship should be maintained between the two groups; (b) trustees will influence the model of the university and those who dwell inside; (c) be attentive that trustees' perceptions of themselves influence the core of the institutions; (d) the president should
guide the trustees to become policy architects and to refrain from involvement in
management; (e) understand the trustees are a loosely coupled group but maintain
remarkable power; (f) boards, in collaboration with the president, should periodically
perform an assessment of themselves; (g) trustees should also exclude themselves from
personnel matters of the institutions, except at the insistence of the president; (h) retain
comfortable working relations with the board, presidents should trust impending
resignations; (i) do not entertain tasks and assignments given by a single trustee (the
board functions as a collective group as should be treated as such); (j) take the
responsibility of the decisions of the board; (k) maintain a level of honesty and trust
between two parties; (l) keep the trustees grounded in their role as campus affairs; and
(m) the overall performance of the board is more important than a single meeting
(Walker, 1979).

Kerr and Gade (1987) also depicted the power of the president as decreasing and
the power of the board of trustees as increasing. Trustees' movement from a policy-
making body to the management group of the institutions was continuous. In light of
court cases, financial problems, and recent scandals, trustees have evolved into a
regulation body ensuring that the policies are being maintained.

Historically, the president has served as the principle administrator. Stoke (1959)
deﬁned the chief function of the president was to be a visionary and an architect. Most
presidents were overwhelmed with the daunting tasks that rise from this position. But
Stoke recommended presidents view themselves, their institution, students, and the public
through a truthful lens during their tenure. To ensure that this is possible, it was strongly
encouraged that presidents become effective administrators.
The effective administrator would appreciate the basic task of organizing to set the tone of their presidency. The meticulous act of arrangement supported the president in clearly sharing the direction and path for the institution. Besides serving as a master organizer, the president must serve as the primary businessman (Stoke, 1959). Most corporations did not believe that they share the same characteristics with a college or university president. In fact, they are more similar than dissimilar.

Colleges and universities operate with cash flows paralleled to an average business. The management of the institution resembled the corporate structure (e.g., property, personnel, and research and development). Just as corporate giants competed for customers, a college president campaigns for students and their federal aid. They were similar in service and growth, but higher education presidents encountered boundaries.

The corporate 'cousin' was not confined by the academic tenure. The process of employment and dismissal was one of the major differences. The ideal of free management was not possible; customers were often delivered conflicting answers along the same timeline, and should keep traditions and rituals of the institutions. The president was assigned the job of maintaining the balance between the corporate and college management.

Discussions about the presidency commonly reflected a permanent presidential appointment, but increasingly, more in the area of HBCUs, interim or acting presidents have held this office. Temporary presidential leadership is similarly important to the general structure of the institution. Langevin and Koenig (2004) examined the difference between an acting and interim presidential leadership. The importance of an interim or
acting president's contributions to an institution, how a temporary president should function in the short-term capacity, and advice on the reaction of the institution to the short-term leadership were addressed.

Langevin and Koenig (2004) gave a clear outline of the principal differences between the two presidencies. An interim president is an external person who assumes the presidency for a short period of time. He or she was chosen to evade the internal baggage that might occur during transitions. On average, these presidents have served as president and have experience in the position. An acting president is an internal person who occupies the presidency for a short term. The acting president is placed in the position to continue the direction of the previous administration and is not to be involved in transitional administration. More likely, she or he is another senior officer without experience as president.

Both administrations, interim and acting, serve the interest of the institution for a short period of time, but Langevin and Koenig (2004) identified the interim president as more desirable for the progression of the institution. Researchers offered major points of the interim presidents. The first was the previous experience and knowledge held by the president. Second was the interim president should not be a candidate for the vacancy. The president should not be placed into the position indefinitely or without a set start date and end date of service. Finally, the president should not have a relationship with the institution before serving as interim president. The outlined points of service and selection of interim leadership are set aside for the protection of the interim president and the institution.
The importance of the presidency rests on the interim president’s ability to lead until permanent leadership is chosen. The president’s objective is to continue operation and progression of the institution or to repair areas of trouble and concern. Depending on the reasons for the previous permanent president’s departure, it should give guidance to the role the interim president plays. If a permanent president’s leave is quick and unplanned or the term of service was lengthy, then an interim president should be invited to serve. The selection of an interim president in these situations could have the responsibility to smooth the turbulence from an abrupt end of presidential tenure and help the institution begin to function under a different style of leadership. Another opportunity to employ an interim president is in the sabbatical of a president. During the presidential sabbatical, an interim president can continue the duties of president. This will ensure that operations continued, and the president is safe and secure with the knowledge to return a presidency and an institution (Langevin & Koenig, 2004).

Presidents at HBCUs

According to Ebony (1999), leaders of HBCUs are a group of individuals with varied backgrounds in their careers. Leaders of HBCUs in this particular article were “scientists, corporate executives, former government officials and even former television personalities” (p.84). The article was an overview of incoming leadership of HBCUs, 46 newly named presidents from 1992 to 1999; all were of African American descent. Of 46 newly named presidents, 9 were women. Ebony revisited the issue of the leadership of HBCUs in 2004; the group of newly named presidents, four men and four women, were again from diverse careers to include a former lawyer, a diplomat for the U.S. State
Department, a mathematician, and a historian. A range of previous career choices for newly appointed presidents of HBCUs has not changed from 1999 to 2004.

Dr. Carlton F. Brown, President of Savannah State University located in Georgia, in the Ebony (1999) article, described new HBCU presidents:

No individual can encompass all of the knowledge, experience, and judgment necessary to operate the modern institution. The new leader needs to be broadly knowledgeable, have a stronger grasp of finance, technology, and teamwork, and needs to be a perpetual change agent. (p.86)

However, Mr. William H. Gray III, former president and CEO of the United Negro College Fund, offered reasoning behind the governing boards’ decisions to select presidents from fields other than education. He stated in Ebony (1999),

They’ve [governing boards and trustees] looked at the skills that make a good university leader—fund-raising skills, management skills, communication skills—and, recognizing that those skills exist in many individuals outside of the academy, they’ve turned to business people or other prominent people who may have been in education only a short while or who may have never been in education at all. (p.86)

Dr. Brown and Mr. Gray revealed that the need to serve various capacities of an institution of higher learning cannot be encompassed by one person, but require a team. The duties of HBCU presidents reach beyond the normal dilemmas of their counterparts at non-HBCUs.
While at the helm of their institutions, presidents of HBCUs are faced with problems that most higher education institutions are not confronting. In *Ebony* (1994), Dr. Sywyget, President of Howard University, stated,

Many African American colleges and universities have to deal quite aggressively with a technology deficit. Our campuses [HBCUs] are being wired for computers not as a frill or an add-on, but as a necessity so that our students and faculty have the competitive edge they'll need in the modern world. (p.86)

In addition, presidents are challenged with institutions with operational budgets normally in a deficit, deteriorating facilities, and, in some cases, the loss of their accreditation (*Ebony*, 1999; Kormanik, 2004). Since 2002, three HBCUs have not received reaccreditation on their first attempt, Edwards Waters College in Jacksonville, FL; Barber-Scotia College in Concord, NC; and Morris Brown College in Atlanta, GA, for various reasons.

Another desired skill of new HBCU presidents was the return to the philosophy of predecessors in the method of HBCU leadership, such as Presidents Benjamin E. Mays of Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia, Mary McLeod Bethune of Bethune-Cookman College in Daytona Beach, Florida, and Mordecai Johnson of Howard University in Washington, DC. These individuals were pioneers in the development of African American students to become the social activists, philosophers, and revolutionaries.

HBCU presidents have been noted for becoming mentors, teachers, and encouragers to students such as Martin Luther King, Jr., John Hope Franklin, Thurgood Marshall, Oprah Winfrey, Tavis Smiley, Tom Joyner, Booker T. Washington, W. E. B. DuBois, and Willie Gary (*Ebony*, 1999). The article further explained that graduates of HBCUs
believe, “[HBCU presidents will need to] reclaim and reframe African American students and turn out graduates with character and technical skills dedicated to the ancient trilogy of African American colleges - service, struggle, and excellence” (p. 86). Dr. John T. Gibson, President of Alabama A&M University, agreed with graduates but maintained the need to have a dual role in the presidency. He stated, “A business background or one in higher education administration could be a plus but whatever the degree, the HBCU president absolutely must have heart” (p. 86).

According to Minor (2004), leadership at HBCUs, especially presidencies, has been continuously researched with negative findings. The researcher explained presidents of HBCUs have traditionally been projected as “autocratic” in their approach (Hamilton, 2002). But understanding methods used to arrive at answers at HBCUs should first be established (Minor, 2004). Active participants, such as faculty, staff, administrators, the mission statement, and the institutional culture of HBCUs influence how decisions are made. Also, to fully understand circumstances surrounding decision-making at HBCUs, it should not be forgotten the method of comparison made to other institutions. According to Minor, two inequalities in the comparison method were occurring. The first are individuals who are unfamiliar with HBCUs, and the second was the same group who compare HBCUs to predominately White institutions. Researchers embarked on comparing these two institutions without the expertise or, at minimum, a foundational knowledge base of the institution could, inadvertently, portray HBCUs in a negative perspective. Coupling decision-making policies with researchers inexperienced in HBCUs often produce inadequate policies and produce negative research.
The upcoming African American leadership, regardless of gender, possessed knowledge, skills, and the confidence to lead all institutions of higher learning. Cunningham (1992) revealed that African American leadership would emerge with the understanding of their purpose based on the institution they serve. HBCUs seek the leadership of young African American intellectuals to assume the helm of their institutions. Dr. Walter Kimbrough would be considered to be a member of the new African American intellectuals. In September 2005, at the age of 38, he was formally installed as the President of Philander Smith College in Little Rock, AR, the oldest HBCU in the state.

Cunningham (1992) indicated since the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, the inclusion of African American individuals at White institutions increased the number of African American faculty and administrators. Nevertheless, appointments of African American administrators were an “appeasement” to the African American community and a principal method to create a funnel to channel federal monies into the concerned institution. Another inclusion of African Americans at White institutions was to retain funding from the federal government. But frustration occurred; African Americans were invited to institutions only for the ethnic and racial background and not to contribute to the overall institutional culture. Traditionally, African American administrators served as representatives without the ability to create or to encourage change. This was due partly to small organizational structure from the past. As institutions grew, they became more involved with state and federal laws and regulations, increased expansion with the utilization of technology, adhered to stricter guidelines for student financial aid, increased dependence on grants and external funding, and additional administrative responsibilities.
African American administrators at White institutions possessed less expertise in the college or university structure than their White counterparts (Birnbaum, 1989).

Institutional leaderships understood methods for decision-making are critical to the management decisions. Universities, regardless of the classification, exploited African American administrators to mimic the student population. The role of African American administrators was no longer about just holding a position and representing a particular group, but about intellectuals with comprehension and the ability to communicate their ethnic and racial background to others. Also, they are informally charged with conveying the ideals of the African American history, identification of the contribution of African American leadership to administrations, and a positive expression of the African American perspective in colleges and universities outside of the administration.

Women as Administrators

Women, regardless of their racial and ethnic group, have been most ignored in the progressive movement in leadership for African American colleges and universities (Lindsay, 1999). To discuss women's perspectives on the leadership of postsecondary institutions, the American Council on Education's Office of Women in Higher Education (OWHE) convened the Fourth Women Presidents' Summit in June 2002. The Director, Dr. Claire Van Ummersen, described it as, "a way in which they can use their knowledge and creativity to bring new leadership perspectives to their campuses, our country, and the world at large" (Black Issues in Higher Education, 2002). While the summit hosted a large contingency of presidents and chancellors, the center point of the conference was a
candid exchange between Dr. Mary Catherine Bateson, the Clarence J. Robinson Professor of Anthropology and English at George Mason University and then President-elect Dr. Johnetta B. Cole of Bennett College (BIHE, 2002).

Dr. Cole’s perspective on women’s contribution to higher education was to address a core belief, “choosing to lead.” She introduced the insightfulness of choosing a path of leadership centered on linking individuals and focused on the varying levels of management, instruction, and leadership in the system of higher education. Dr. Cole continued her presentation by including that those in education were laying the foundations for learning. This was closely linked to her then-recent appointment to the presidency of Bennett College, an all women HBCU located in Greensboro, NC. She explained her return to the presidency as a “voyage of discovery.” The discussion between Drs. Cole and Bateson offered insight into the African American women’s transition between institutions and positions and how various women have experienced the journey differently.

Women confronted with many obstacles associated with their career, but the personal responsibilities also affect their movement up the career ladder. Dr. Lucy J. Reuben, Former Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs at North Carolina Central University (NCCU), was aware of the personal tasks affecting her career. Dr. Reuben’s experiences as a mother and an administrator did cross to create concern for her and her family. When Dr. Reuben was selected for the position at NCCU, she was serving as Dean of the School of Business at South Carolina State University (SCSU) in Orangeburg, South Carolina. Her residence was active with a teenage son and her husband. Dr. John A. Cole, Dean for the School of Professional Programs at Benedict
College (BC) in Columbia, South Carolina. Assuming this opportunity would ask her to suggest to her son to forgo his senior year and to enroll in a new school and her husband to move his career to North Carolina. Dr. Reuben and Dr. Cole decided to allow their son to complete his senior year in South Carolina and to create two households (Hamilton, 2002).

Other women who have pondered the choice between family responsibilities and career advancement were Drs. A. Toy Caldwell-Coleman, Beverly Daniel Yamas, and JoAnne Haysbert (Hamilton, 2002). These three women also have constructed separate households to aid in the advancement of their careers. Unlike their male peers, they have the added duties of organizing a residence and home and the duties of their position. They ensured their children’s needs are met, their marriages maintained, and their households structured. Hamilton explained this as a double day. The first half of the day involved the office, and the completion of the day was household duties.

These women administrators shared that the relationship they have with their children has changed. Children and fathers have improved on their relationship in the absence of the mother-administrator (Hamilton, 2002). The other change in the relationship is the separation, in the opinion of some of the mothers; the independence of the children has also increased. Another relationship that has changed has been their marriages. Dr. Yolanda T. Moses, former president for the American Association for Higher Education, shared that “couples can have it all, but not all at the same time . . . have a clear sense of when it’s ‘your turn’ and when it’s not” (p. 5). These couples developed a teamwork ideal that continued during their marriage. To overcome changes in separate households, traditionally for men, Hamilton provided suggestions. Those are
to create and to maintain open lines of communication, be spiritual, and to keep a steady approach to all activities and decisions.

*African American Women Administrators in Higher Education*

Administrators, regardless of gender and ethnic group, have specific sets of responsibilities. These included providing leadership to their individual department as well as institution-wide initiatives, managing the budget of their appointed areas, and other requirements of the position they assume.

African American women have very different experiences in administrative roles than their counterparts; this not only includes White women, but all men. According to Mosely (1980), studies that have reflected administrators’ perceptions of their roles have traditionally been from the viewpoint of African American men. Mosely further stated that “search of the literature provided little or no information” (p. 296) of the inclusion from the standpoint of African American women. Mosely’s work was created with the intention to discuss six points of African American women in higher education. However, for this literature review, the central themes were from African American women’s perceptions on their inclusion in the decision-making process and barriers and pressures felt by them in their administrative roles in the field of leadership in higher education.

African American women in positions of leadership described their experiences as tokenism and their positions as non-influential in policy or decision-making (Mosely, 1980). In addition, they represented their careers in higher education as being “overworked, underpaid, alienated, isolated, uncertain, and powerless” (p.296). Mosely reproduced a study by Moore and Wagstaff from 1974, which was the basis of their book
African American Educators in White Colleges. Mosely sent 232 questionnaires to African American women from 79 postsecondary institutions from across the United States. Of the 232 questionnaires, 120 returned, usable questionnaires revealed that most African American women administrators were expected to be experts on topics related to African Americans. While this was not of great concern, it was a burden with the added responsibility without the release time and added resources for performing these additional duties. According to Mosely, being seen as a representative for an ethnic group and a gender is a common practice for African American women employed at predominantly White institutions.

Mosely (1980) also focused on the separation of African American women from African American men and White women in higher education, which fueled ideas about affirmative action and nondiscrimination in the postsecondary workplace. Mosely presented African American women’s inclusion in higher education via Constance Carroll’s 1973 theory of three is a crowd. The affirmative action and nondiscrimination Executive Orders 11246 and 11375 were signed into law 1965 and 1967, respectively, forbidding race, color, age, gender, or national origin to be used as criteria for selection of employment. According to Carroll (1973), African American women believed this would have afforded many opportunities to improve their employment and economic status. However, it was with executive orders that White women were included as a minority based on gender. The inclusion of White women and African American men in the Executive Orders produced the new three is a crowd in the search for employment. African American women were placed last in the selection process, after African American men and White women. In turn, it created a multitude of individuals for
employment (Carroll, 1973). The laws were created to increase diversity in the workplace, as Mosely stated in her article, were a “bust” for African American women. Nevertheless, employment experiences for African American men and White women were changed. According to Mosely, of the 120 usable returned questionnaires, only four African American women believed that the women’s movement was for all women. A majority of the respondents (56.5%) perceived the women’s movement was for White, middle-class women who were detached from White, lower class women and all African American women. The greatest concern for African American women described in the survey was gender issues overshadowed by minority status issues. Most of the respondents in Mosely’s study believed the women’s movement was a “real humanistic movement.” However, it was only an opportunity for advancement for White women and not a system of change for women of all racial groups.

The Mosely (1980) case study was an overview of African American women’s perceptions of the women’s movement, affirmative action, executive orders, and nondiscrimination executive orders. While the study revealed that African American women were very optimistic in the women’s movement and executive orders to facilitate progress, they were very disappointed in the results. The women’s movement was not for all women, and affirmative action was not for all persons of color.

Dr. Ruth Simmons, President of Brown University, is an example of African American women’s influence on higher education. Prior to her presidency at Brown University, Dr. Simmons was the President of Smith College, a private women’s college. Her transition to the Brown presidency was a first for an African American and the first
for a woman. Both demographic statistics are of interest but are more of an indicator of the movement of leadership towards African American women.

According to Crayton (2001), Dr. Simmons' family history closely relates to other African Americans from the South. She was the youngest of 12 children from Grapeland, Texas, and her parents were sharecroppers. They moved to Houston, and her father was employed in a factory; her mother became a maid. Dr. Simmons described her parents as "brutally hard and sometimes demeaning... they helped me to understand something very important: that poverty is neither a state of mind nor a definition of one's character, but merely the condition of one's purse" (p. 104). This family principle maintained a staple of her personal and professional development. The ideal of having good character was the foundation of Dr. Simmons' approach to her professional development.

However, Bradley, Carey, and Whitaker (1989) understood the view could be widening to other African American women in higher education.

Bradley et al. (1989) also researched issues connected to African American women and their leadership in higher education. Their research study invited 21 African American women college presidents from various types of institutions to join, and 15 of them agreed. The college presidents were then interviewed via phone about their leadership style and associated race and gender issues. The presidents shared that symbolism played a role in the "organizational culture." Nevertheless, they stated their gender and race had hindered them from obtaining benchmarks. The researchers added various presidents did often receive negative feedback from others. Observers acknowledged their ability was less than White peers, regardless of gender. These statements added validity to the pay scale of African American women being at the
bottom of the reverse pyramid. In contrast, the presidents stated they are driven harder to advance in projects and other responsibilities to improve others’ perceptions of them.

Bradley et al. (1989) reviewed the positive side of presidential leadership of African American women. One president commented because African American women are “less valued” they are considered to be less intimidating. In turn, it was easier for the president to influence others and assembled them to action. When brought together under an objective, it is an opportunity to make a “competent presence.” This opened the possibility to persuade policy and governance on campus and reduced the negative scrutiny of others. Competence was an opportunity for presidents to assert who they were and what they represented to those invested in the campus, both internally and externally. The interaction between presidents and their communities were more of a concern for public institutions.

Another issue shared by the surveyed presidents in the Bradley et al. study (1989) was the acceptance of others. While most presidents during their tenure strive to achieve acceptance, it is more difficult for African American women to earn. The process to earn acceptance from individuals was much more difficult because of the question of loyalty to which group based on gender and race. They added the traditional theme, “we-they relationship,” was very common to HBCUs and was based on the gender. Based on gender, the faculty was majority male with female chairs in administration. The conflict between the faculty and administration has traditionally taken place, but when gender roles were introduced, it was transformed to gender issues.

The final issue linked to women administrators is the credentials for assuming a presidency. Bradley et al. (1989) explained that data suggested that there are
inconsistencies associated with obtaining and retaining the top-level position of leadership. African American women explained, when they assumed the position of president, their qualifications are higher than their male counterparts. Thus, women in the role of president are “overqualified” and have been requested to prove their experience further than what is commonly required. Presidents commented African American women were observed, and often were more interesting when failing than when succeeding. They also revealed benchmarks set for one group were not equal to those set for another group giving precedence to a “double standard.” This double standard aids in the “stereotypical perceptions” of African American women’s leadership as inadequate and reverted them to familiar “manly” or “nurturer.” While African American women were being viewed as caregivers, men and White women return to steering their institutions through policy and governance.

Alexander and Scott (1983) interviewed 39 African American women administrators in White institutions across the United States. The research question for the Alexander and Scott research study was: What personal characteristics for administrative leadership do these African American women administrators embody? The African American women responded that they felt a high self-reliance in their career path due to their professional development. They identified along their career development that they utilized on-the-job training to increase their ability to be promoted from within their institutions. They cited continually working through the ranks of the organization, early formal education in areas relevant to leadership positions, and participating in management training when offered were important. The key characteristic to propel these women administrators was the development and
strengthening of various personal characteristics conducive to successful leadership. This was especially important in creating “self-confidence” to seek the counsel and advice from mentors.

_African American Women Administrators at HBCUs_

Faculty membership has been the entrance into the pipeline for individuals, men and women, to move forward to a coveted presidency. For African American women, the opening to their management careers has been through a directorship in a minority service programs (i.e., Educational Opportunity and TRIO). EOP was designed to improve the access and retention of low-income and educationally disadvantaged students (csu, n.d.). TRIO Programs, a phase for the three founding organizations, was based on the mission of EOP or advancing students from low-income backgrounds to succeed in colleges and universities. This program evolved from Upward Bound, Upward Bound Math/Science, and School and Student Service for Financial Aid. Additional programs that have become part of the group were Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, and McNair Scholars (Federal TRIO Program, 2005). The starting point of a directorship of a minority retention program could, in most cases, be observed as unimportant. This contrast was untrue for African American women.

Jones (1984) reflected on her mentorships and network of women and men to increase her presence in policy-making and leadership positions. An individual can hold a title or position and fail to make impressions or progress in his or her respective area. Securing a position did not signal the person to be a leader. Conversely, it was possible for an individual to possess the power to strategize, implement, and produce projects
along with garnering the resources of task forces and committees without the position of title (Jones, 1984). A clear recognition of a true leader’s ability was the accomplishment of goals.

Associations and professional organizations developed conferences to foster informal mentorship and additional networking opportunities. Jones (1984) attributed her career advancement and continued success to these organizations. The importance of mentorships for women was support. The common misconception was mentorship for women was restricted to emotional guidance, but another core responsibility was to develop the potential skills and to link individuals with resources to improve their employment potential.

Mentorships often occur among peers on the same level of management. Still, presidents do encourage subordinates to strive to higher levels in administration. The perception of presidential mentorship from African American women in higher education, specifically women leading HBCUs, was best understood by a 1989 interview with then-President of Bennett College, Dr. Gloria Scott (Jones, 1990). In the article, Dr. Scott described her career development, her personal philosophy on leadership, and her dedication to the creation and facilitation of a pipeline to increase women’s leadership.

Dr. Scott attributed her movement upward in the organization structure to her experiences in entry and mid-level positions.

According to Jones (1990), Dr. Scott "honored her administrative skills...[with] experiences in [areas of] educational research, institutional research and planning...punctuated by terms as ‘special assistant’ and ‘assistant’" (p.29). She further recalled being advised not to accept such positions because of their ability to become “dead-end",
and “void of substantive learning experiences” (p.29). Nonetheless, Dr. Scott thrived in those positions with opportunities to engage in various activities, which provided on-the-job training in a multitude of roles. One position was the establishment, and later direction, of the institutional research office. The primary duty of this position was supervision of the 10-year plan for the institution. The post offered her the capability to gain experience in the construction of long-range vision. Her involvement in the institutional planning produced knowledge she carried into her presidency at Bennett College.

Dr. Gloria Scott’s presidency (Jones, 1990) was founded on the idea of “the ‘vision’ [of an institution] has [to] have depth, as well as breath” (p.30). Jones (1990) continued by analyzing Dr. Scott’s personal ideals for senior-level leadership. Those points were: (a) to have a wealth of knowledge of the research and information in the area, (b) to bridge the gap between the policymakers and those who are affected by policy decisions, (c) to have an understanding of “reality” and continue to be a supportive leader, (d) to create and maintain a solid commitment to the purpose of the institution and have the ability to articulate this commitment to others, (e) to acknowledge the external roles of an institution, and (f) to cultivate growth among the administration and students of an institution. While she did use these goals in higher education, she has also been a strong advocate of the pipeline for women’s development.

Dr. Scott (Jones, 1990) stated “part of my leadership style is to help enable . . . young women, especially, to develop leadership qualities . . . in the pipeline” (p.30). In doing so, she understood that a large part of the teaching process was the allowing of those in the pipeline to make mistakes. Thus, participants in the pipeline are learning to
correct errors and retain the lesson. This method is an example of Dr. Scott’s “classroom.” She described this method as “messiness” in the participatory method of leadership.

Her method of mentorship was incorporated in her direction of the campus. When she conducted meetings on campus (Jones, 1990), most were held outside her office. This would give her the ability to “move back and forth and see things on campus and get a better sense of what is going on” (p.30). In becoming a public figure, the president has become the center of anecdotes, rumors, and gossip. Dr. Scott added the president cannot control the public image. However, in her case, the truth would be told when questioned.

Dr. Gloria Scott was the President of Bennett College from 1989 until her retirement. Her tenure as president affected the students, faculty, and administration of Bennett College and the Greensboro, North Carolina community. The dedication she displayed to understand the field of higher education, commitment to being a change agent to Bennett College, and her establishment as an advisor to others who seek promotion in administration, have been strong abilities of Dr. Scott. Other African American women in presidencies at HBCUs often imitate the model. In addition to the multitude of duties and responsibilities of the president, African American women presidents at HBCUs have used previous work experiences to propel them into senior-level management. Once in their positions, establishing their administrations with younger women is an opportunity to share their experiences.
Career Path to Leadership Positions

According to Nieboer (1975), there are two issues that contributed to the low number of women in senior-level higher education positions, regardless of ethnic group. The first issue was the small number of women who are currently in those positions serving as role models or examples. The second issue was the low number of women applying to senior-level positions. These two factors enhanced the low number of senior-level women administrators in higher education. However, Nieboer presented a case study that referred to women’s presence in senior-level management. Its specific focus was on the women’s educational background, personal and professional experiences in the pursuit of their careers.

Nieboer (1975) reviewed the relationship between women and their peers in upward movement in higher education. Women are not commonly perceived as leaders in management positions. Nieboer presented a case study by Coleman, McElroy, and Whitehurst (1973) as an example. It stated, upon completion of a leadership task, male colleagues do not view women as leaders. Moreover, when the objective is achieved, women do not receive positive response. Women were more likely to have received positive feedback for their role as supportive contributors than leaders in a task.

Nieboer (1975) also pointed to a case study by Horner (1968) about the qualities that are observed as leadership traits. Horner presented senior-level administrators related masculinity to successful leadership. In turn, when women presented femininity in leadership opportunities, it was considered weak. Masculine traits in leadership are competition, independence, competence, intellectual achievement, and leadership. Most of these qualities are observed as the opposite of feminine traits and are most desirable in
the selection of an administrator. Nieboer gave an example by Bowman (1962) on the
promotability of a specific type of leader. According to Bowman, most of the
respondents of the study believed race and ethnic background should not be used in
promotions. Conversely, the same group believed age and gender have been factors in
non-promotion and promotion of individuals.

Nieboer (1975) offered another example of the low presence of women in higher
education with a survey of 118 member institutions of the National Association of State
University and Land-Grant Colleges by Arter in 1972. The study was based on 101
responses from women in senior-level management positions in higher education. The
survey yielded results of women’s perceptions of women in senior-level management.
According to Arter (1972), the results among the member institutions were: (a) There are
very low numbers of women in senior-level leadership positions; (b) based on the
Executive Orders 11246 and 11375, there will be an increase of women in these
positions; (c) the principle leader of the institution (i.e., president or chancellor) is
inclined to select a woman for senior-level leadership positions; and (d) gender should
not be in consideration for the selection of women in senior-level leadership positions.

Based on the previous points, women were not active participants in policy-
making decisions; it is partly due to the gender roles of women and men. Nieboer (1975)
addressed this point by providing a case study authored Broverman, Vogel, Broverman,
and Clarkson (1972). The case study was a comparison between men’s and women’s
actions being perceived as having a positive outcome. Gender roles are intertwined in the
personalities of both genders. Therefore, in order for women to be considered to have
leadership qualities, women had to understand society’s observation of them as not
“feminine.” Due to the low number of women retaining their feminine traits in senior-level leadership positions, it is very comprehensible why more women are not pursuing leadership positions. Fuller and Batcheler (1953) stated that on-the-job performance for women is professed to be less important than their on-the-job behavior. This further offered an understanding that most women hold their position behavior in higher status because they are aware that they may be viewed as possessing masculine traits.

Patrick (1973), as presented by Nieboer (1975), studied a group of women in graduate programs for becoming medical doctors, attorneys, scientists, and engineers. The researcher compared this group of women with advanced degrees to women that had chosen to become full-time homemakers. Women with advanced degrees did not have greater desire for autonomy than their homemaker counterparts but were more independent in their field. The motivation for achievement for the advanced degree women was “pride in competence” and for homemakers it was approval from others. Also, homemakers demonstrated low self-esteem and disbelief in their own ability or in fear of success unlike their advance degree equivalent. Yet, parents of women in pursuit of their advanced degree did have higher expectations for their daughter than parents of women who were full-time homemakers, and it is illustrated in their leadership positions. Development of women motivated for advanced degrees was established in high school and with parental involvement. They possessed the same self-esteem and fear of success as their peers. Based on their personal motivation for achievement, women seem to possess strong factors to become leaders. As previously stated by Horner (1968), this personal motivation for achievement of competence has been discerned as a masculine trait.
In 1989, Berrey revisited psychological power of women in leadership roles questioning if the struggle that women encounter to assume leadership roles emerges from internal or external forces. In the literature review, she uncovered both internal and external forces are contributors to women’s slow movement up the administrative ladder. Hesitation had been given as a contributor as to why women do not push through the proverbial glass ceiling. Berrey identified the fear of power as a key reason in the delay or refusal to apply or initially show interest in high-level management positions. With advancement comes increased responsibility; there are increased opportunities to be more visible and attain power. The grouping of additional power, public attention, and position responsibilities created a negative viewpoint for some women (Yomner, 1968).

Power, according to Berrey (1989), has been described positively as "independence, potency, aggressiveness, and dominance" (p.12) and is closely linked to male leadership traits. Men are expected to possess these characteristics in leadership positions. Nonetheless, women are expected to embrace power very differently than their male counterparts. Women’s affiliation with power is depicted as “dependent, soft, passive, subservient, and irrational” (p.12). Two very polar perceptions of power exist based on gender. Women pondering higher levels of leadership understand men’s power characteristics were thrust upon them. Characteristics that once described men in a positive sense are frequently transformed into negative reflection for women. Women comfortable with powerful positions challenge the perceptions of women’s roles, simultaneously challenging the established social order by which traditional roles rest. Berrey (1989) reported when a women is identified as powerful in a position, she is
viewed by others, both men and women, as "unfeminine, dangerous, and threatening" (p.12).

Another conflict for women in high-level leaderships was moral responsibility. To address it, Berrey (1989) referenced Gilligan's (1982) book titled *In a Different Voice*. Gilligan outlined western women were raised to please the needs of others, to create and maintain relationships, and to be a caregiver for others. Relationships, based on this traditional structure, have a strong correlation with the desire of community building, romance, and concern for individuals' feelings. Men were raised with contradictory moral roles of living, to be fair and to be risk-takers. In being risk-takers, men were taught to be critical thinkers and to disregard emotional influence when making a decision. The absence of emotions in making decisions allowed men to learn that consequences might hurt them and might hurt someone else, ultimately, teaching men the rules of "the game." The game consisted of competition, removal of emotions in decision-making, becoming accustomed to power, bargaining, and strengthening the ability to function independently.

As previously stated, routinely, relationships are very important for women. The desire to establish and to maintain a positive interaction among participants was the core principle for women in this view. A positive relationship for women is being observed as "nice" and well liked. Yet when the relationship is no longer viewed as positive, women are less likely to resolve the conflict, also known as conflict aversion (Berrey, 1989). Conflict resolution forces women to address competition, as earlier stated. This capability is not traditionally associated with women. When women are presented with the option to resolve conflict, they often deflect the opportunity. Sassen (1980)
reasoned that solving conflicts would force the woman to address the win-lose outcome at the conclusion of the process. Women's reluctance to become involved in conflict does not have a strong outcome for women dealing with conflict resolution. The separation between personal and professional relationships will have to take precedence if women are to assume leadership positions. For example, if a woman's personal relationship intimidated a professional relationship, or the impact of power or position had a negative impact on others, then the woman might feel self-centered and insensitive, emotions that women should not experience based on Sassen's research study. On the other side, if a woman refused to participate because of trepidation or possible insult to another person than a peer's opinion about her selection to a principle role will be questioned and seen as sign of weakness (Sassen, 1980).

Another key characteristic was concerned with women in leadership roles is expectations, from themselves and from others. Traditionally, expectations for men as policy-makers and women to complete the established policy differ. The perplexity took place when women comfortably assumed powerful positions, and men become hesitant and doubtful. The power women assumed in a role is often awkward for them and others that surround them. They are unsure about the correct method to exhibit their power, and others around them are unconfident about the accurate response to them. Apart from the reaction from themselves and others, women assumed duties and addressed situations unfamiliar with the possibility of making unpopular decisions. These unpopular decisions could be interpreted as rebelling against the norm (Johnson, 1976). Berrey (1989) suggested a new system to process conflicting expectations. The suggestion was
to resolve that everyone has an expectation of each other, the woman or others around her, neither one's expectation of the other was incorrect and should not be questioned.

Women's comprehension of how they are promoted is another contributor to women's hesitation to assume leadership roles. Men commonly accepted the credit for positive outcome, and when problems arise, they were also more likely to place the blame on others. Women were more likely than their counterparts to assume the responsibility when problems arise and less likely to absorb the credit when good outcomes occur. Due in part to women's inability to accept good results, women are not considered for leadership positions (Berrey, 1989).

But the strongest contributor to the detriment of women's pursuit to senior-level administration was being visible (Berrey, 1989). As an individual ascended the career ladder, they became increasingly more visible in the institutional culture. Berrey listed four ideals associated with the reluctance to serve in higher levels of management. There were a growing number of women in administration in positions previously held by men. In doing so, women availed themselves to the opinion of internal and external constituents. When women made decisions, they are progressively being discussed in the public domain. Once women made decisions, constituents may have voiced their protest to decisions and policies. This sometimes created a conflict between the decision maker, a woman, and the campus community.

Also, women were not wanting to progress higher because their exposure to the public and to the possible repercussions of open, public mistakes. In situations when a woman administrator had chosen a direction, and results are negative or not widely accepted, the woman's perception was her career has been delayed or halted. The risk of
making a public mistake and the possible repercussions were factors in women not pursuing higher positions in colleges and universities (Berrey, 1989).

The third point with reference to women’s standpoint of visibility in senior leadership positions was “the ol’ boy network” (Berrey, 1989). This network was an informal organization with membership traditionally restricted to White men. Since the civil rights movement, membership had slowly opened to include men from other ethnic groups. Women observed the protection men received in the decision process, especially in the public forum. Women attributed it to benefits of the old boy network. Taking a high profile risk for a man, with the support of the old boy network, buffered the negative outcomes from others and secured them to make other such judgments. Women’s viewpoints of a system paralleled to the old boy network do not exist, thus there are not offers of a safeguard for them to take high profile risks. The absence of such a system gave women the feeling or perception of being unsupported.

The final factor of concern for women was having more advanced education and professional experiences than men in the identical position. Berrey (1989) gave an example of the Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, and Broverman (1968) study. It confirmed opinions of their peers; women are considerably less qualified and knowledgeable in their respective field. Evaluations and assessments refuted claims of the group with concern of inexperience and education. Women believed they have more familiarity and education than their counterparts, and additional research supported their claims. But from their peers’ observations, they are not above their qualifications. Power and being visible to a greater population of individuals increased women’s pursuit to senior-level management.
Relationships were key support for women in leadership positions. When the
dynamics of a relationship suddenly changed, there was a strong correlation that the
relationship might end with women peers. Berrey (1989) examined relationships
between men and relationships between women. Of nine women senior-level
administrators interviewed, all of the nine women shared that one or more of valued
associations that they had recognized prior to their current position had been
discontinued. The identical question was posed to male senior-level administrators, and
only one third of the men identified that one or more of their valued associations had
ended. This was a large contrast between men and women relationships after moving
into senior-level management. Two reasons women encountered the conclusion of
acquaintances was due to the potential of losing the familiarity of the friendships and the
loneliness at the top. Additionally, women experienced this separation when they
surpassed the boundaries for women. The rising of women to the upper levels of
administration could and have caused other women in lower positions to sabotage women
in new positions. Berrey (1989) suggested women are revengeful by creating “negative
gossip, obstructionism, and active undermining” (p.15). To avoid these occurrences,
women elected not to enter into senior-level management.

Personal traits discussed above are a portion of the personal concerns for women.
Hennig (1970) researched the birth order and marital status of women presidents and vice
presidents of business administrations. Of the sample population, 35% were either an
only child or the oldest of two or three girls. All of the sample population had chosen
their career over marriage, with most wedding between the ages of 35 and 40. The delay
of marriage in favor of their careers exhibited an overview of the importance of career.
Based on case studies, presidents and those in senior-level management positions in higher education were more likely to assume some traits in leadership that might be conceived as masculine. In having these traits, these women understood they were respected among their peers due to the respect associated with masculine leadership. They are motivated by their competence in their field and usually do not seek the approval of others. Women in these positions were products of families where they were the only child or the eldest of girls in the family; they were very independent in their adolescent years, and their parents maintained high expectations of them in their careers. Those who became presidents of institutions of higher learning are individuals who possessed these qualities and traits (Hennig, 1970).

A program that has been identified as a factor in the increased presence of African American women in senior-level positions has been the National Identification Program (NIP) sponsored by the American Council on Education (ACE), also known as NIP/ACE. According to Shavlik and Touchton (1984), NIP was a multileveled program to expand the barriers of women of all ethnic and racial groups to assume the next level of leadership. The program was not created primarily to produce only presidents for colleges and universities. It was constructed to support women with the focus, drive, and experience to obtain the next level in postsecondary senior-level management.

Since the founding of ACE, there have been three programs created to research and to assist the upward mobility of women. The inaugural program was the standing committee on the training of women for public service, created in 1920, which lasted for a brief time. In 1953, ACE formed a committee on the education of women, which
continued for 8 years. The committees on the training of women for public service and
the education of women were both predecessors to NIP.

NIP was the result of the collaboration between commission members of ACE
and the Office for Women in Higher Education (OWHE) staff members. Shavlik and
Touchton (1984) reported a renewed interest from ACE in the development of women
leaders was based on a number of reasons. Those reasons were: (a) the new presidential
leadership of ACE, (b) the membership of the Board of ACE was very interested in the
progression of women in higher education, (c) the staff members of ACE were also
committed to the development of a leadership program for women, and (d) a contingency
of women in senior-level management positions volunteered their resources for the
mentorship and framework for the creation of NIP. The cohesive effort of then-president
of ACE, Board of Directors, staff members, and women leaders in the community of
postsecondary education asserted ideas of women’s attainment of positions that included
policy-making and fiscal management. While Shavlik and Touchton added there were
leaders in higher education that were women, the key concern was the disproportionate
number in visible positions. The lack of the appearance of women has been a vital force
against women in leadership roles. It perpetuated the understanding, according to
Shavlik and Touchton, of the “bias, sex role stereotyping, institutional sexism-accounted
for much of the problem” (p.48).

Once the program received the support of key participants, the current structure
was extended to involve an objective for women of color. Originally, the infrastructure
was a network of state coordinators working in tandem with state planning committees
and state panels, a national panel, and ACE conferences with the specific focus and
mission to address policies and professional development for all women. To address the distinctive concerns of women of color, the Focus on Minority Women’s Advancement (FMWA) initiative was created. FMWA was designed to address the issues and concerns unique to African American, Asian American, Native American, and Hispanic Americans. As stated by Mosely (1980), the minority movement for women of color, especially African American women, was often dimmed by the women’s movement. The conception of FMWA was a successful attempt to identify and to address the professional development requirements tailored for minority women. Besides the creation of the FMWA, the structure included women currently or soon to be retired. The inclusion of retirees was to provide their resources in policy-making, fiscal management, and networking, with hopes of employment opportunities in the established field of higher education.

The numbers of women presidents increased from 154 to 253 in the first 8 years of NIP, which was an increase of 65%, the largest in the nation’s history (Shavlik & Touchton, 1984). The authors do not attribute the large growth directly to NIP, but they stated that NIP has been a contributing factor in growth. They indicated of the 99 women presidents appointed from 1977 to 1984, 25 had attended ACE national forums.

NIP, since its inception, has been founded on the mission of building a structure to increase the presence of women in senior-level management positions in higher education (Shavlik & Touchton, 1984). Even as the center of attention has been directed to all women’s involvement, the need for direction from women of color has been addressed. NIP has had a strong impact in identifying women with potential for succession, forming a system of mentors, coordinating state and national levels forums,
and increasing the interest of women’s ability to assume positions of policy-making and not enforcing policy (Shavlik & Touchton, 1984).

Another program created in 1965 by ACE to encourage women and minorities to ascend to presidencies was the ACE Fellows Program. In an effort to bridge this gap for women and minorities, ACE created the ACE Fellows Programs in 1965. The objective of the ACE Fellows Program was to provide the opportunity to be educated in the skills and knowledge of leadership and exposure that would lead to a presidency (Green, 1984). During the yearlong program, which is open to men and women from all racial and ethnic groups, participants are instructed on methods to begin the transition from junior-level management to key senior-level positions. Individuals selected from a national applicant pool to join an average yearly cohort of 35 members. The criteria to be invited into the program were based on candidates’ professional and educational records, recommendations, and the potential to contribute and lead in the field of higher education. Once selected into the program, members have the option to become a fellow at their respective institution (home) or at another institution (host) (Green, 1984).

Between 1965 and 1984, 748 persons participated in the program and moved in 18 cohorts (Green, 1984). In the summer 1984, then-director of the ACE Center for Leadership Development, and the supervisory board of the ACE Fellows Program, examined the progress of graduates from the program. According to Green (1984), the ACE Fellows Program was commonly called a “fast-tracking” program and, by 1983, had been instrumental in 83 graduates (11%) having served as a president of a college or university. Of the first 15 cohorts, 33% were women, and 16% were African American cohort members. More specifically, the first five cohorts were 8% women; the next five
cohorts 23% were women; and the final five cohorts were 45% women. The ACE Fellows Program was a movement to increase women’s presence in senior-level leadership. By December 1981, 66 former cohort members had become presidents, of which 18% were women. In addition, only 15% of the women in the same cohort group had been promoted to vice president or assistant/associate vice president compared to men (40%). In the final group of participants, 16% of women did not move forward to vice presidencies or presidencies, which is a sharp contrast to all men in the similar group to move up the administrative ladder.

The statistical analysis from the research study focused on African American women’s participation in the ACE Fellows Program. In surveyed cohorts, from its creation in 1965 to 1980, there were no minority women to obtain a presidency. However, former African American women members (20%) were primarily employed in deanships, in comparison to 18% of minority men, 22% of White women, and 22% of White men. Majority men (22%) led in deanships followed by African American women and other cohort groups. Green (1984) explained that administrative posts are greater at HBCUs. Of the first five cohort members from HBCUs, 82% remained with their respective institutions after their ACE fellowship and rose to higher levels than their minority counterparts at predominantly White institutions. Of the group, half of all ACE Fellows moved to another administrative position. Moreover, 41% of African American graduates from the ACE Fellow program moved to the position of dean and other senior level positions. Their minority counterparts at White institutions represented 59% of deans and vice presidents. This revealed that former African American fellows were
more likely to remain at HBCUs and internally move to higher positions than their counterparts at traditionally white institutions (Green, 1984).

Graduates of the ACE Fellow Program during the Green (1984) study were divided into two groups, the first five cohort groups and the remaining groups to 1980. Based on cohort membership, those from 1965 to 1970 were less likely to ascend into positions of dean and vice president at a faster rate than members from 1971 to 1980. Upon reflection on the ACE Fellow Program and the national level, graduates from the program in the newer cohorts were more likely to be in senior-level administration than their peers in the first five cohorts. Thus, graduates from the ACE Fellow Program after 1980 are individuals who ultimately lead institutions of higher education (Green, 1984). The ACE Fellow Program has made a significant contribution to encourage junior administrators to ascend to senior administrative positions.

Along with the national initiative of ACE Fellows, individuals, formal and informal, are creating pipelines for women’s professional development. Ironside (1983) examined women in the traditional pipeline to senior-level management. The pipeline began with teaching on the college level, followed by continued education to earn a doctoral degree, and then entry-level administrative work. After women, regardless of racial and ethnic background, followed this line, they continued to move to higher levels of leadership. Kreps (1974) contradicted Ironside by stating that women also begin the pipeline to senior management by teaching college courses; however, they remained in the position for an extended period of time and failed to ascend the career ladder. The stagnant employment could have been attributed to personal choices that would influence
a woman to remain in the same position, such as marriage, starting a family, and the flexibility for family duties.

In the analysis of literature associated with women performed by House (2001), the standard line to senior leaderships has not been established. The Donohue (1981), Evans (1985), Freeman (1977), Moore and Sagaria (1981), and Murrell and Donohue (1982), research studies were inconclusive about the definitive method for women to move up the ladder to deanship and higher. It further detailed the pipeline to achievement is dependent upon the woman. Conversely, Donohue (1981) explained women in public institutions were not proficient in senior-level management prior to their current position. Nonetheless, women in Donohue’s study were employed in junior management prior to their current position.

Other points discussed by House (2001) about the pipeline were fields of study and degree attainment. Warner and DeFleur’s (1993) study described 394 senior-level administrators’ degree attainment and subject area. According to these researchers, of the 394 respondents, 63% of the women and 66% of the men held earned doctoral degrees. Yet, fields of study for the doctoral degrees were very different. Women earned more degrees in education than men, 60% to 30%, respectively. Warner, Brazell, Allen, Bostick, and Marin (1988) and Moore (1984) explored levels of attainment and importance of majors. They surmised women should be guarded when earning a degree in education. Moore (1984) added, “If women continue to seek advanced degrees in the area of education at a higher percentage than men, we may not see significant changes in the distribution of men and women throughout the administrative hierarchy” (p. 8). Warner et al addressed oversaturation of education degrees as a strong contribution to
women earning a terminal degree. However, the myth about Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) still remains. A noteworthy point was 30% of men presidents have terminal degrees in educational administration (Wilson, 1989). Yet, the percentage of men and women administrators at the community/junior college level with an Ed.D. differed, 51% to 36%, respectively. It signaled a higher percentage of men with a Ph.D. to lead 4-year institutions (Moore, Twombly, & Martorana, 1985). The attainment of a terminal degree for senior-level management is a definitive requirement. Based on gender and area of study, it could have a direct link to the progression up the administrative ladder.

Once the degree has been conferred, it is not the single requirement for entrance into administrative positions. Most academicians theorized the thrust of administrative leadership is grouped into categories with specific, detailed purpose in academic and non-academic areas (House, 2001). The traditional climb up the administrative ladder has firmly remained in place for decades and has consisted of the common benchmarks whereby men and women, regardless of ethnic or racial background, are measured. Mattfield (1974) and Moore and Sagaria (1981) outlined the administrative ladder starting with the completion of the bachelor’s degree, continuing to the Ph.D., employment as a faculty member, and concluding with an administrative position. Graham (1974) added the transition between each phase was parallel among those who traveled the ladder. It is uncommon that every faculty member adapted to this method, but it was most commonly used for promotion.

The comprehension of success by employing the traditional ladder has encouraged women to adapt this method (Moore & Sagaria, 1981). Assuming this track
towards management, Warner and DeFleur (1993) deduced the entry level for faculty members with goals for senior management should begin with chair of the department; it is considered the “basic foundation” of administrative work. In a confirmation of the importance of faculty work to administrative work, Warner et al. (1988) added, for both genders, experience as a faculty member (55%) had a greater impact on the likelihood to obtain positions of leadership at institutions of higher learning than individuals without faculty experience (38%). Warner et al. concluded, “Those who have had faculty experience are much more likely to be in the highest level of administration as well as in academic dean position” (p. 8). The location of where their experience was earned is also important.

Academic and non-academic positions are other principle factors in the direct link to administrative leadership. In an additional illustration, Donohue (1981) measured the early career choices of women who advanced to administrative posts. The researcher discovered for women to move forward in management, they would have to begin their career in education. Warner and DeFleur (1993) furthered the review by adding that being a woman nominated or recruited for her first administrative position is connected to the position she currently holds. A woman was more likely to be recommended from an academic position than from a nonacademic position to her first administrative position. Nonacademic positions are outside the scope of teaching and research potential, in most cases, the inability to earn tenure. Common areas associated with nonacademic positions are student support services and student affairs. In a general consensus, they are not strong writers and often are rejected for tenure then given a supportive, teaching post within the department. Mattfield (1974) offered an alternative reasoning behind some
administrators choosing this method, “Some choose to become administrators of this kind directly after receiving the Ph.D. or during work on a dissertation that may never be finished” (p.122).

The academic and nonacademic positions have been reviewed in relation to gender-neutral situations. Moore and Sagaria (1981) studied the affects of early career choice on careers long term \( n = 180 \). The results of the study revealed that 80% academic administrators had faculty experience, and 26% of support administrators had faculty experience. The understanding is that women mostly remain close to the vision that they begin with at the start of their career. Later, Moore (1984) revisited the topic of position types having a direct impact on the potential of women and minority groups. The study revealed that movement to an administrative position is based on which track an individual chooses. Moore reported, “Some career tracks, such as student personnel, appear to be quite hospitable to women and minority group members, while others, such as academic affairs, have almost no representation from these groups” (p. 7). The opportunity for women and minorities to enter other areas other than student personnel was very difficult, yet possible.

Fennema and Ayers (1984) suggested unconventional options to administrative positions for women and minorities. They identified in recent years populations of these groups have increased, and a prevailing trend was emerging. Individuals employed in the academic area who lack faculty experiences obtained high positions in the college or university. But the highest levels of academic affairs remained dedicated to “academicians.”
House (2001) narrowed the academic progress to women of color in the pursuit of academic administration. A focused view of women of color and their attempts at administrative work found that most entered into the field of higher education through nonacademic specialty programs. Wilson (1989) identified programs geared towards minority students’ involvement on campus or other ethnic or gender specific programs and “are less valued in the academy than academic disciplines and rarely lead to upward mobility” (p. 65). Warner and DeFleur (1993) best explained categories in which women of color began as “more likely to be dead-end or to be on ladders which have low ceilings” (p. 8).

Once the journey of the career has begun, concurrently the entrance into the pipeline has begun. Another perspective of the pipeline was the gaining of experience while on the job. The importance of work experience was closely linked to being awarded a position. Depending on the experience in the pipeline, it indicated which administrative position, nonacademic or academic, was possible.

Differences between Genders: Administrative

Most research studies, journals, and scholarly papers questioned the link between gender and race to administrative abilities. These three indicators often make it complicated to select, orient, and retain Africa American women. The continual low presence of these participants created an unwelcoming environment to maintain mentorships. Development and maintenance of mentorships was key to upward mobility, but other factors had an effect. These factors included salary, affirmative action, sexism, racism, homophobia, heterophobia, campus climate, feeling of isolation, tenure, and
promotion process. However, according to Patitu and Hinton (2003), the major issues were sexism, racism, and homophobia. With relation to this research, only two concerns will be discussed, sexism and racism.

In Patitu and Hinton’s (2003) research study, five senior-level African American women administrators from varying institutions were surveyed about their experiences of sexism and racism. Three women agreed that ethnic background was more of a hindrance to their career than was gender. One administrator identified her gender as a negative influence in comparison to her race. Another woman expressed that both race and gender were equally a delay in her career. Nonetheless, sexism and racism were often formidable to identify because both affect the environment in a similar manner.

Results of sexism and racism created marginalization, survival and coping skills, lack of support, and transition and growth to emerge. Of the five members of the Hinton survey group, three women were active participants in the organizational structure, had available resources, and were decision makers. Displays of the lack of support precipitated retaliation from colleagues and supervisors in the form of restricted budgets, harassment from supervisor, rejection of diverse student programming, and alienation.

In a research study conducted by Chliwniak (1997), the question was asked: what, if any, contributors affect the way women lead? The researcher sent 580 surveys to higher education administrators from different levels, presidents/chancellors, provosts, vice chancellors/vice presidents, and deans. Of the 386 participants of the survey, the response rate for men was (61%), and for women between the ages of 40 to 49, it was 49%, the largest group of women. The average years of experience for women were from 4 to 9 years, and men had an average of 21 or more years.
Chliwniak (1997) discovered the position has more influence on the leadership styles than gender. Gender does affect the viewpoints of leadership, but the common influence is the position. Thus, individuals in a particular position displayed the mannerisms associated with the position. For example, individuals, either men or women, employed as a provost will “act like” a provost; presidents will “act like” a president; and vice president will “act like” a vice president. The original view that men are more astute to natural leadership was not entirely true when the position is included in the analysis. When the position was introduced into the analysis, women emerged as equals to men (Chliwniak, 1997).

Campus leaders’ observations of themselves are dissimilar based on gender (Chliwniak, 1997). Women campus leaders see themselves as mediators and encouragers of change, and they are more likely to have assessments of service and leadership based on their sensitivity to faculty and staff. Another influence in the difference between women and men participants in the survey was age. The survey revealed men in their 60s were more concerned with community involvement and mindful of the needs and issues associated with others. Women focused on the interaction with the community and colleges and universities at a younger age than did men. In addition, for employment compensation, women deans explained that they preferred an increase in salary based on job performance to fixed annual raises than their counterparts (Chliwniak, 1997).

The discussion of women and men in leadership positions in higher education was the focus at the 1989 annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges. The forum was in the form of a panel discussion entitled: If Good, Sound Leadership is Based
Solely on Gender. The panel agreed that the research surrounding this topic is considered “soft” data (Academic Leader, 1989).

Panel discussion of soft data was corroborated by a research study from Sue Carroll of the Center for the Study of Women and Politics at Rutgers University in New Jersey. Years of political service varied from 7 to 23 years with diversified backgrounds for 12 women legislators that participated in the study. Women explained the relationship between gender and leadership in politics yielded five points, and they were inherit for women in leadership roles, regardless of their field. Those five positions are:

(a) women’s style of leadership is more cooperative and sharing, (b) women are more enticed to social change, (c) women are more connected to their constituents or community and value their opinions, (d) women are harder workers in every aspect of an organization, and (e) and women select issues to champion associated with community improvement. Women in the focus group described their observation of men on the five points as dissimilar to the women.

Men regularly employed the leadership style of self-advancement and self-empowerment, and they are drawn to personal power versus the social change of women (Academic Leader, 1989). They tend to retain power and then distributed it at will to whom they decide are worthy of the power. This is the opposite of women’s views of maintaining contact with the people they serve. Women added men work harder for special interests within an organization in contradiction to women’s perceptsives that the entire organization is important. The difference between these two standpoints was activities that appeal to a person based on power and not on purpose (Academic Leader, 1989). The five ideals explained differences between genders while in pursuit and
attainment of leadership positions. Once in the position of leadership, women experienced additional concerns (Academic Leader, 1989).

One of the concerns was the linkage between expectations while in the position and access to leadership (Academic Leader, 1989). Expectations for women are not set to guide them to leadership roles, but once they overcome the expectations of others, they are met with denied access based on gender. Fontaine Belford, dean of the Union Graduate School and Provost of the Union of Experimenting Colleges and Universities, explained women are identified by gender with a title. As Belford explained as cited in Academic Leader (1989), women were either woman president and woman dean but “never just a dean” (p. 1).

The second concern was society’s description of women in leadership roles. Belford delved into the social science by providing a list of adjectives that describe positive words for men in leadership. Those words are “decisive,” “tough,” and “quick” and positive for men, negative for women. When these adjectives are used to describe women, they are seen as harsh and repugnant. The viewpoints of peers, subordinates, and superiors of women are skewed. Reactions from those terms forced women to confront possible negative retort; coupled with traditionally being taught to seek the approval of others, they cause hardships for those who are targeted.

Belford (as cited in Academic Leader, 1989) offered possible suggestions to deflect the harmful interaction from other persons. The first idea was for women to not be caught between two groups and not continue to attempt to please each group. They should practice being decisive and directive when decisions are needed. The second idea was for women to function within the organizational structure. Inclusion in the structure
helped women gain an understanding of the procedures and governance of the organization. The final idea was women should not continue to function in collaborative action with indecisiveness.

Leadership roles have been partially dependent on the sex-role stereotypes employed by individuals, the subordinates who decide to or not to follow, and the situations to offer opportunities for examples of leadership to be seen. Friesen (1983) evaluated three principle perceptions of women in leadership roles. Two of the three perceptions were rooted in late sixties and early seventies research; one viewpoint was “whether women had the innate ability to adapt to leadership roles and then conform to male sex-role stereotype” (p. 224). The second viewpoint was “to alter the personality traits of the aspiring female leader, to enable her to more closely resemble male leaders and, thus adapt to an administrative climate” (p. 224). The final viewpoint emerged as women began to increase their presence in leadership roles with the women’s movement and other progressive legislations. It was the urging that a difference in management style between men and women continues to exist. The opening between the management styles would “complement” the style of the other. One generic method of leadership should not be expected from a particular gender.

Conventionally, leadership was the ability of an individual to rise above their peers and provide vision and focus for the group. For individuals to assume their place of leadership, most researchers classified the ability to lead through personality or charisma. Charisma was not a skill that was taught but an “innate, superior ability, most often based on heredity” (Friesen, 1983, p.224). Carlyle (as cited in Friesen, 1983), expressed a leader as a “hero possessing special qualities that captures the imagination of the masses”
Early scientists' theories on leadership and the relationship to gender role were the foundation of the association from gender to leadership.

Leadership roles have traditionally been associated with masculine areas (Adkinson, 1981). Coupling the position, in this case occupation to the gender, it caused a direct link. The creation was the occupational sex-type. Occupational sex typing was when a larger gender group was employed in a specific occupation and others become familiar with gender groups dominant presence, thus creating a connection between the occupation and the gender continue to be commonplace. Examples of occupational sex typing were professions of nursing and teaching in a K-12 classroom. Schein (1973, 1975) and Brenner and Bromer (1979) researched the general characteristics of a leader founded on ideals of general women, general men, and equal women and men. The results revealed managers identified good managers as possessing the characteristics closely linked to men compared to women. Women in leadership roles or in the pursuit of leadership roles were aware of followers' and superiors' attention to masculine leadership. In place of reassuring themselves in their chosen leadership style, they decided to not assume leadership roles. This is commonly noted as avoidance (Friesen, 1983).

To study the preference of leadership style in conjunction with gender, Megargee (1969) studied pairs assigned to complete a task and found that in pairs of women, the high-dominant women gravitated to the leader role. Nevertheless, when a woman was paired with a low-dominant man, the woman systemically deferred to the man for direction. In 1982, Golub and Canty replicated the Megargee study. This time, the high-dominant women were, again, placed in same-gender and mixed gender situations for
analysis. The results were identical to Megargee’s study. High-dominant women, when
paired with another woman led the pair, but when the high-dominant women were paired
with men, regardless of dominant ranking, the women again deferred to the men for
leadership. Based on the research studies presented, masculine leadership style would be
the most effective leadership style for both genders. Friesen (1983) cautioned a single
strong trait of leadership has not emerged in women.

Stogdill (1974) discovered, based on 163 studies on leadership characteristics,
there are 43 characteristics grouped into six clusters that a leader must possess. Those
groups were: physical characteristics, social background, intelligence and ability,
personality, task-related characteristics, and social characteristics. Stogdill emphasized
the position of earlier studies, which suggested most sex-roles were not masculine. There
was one characteristic to be classified as gender neutral, which was intelligence and
ability. Yet, one characteristic was coupled with feminine sex-role: social characteristics
(Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

Friesen (1983) discussed intelligence, ability, and expertise in leadership as being
devoid of association with gender. Nonetheless, participants in a replicated study
suggested competency, creativity, and intelligence were key factors in effective
leadership (Schein, 1973). The knowledge and competence to help a group to achieve its
goals have been characteristics that a leader should possess, regardless of gender. The
key directive was to have the knowledge and expertise to guide others.

Bolman and Deal Leadership Styles: Looking Through the Frames

Leadership has been the center force of management and business. According to
Stogdill (1974), over 7,900 research studies have been performed to learn about those
who lead. The identical number of studies that have been performed is unknown, but there have been theories to the methods these leaders employ. Friesen (1983) identified a leadership style associated with women and men outlined by Lyle and Ross (1973). Lyle and Ross surveyed 246 industrial and non-industrial firms and discovered women and men displayed four common leadership styles. Those styles were product-oriented, permissive style, detached and aloof and under controlling, and exploitative style.

Lyle and Ross (1973) defined the product-oriented leader to more micromanage subordinates and driven by the task to be completed. Of the respondents, one third of the women demonstrated this style of leadership. The second leadership style was the permissive style. This style of leadership allowed women to be well received and was selected as the preferred style of leadership among subordinates. Another one third of the women displayed this leadership style. Next was the detached style of leadership, and one sixth of women shared examples of this style. This style of leadership was heavily dependent on subordinates to troubleshoot their respective problems. Managers in this style of leadership were less likely to become involved and provided support in the decision-making process. The final method was the exploitative style. Exploitative style of leadership was common for those individuals who wanted to advance their career. Their current position or responsibilities were superficial and a way for promotion. When goals were reached in the current career, the leader assumed full credit for the progression. Conversely, when the goals were not met, the leader relinquished responsibility and blamed others, usually subordinates, for the shortcomings (Berrey, 1989; Lyle & Ross, 1973).
Lyle and Ross (1973) included men’s leadership styles based on the four management styles. Compared to women, men were less diverse in the leadership styles they substantiate in the workplace. Men used two of the four leadership styles presented by Lyle and Ross. Most men, three fourth of the men respondents, were deemed as using the exploitative leadership style in the companies. The remaining one fourth of the men respondents utilized the product-oriented/over controlling leadership style.

In 1991, Bolman and Deal expanded Lyle and Ross’s four leadership styles for professionals by focusing on how individuals viewed their organizations. Similar to the Lyle and Ross research, it was based on four principles, or frames. The four frames were: structural, human resources, political, and symbolic frames. Each frame was an observation of the relationship between the organization and individuals that work in the environment. It also continued to explain the governing policies and the effects on the surrounding communities.

**Structural frame.** The structural frame detailed the interior of organizations and its operations. It encompassed: (a) foundational mission statements and benchmarks; (b) interaction within the organization and its affect on the surrounding environment and those employed; (c) the individual participants have to set aside personal ideals for the betterment of the organization; (d) internal operations must meet the demand of the organization; and (e) when disjointed problems arise the previous points, the frame should be applied.

This frame possessed the management of time and, more importantly, denoted the tasks, outcomes, and growth for the organization and personnel. Bolman and Deal (2003) advised there is a difference between structural and human resource frames. The key
ideal to the structural viewpoint managed the personnel of the organization. It aided in the development and growth of the structure. The creators interjected there are two points for the core of the structural frame: differentiation and integration. They defined differentiation as the method of how work is distributed among the employees. Integration was the flow of the work between the established groups.

Bolman and Deal (2003) further posited the structural frame created supervision of knowledge/skill, time management, product quality/distribution, clients to receive the service or product, the demographic information, and fulfillment of quest. Movement of these characteristics was both vertical and lateral. Vertical began at the supervisor, or another person in authority, who managed by rules and policies that encompass standards and benchmarks (i.e., standard operating procedures [SOP]). In addition, the structural frame does not restrict its focus on the establishment and function of the organization. Consideration expanded the potential growth and implemented performance control and action plans. These assessments and reviews of the organization further strengthen the foundation. Lateral coordination, as defined by Bolman and Deal (2003), was a detailed idea of the communication lines. Researchers maintained meetings, task forces and committee assignments, role coordination, structural maintenance, and network infrastructure, which are forms of lateral coordination. In a detailed analysis, members are grouped in task forces and committees based on the mission and then schedule meetings to accomplish the goal. During membership in their respective groups, they were assigned, or they assumed, roles that supported the matrix structures on local, regional, and national levels. An individual’s contact in other regions reinforced the network of the group and the organization.
**Human resources frame.** The next frame was the connection between people, employees, and the organization to employ them. The interaction between these two actors is key to the human resources frame. The four principles of this frame were: (a) individuals do not serve at the will of the organization, (b) they are in need of each other, (c) both suffer when they fail to “fit” well together, and (d) it is imperative to have positive relations. Researchers continued to emphasize the organizational primary purpose to meet the needs of individuals and not vice versa. Nonetheless, the organization needed persons’ skills and knowledge, and persons need the organization for career development and monetary compensation. When the two do not work well, both do not reach their full potential. But, when the organization and the personnel do work together, it benefited all involved to achieve their respective goals.

Bolman and Deal (2003) referenced Maslow’s Theory of Needs for further understanding of the human resource frame. Abraham Maslow developed a theory to illustrate an individual has needs that must be fulfilled. The emptiness provided motivation to fill these empty points. Those points were: (a) physiological, (b) safety, (c) belongingness and love, (d) esteem, and (e) self-actualization. Each was important in a person’s existence. Physiological referred to the basic necessities such as oxygen, water, food, physical health, and comfort. The next was safety from assault, hazard, and harm. More importantly, the final three parts of Maslow’s theory are often provided by an organization. Belongingness and love were essential in the relationship between the organization and personnel. Esteem was vital to ensure the self-worth of an individual and increases their self-value. The final point was self-actualization and is the key role of an organization. Organizations were the principle aid in the development of a person’s
potential to succeed. An individual’s inclusion in an organization serves to facilitate their membership into a group (belongingness). Then, employment validates their worthiness to themselves and to others in their group (esteem). Finally, the organization cultivates individuals’ future through their employment. The human resources frame was a direct observation of the interaction between individuals and their organization. The desired outcome of this affiliation was positive, and each had their needs met.

**Political frame.** Another frame described in Bolman and Deal’s organizational structure was the political frame. Bolman and Deal (2003) explained there are five perspectives of this frame. They were: (a) organizations that function as a umbrella of smaller coalitions and interest groups; (b) coalitions maintain differences in principles, doctrine, knowledge, concernment, and understanding of the truth from within the organization; (c) allocation of funding influences political decisions; (d) the scarcity of the previous resources often causes conflict and struggle over power; and (e) possible options to resolve the conflicts are compromising, mediation, maneuvering for opportunities among the active players in the organization. The organization suggested the creation of coalitions and group dynamics. Working from within such groups did not help conform individuals to a single-minded group. It was this prospect to band resources in order to move forward on common goals.

Bolman and Deal (2003) continued the discussion with the reflection of colleges and universities management of the economic trends. They included that when the resources are plentiful, the programs of study and construction of new facilities are increased. Nevertheless, when the economic trend turned downward, programs of study are scaled down, and maintenance replaced new construction projects. Funding
opportunities, or lack of resources, directed political activities then it was employed by an organization. In additional to financial activities that influence the political frame, power is supplementary. Researchers defined power as "the capacity to get things done" (p.188). It was an important aspect for the organization to accomplish tasks and goals by the display of power and is often a link to leverage. When a request from a group was presented, and another group had the ability to meet those needs, it created power, or leverage, for the latter of the groups.

Power has various forms to answer the necessities of organizations. It has often been closely associated with companies. Nonetheless, Bolman and Deal (2003) contradicted this presented research by introducing alternatives. The alternatives to the norm were: (a) position power (authority), (b) information and expertise, (c) control of reward, (d) coercive power, (e) alliances and network, (f) access and control of agendas, (g) framing (control of meaning and symbols), and (h) personal power. Positive power is largely linked to formal relationship where the title imparts a greater importance in decision making. Examples of position power were police, mayors, and professors. Another form of power was information and expertise. Individuals and groups possessed knowledge on a specific topic with the ability to solve problems have expertise power. Members of think tanks, such as lawyers with narrowed experience in an area, and leaders in a determined field are classified as having expertise. Reward control was the ability to influence decisions with money and political support. During elections on the local and national levels, candidates sought the endorsements of groups in their respective areas. Endorsements from parents' associations and teachers' unions for school board primaries and police and fire association for mayoral candidates were
displays of reward control. The backing of a cause or candidate for a group reinforces their control power. The ability to manipulate outcomes through blocking, interference, punishment, and constraints was coercive power. It can be viewed as a form of grassroots methods. Protesting against an issue with information to influence an outcome was also coercive power. It was also shown alliances and networks commonly advanced by organizations via agendas to accomplish its mission. In addition to the established methods of power, another form was framing. These sources of power created symbols, established meaning of values and beliefs, and were catalysts of hope and determination. Finally, power was associated with personal strength. Inner abilities of energy, charisma, political skills, and verbal aptitude were examples of personal power.

The political frame centered on the ability to accomplish goals and tasks from within and between organizations. This achievement of tasks was, according to Bolman and Deal (2003), by power. It was this principle that propelled an organization to have the respect or disdain of other organizations. A positive use of power did yield the respect of other observers, but the lack of an effective use of power could work against an organization. While power was the key to this frame, it was assisted by goals, structure, policies, and objectives.

Symbolic frame. The final of the four frames was symbolic. This frame explained the significance of organizational culture. According to Bolman and Deal (2004), to create “the glue that holds an organization” (p.243), it was constructed on myriad forms. Those were: (a) myths, visions, and values; (b) heroes and heroines; (c) stories and fairy tales; (d) rituals; (e) ceremony; and (f) metaphor, humor, and play. As a collective group, these examples supported the importance of a consolidation of all
levels, both vertical and horizontal, for progress. Myth, values, and visions are grouped together because they were interdependent on each other. The myth was the expression of the trio and helped convey the idea. It was blatant, exposed, and was the opposite of values. Myths were often the explanation for the creation of companies, universities or colleges, groups, and rituals. Unlike stories and fairy tales, they were outlandish but are based on some form of truth. Yet, values were the underlining theme of myths. It was “what an organization stands for, those qualities worthy of esteem or commitment for their own sake” (p. 252). By the same process, it linked all members of the group and external observers to a pivotal purpose. The final of the three ideals was vision. Often confused with goals, vision was the overarching picture of the projected outcome.

Bolman and Deal (2003) offered many examples of myth, values, and visions. However, the best example was from eBay in Silicon Valley. The myth was the founder’s fiancée missed her circle of Pez friends in Boston. To reconnect her with friends, the founder created eBay. The account was a myth with the principle of bringing people together with the use of computers. eBay’s purpose for creating this myth was to increase public interest in the company, and it worked. Most of the myth was true of bringing people together through commerce and computers. The Pez and fiancée were not part of the story; it was to increase curiosity. The purpose for such a myth was best explained by a company representative: “Nobody wants to hear about a thirty-year-old genius who wanted to create a perfect market. They want to hear that he did it for his fiancée” (p. 254).

Other examples of the symbolic frame were heroes and heroines; they explained the central theme of a story. He, for heroes, or she, for heroines, were human examples
and presented an idea or lesson. Bolman and Deal (2003) offered the story of *Business Week*’s selection of “good” CEOs for their outstanding moral and ethical practices. One of the persons featured was Ruben Mack of Colgate Palmolive. When asked about his selection, he refused to comment because he did not want to draw attention to himself. The same was asked of Costco’s James Sinegal. He responded that it was an honor but quickly added that his “disdain for corporate perks” (p. 254) was common, and “We’re low-cost operators, and it would be a little phony if we tried to pretend that we’re not and had all the trappings” (p. 255). These two individuals established strong companies by good judgments and are heroes because of it.

Stories and fairy tales were the next pane in the symbolic frame. Stories were told over and over again to friends, family, and strangers about an experience. Fairy tales are children’s versions of stories. A definitive explanation of what a story accomplished by David Armstrong (Bolman & Deal, 2003). He outlined a story exchanges traditions, cultivates employees, invests in people, identifies accomplishments, disseminates the word, encourages fun, attracts the right people, produces sales, and promotes better managers (Bolman & Deal, 2003). KFC, formerly known as Kentucky Fried Chicken, has examples of stories about the founder, the Colonel. He visited each restaurant and toured the facilities. If it were not up to the Colonel’s code, he would raise his voice in protest in the hope that next time it would be better. Because the Colonel’s drive for perfection was in his product, stories about him will continue to be told to each new employee and to the public.

The next pane was ceremonies and rituals. Both are similar to each other but have a noticeable difference in the timeframe they are performed. Rituals are activities that
take place frequently. It is simple and without fanfare, such as the morning cup of coffee and reading the newspaper. Another was washing clothes every Thursday and cleaning the house on Saturday. These rituals took place everyday or every week without much attention or notice. Ceremonies often occur on a yearly basis. Baby showers, graduations, town festivals, and an annual sale at an upscale store were considered ceremonies. These events incur public awareness and, maybe, took place once or twice a year. Special accommodations are arranged, such as announcements, invitations, and options for getting attention. Both ceremonies and rituals are possibilities to link feelings among participants.

The final piece of the pane was metaphor, humor, and play. These were methods of conveying ideas (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Metaphor was used to explain the rare occurrences, and humor was a way to lighten the conversation. Play was “what people do when they are not working” (p. 268). The description of the Statue of Liberty as being a “Lady Liberty” expressed the desire to protect, revere, and honor. Yet, making a joke about the Statue of Liberty playing soccer in the ocean would be considered humor. Play spurs a lighter side for the employees and those they serve. For example, when Microsoft unveiled a new software product, employees invited Jay Leno, host of the Tonight Show. In doing so, it formed a fun and playful atmosphere at the launch and allowed the employees to relax. The symbolic frame was utilized to create common bonds. In companies, it had developed teamwork and loyalty; in sororities and fraternities, it created family and service; and in higher education, it generated pride and understanding.
Leadership Frames in Higher Education

Bensimon (1989, 1990) further explained the association between Bolman and Deal’s frames and “good” presidential leadership. A clearer understanding of good leadership was explained by the “espoused theories” created by Argyris and Schon (1975). It stated because these presidents represent what is defined as good leadership via their self-perception and others’ perceptions of them, they are more informed to define skills and qualities of a good president. The first factor utilized the frame ideals in terms of leadership via interviews with 32 presidents. Of this population, 13 used a single frame, 11 employed two frames, 7 espoused three frames, and 1 used four frames. Based on institutional types, 5 of 13 of the single frame users were from community colleges, three paired frame users each represented from universities, public colleges, and independent colleges, and three of eight multi-frame users were employed in university settings. Another factor in good presidents were years of service as a president. Equally, 16 presidents had tenure service of more than 5 years (old) and less than 4 years (new). Eight of 16 (50%) new presidents employed a single frame, and 6 of 16 (38%) old presidents operated under a pair of frames. Tenure of service and institutional type coupled with the number of frames used offer an understanding of good leadership.

This study outlined that first-time presidents were more likely to use single frame leadership. Moreover, old presidents or presidents having served at two institutions in the same position lead their institution by multiple frames. It is noted by researchers’ experience was principle to these frames and leadership. There was a strong correlation between the years of service as president and the number of frames used to lead institutions (Bensimon, 1989, 1990).
Chapter III

Methodology

Introduction

This study was an investigation of the gender and ethnic roles associated with African American women serving in the role of president at HBCUs. The presidential demographic profile data were collected using an instrument developed by Dr. Terri Brown for her 2000 North Carolina State University dissertation entitled, *Women College Presidents of Independent Colleges: Career Paths, Profiles and Experiences*, sections one, two, and three in this study’s survey instrument. Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation Survey (Sell) (1991) measured the leadership style in sections four and five in the survey instrument. The methodology and research design to conduct this study is described further in this section.

Population and Sample

The population for this study was nineteen (19) African American women presidents of HBCUs. The institutions they head, using the Carnegie Classification, range from baccalaureate-liberal arts to doctoral-intensive institutions. Of the 19 institutions, 10 institutions were baccalaureate-liberal arts, 5 were master I colleges/universities, 2 were baccalaureate-general institutions, 1 was master II colleges/universities, and 1 was doctoral/research university-intensive institution. As of November 2004, one of the women presidents served in the position on interim basis and was not included in the sample. The researcher surveyed the remaining permanently
appointed population (n = 18) to effectively reflect the cohort. Names and contact information for the women presidents were retrieved from the individual institutions’ Web sites. The Higher Education Act of 1965 designated each of these 18 institutions as a HBCU.

Instrument

The survey instrument yielded data to address the participants’ demographic overview and leadership styles during their administration. The instrument has five sections developed using items from existing instruments (i.e., Brown demographic survey and Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation Survey Self (Bolman, 1991). The first instrument was the Brown demographic profile survey, which was used to collect data in relation to career development, career path and choice, and experiences during their current, and in some cases, past presidencies. The second instrument assembled data in connection to self-perceptive leadership style associated with the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation Survey Self (Bolman, 1991). It asked questions focused on the four frames of an organizational culture based on their book entitled, Reframing Organizations. Demographic characteristics were assessed using an existing survey developed by Brown’s dissertation (2000) titled “Women College Presidents of Independent Colleges: Career Paths, Profiles, and Experiences.”

This instrument was divided into five sections. Section one was a compilation of the career experiences of the administrators prior to their presidencies, factors associated with aspirations to become president, and any factors respondents may perceive that may have delayed their ascent to the presidency. Section two gathered information
concerning graduate background and professional activities that enhance their skills and
knowledge base in preparation for their presidency. Personal and family background (i.e.,
birth information, marital status, and parents’ educational level) was included in section
three of this instrument.

To provide a better understanding of the instrument being used to collect data,
Table 1 outlines the purpose of each section.

Table 1
Sections of the Survey Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brown instrument</th>
<th>Question focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Career experiences, obstructions, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Graduate background, professional activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Family background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bolman and Deal instrument</th>
<th>Question focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Leadership behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Leadership styles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. This chart has information compiled from the Brown and Bolman and Deal Instruments. Both are
copyrighted by their respective creators.

The 29 survey questions were forced-choice items for the Brown section. The
variation of possible answers for each question varied from 2 to 8. Questions 1 through
13 centered on respondents’ current presidency, addressing how they were recruited for the position, previous career opportunities, and if applicable, experiences as a candidate in previous presidential searches. Questions 14 through 21 are focused on their undergraduate and graduate studies, number of years in higher education, number of years in the current presidency, and external board and organizational memberships. Corporate, community service, and governmental elected or appointed boards were grouped as external boards. Service on college/university boards, primary/secondary school boards, and educational organization boards (e.g., think tanks and research groups) were assembled as organizational memberships. External board and organizational memberships were described as serving on corporate board, an educational board (e.g., think tanks and research groups), community service board, college or university board, primary/secondary board, and governmental elected or appointed board.

The answer choices for question 21 were narrowed from the Brown survey. To widen the potential answer choices, additional responses were cropped from another survey. This was accomplished by incorporating answer choices from the survey Descriptive Profile of Women College and University (Touchton, Shavlik, & Davis, 1993). Questions 22 through 29 collected data with regard to marital status, birth order in the family, and parents’ education (Brown, 2000).

Sections four and five of the survey instrument were extracted from the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientations Survey (Bolman, 1991). This portion of the instrument gathered information on the four frames of leadership. A detailed overview of the four frames was provided in chapter 2. Bolman and Deal created two versions of the instrument. The first version, Self, measured the self-perceptive leadership by the
principle administrator. The second version, Other, questioned others’ individual perception of the principle administrators’ leadership style. Since the study examined the presidents’ view of their leadership style, the Other version of the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation Survey was not used. Respondents answered a series of items designed to gather knowledge on leadership style at her current institution. The results of the study categorized each participant as: single-frame leader, a paired-frame leader, or multi-frame leader (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Section four was entitled leader behaviors. There were 32 questions that use a 5-point Likert scale for responses. Participants indicated, on a daily basis, how often a particular behavior is displayed. The rating scale was (1) never, (2) occasionally, (3) sometime, (4) often, and (5) always. Thirty-two questions were further divided into four subcategories consistent with Bolman and Deal’s four frames. The sequences of questions were: structural frame (questions 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, and 29), human resource frame (questions 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, and 30), political frame (questions 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, and 31), and symbolic frame (questions 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, and 32) (Bolman, 1991).

The final section, five, was entitled leadership styles. This section contained six forced-choice items and asked the president to describe her leadership style overall. Under each question, the president articulated her leadership style at her current institution.
Reliability and Validity

Their respective creators established reliability and validity for each of the individual surveys. According to Brown (2000), the validity and reliability of the instrument was low. This was due to the length of time during which the data were being collected; data collection for Brown’s study was approximately 8 weeks. Brown further noted the low level of item reliability is acceptable when the data is reflective of a collective group, African American women presidents, and not an individual respondent. The time period allotted for data collection, according to Brown, "[has an] adverse effects of history and maturation and other changes in the data collection procedure were avoided by the limited data collection time period" (p. 38).

Bolman (1991) stated that based on the sample population of 1309 business and education managers, the validity of self-ratings of leadership was low. The Bolman and Deal sections of the survey were not being used for effectiveness or others’ perceptions of the president. The primary purpose was to ascertain the self-perception of the president in her institutional setting. Thus, the low validity of the self-rating did not affect the results of this study. The Leadership Orientations survey instruments, both Self and Others, were utilized in numerous studies and dissertations (Bensimon, 1989, 1990; Bista & Glassman, 1998; Bowen, 2004; Burks, 1992; Caldwell, 1994; Cantu, 1997; Chang, 2004; Cheng, 1994; Childress, 1994; Davis, 1996; DeFranks-Cole, 2003; Durocher, 1995; Eckely, 1997; Gilson, 1994; Harlow, 1994; Hollingsworth, 1995; Lathan, 1993; Martinez, 1996; Mathis, 1999; Miron, 1994; Peasley, 1992; Rivers, 1996; Scott, 1997; Shum & Cheng, 1997; Small, 2002; Strickland, 1992; Suzuki, 1994; Washington, 1996; Wimpelberg, 1987; Winans, 1995).
Meade (1992) stated the reliability of the Bolman and Deal Orientation Survey was high based on a factor analysis. When a factor analysis was performed using principal components and varimax rotation, it showed a high degree of internal consistency of the instrument. This factor analysis supported the claim that items in the instrument did measure the intended leadership frames as intended (Meade, 1992).

As previously stated, the respective instrument creators have established the validity and reliability. However, due to comments on low reliability by other researchers, the researcher performed statistical analysis using alpha coefficients, to analyze the reliability for this study. The purpose of revisiting the reliability was in part because of the change in the survey population and questions from the original version of individual instruments.

Data Collection

Data collection was performed in this study via a self-administered paper-and-pencil survey that was sent by USPS first-class mail. An invitation to participate was extended to HBCU presidents, identified in the previous population section (n = 18). Each potential participant was mailed a survey packet. Within the survey packet was a letter, the survey instrument, and a stamped self-addressed envelope for returning the instrument. The letter accompanying the instrument described the researcher’s host institution, explained the purpose of this survey, estimated time for completion of the instrument, approval from the Institutional Review Board of the researcher’s host institution, description of the procedures for the survey, a statement on anonymity and confidentiality, and guidelines for participation in the study (Appendix A).
The instrument included directions at the top and at the top of each of the five sections contained in the survey (Appendix B). Directions for returning the survey were included in the letter and at the beginning of each distributed survey. The initial mailing was sent on March 7, 2005, and 3 weeks later reminder postcards followed. On April 1, 2005, a follow-up letter accompanied by another copy of the survey was sent to presidents that had not responded (Appendix C). A final letter without a survey was sent to the presidents on April 20, 2005, to achieve the projected response rate of 50% plus one, which is 10 respondents. If invited respondents were not willing to participate in the study, they did not return the survey. The completion date for receipt of nine completed questionnaires was September 2005. According to Brown (2000), this procedure for contacting respondents was effective in increasing the subjects' response rates for her research.

**Data Analysis**

Collected data were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows version 13.0. Responses were coded, entered into SPSS, and evaluated on the basis of the research questions. The Brown Demographic Profile used three methods for evaluation, descriptive analysis, correlation, and independent *t* test. The first method was a descriptive analysis of the sample. Descriptive statistical analysis was organizing and summarizing information about a collection of actual observations. Examples of those methods used to organize data were frequency distributions, mode, median, mean, and range (Witte & Witte, 2001).
According to Touchton, Shavlik, and Davis (1993), the interest in women presidents, as a collective group, came from the increase of women administrators in the position of president, from 148 to 328 women leaders, between 1975 and 1992. The increase of women in leadership roles was a principle catalyst for the research project undertaken by Touchton et al. (1993) and was sponsored by the American Council on Education (ACE) entitled Descriptive Profiles of Women in College and Universities. This project had become a foundational work concerning women in administrative and leadership research. They realized the gap of research associated with women by stating “[there] is very little data on women CEOs in higher education, and none is comprehensive” (p. vii). The purpose of the previous study on background of women, regardless of ethnic affiliation and educational setting, gave direction to the researcher. In contrast to the Touchton et al. study, this profile narrowed to a specific gender and ethnic group, thus forming a comprehensive research file concerning the career path and career development of this group to parallel the Tochtion et al. study.

Once the descriptive profile was produced, the study used the correlation method for further analysis, more specifically a Pearson correlation coefficient (r). A correlation coefficient was a description of the relationship between variables (Witte & Witte, 2001). Variance interpretation did not address the cause-and-effect relationship between the variables. It did, however, yield two analyses. The first analysis was the interpretation of the relationship between factors of leadership and the surveyed population. The second was to measure the relationship between variables (Witte & Witte, 2001). The results from the variance interpretation determined if there is a relationship between the Brown, sections one, two and three, and Bolman and Deal, sections four and five.
The third method of analysis was the independent *t* test. The *t* distributions were a family of symmetrical, bell-shaped distributions that change (Witte & Witte, 2001). This method allowed the researcher to illustrate the independent variables, personal and educational background, affected dependent variables, career choices, and previous employment. Nonetheless, this method was not used for the entire Brown sections of the study. Only these survey questions from sections one, two, and three with responses of yes or no used the independent *t* test, (i.e., questions 5, 12, 19, and 28).

The next method was the one sample *t* test. This analysis enhanced the data set by comparing the results from this study to the previously mentioned, ACE Report *The College President*, published in 2002. By comparing African American women presidents to the collective group of all presidents, all HBCU presidents, all women presidents, the uniqueness of the surveyed group was clearly understood. The one sample *t* test utilized selected questions from the researcher’s survey, sections one through three, (questions 7, 9, 16, 17, and 22). The one sample *t* test compared the quantitative questions common to both data sets. This test was used only one tail of the distribution for testing the null hypothesis. For example, if the direction of the difference had already been specified in the alternative hypothesis, then the critical value of *t*, for a given number of degrees of freedom, was taken from only one side of its distribution (Spinthall, 1997). In relation to this analysis, the testing of the hypotheses of these selected questions predicted the direction of the difference between all college presidents, all HBCU presidents, and all women college presidents and African American women presidents at 4-year HBCUs. This, then, allowed the researcher to either accept or reject
the predictions of the direction and difference between the established database and the research database.

The Bolman and Deal sections, four and five, used additional methods for analysis. According to Bolman (2004), the most effective method of determining the frame of an individual president was to calculate the population median for each frame, and any president scoring to score at or above the median classified her as using that leadership frame. This method gave a better understanding of the most common leadership style used. The possible outcomes were single-frame, paired-frame, and multi-frame leadership style.

The second method was the one sample t test. This analysis enabled the researcher to “calculate the sample mean (Witte & Witte, 2001, p. 290)” for the sample set (n = 18). A comparison of the results from this study and the data set from the national database provided feedback to the most common and least common leadership styles used by the sample. The established data set for the Bolman and Deal sections of the survey instrument, sections four and five, drew from an established and maintained internet site of Dr. Lee Bolman. At the time of the current investigation, there are 1309 respondents from previous administered examinations.

Summary

This dissertation investigated the self-perceptive leadership styles and formalized a demographic profile for African American women presidents at HBCUs. Once the data analysis was completed, a comparison between the sample population and the established data sets were performed. This was achieved by utilizing an instrument comprised of two
separate surveys: the Brown demographic profile and Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation Survey (Bolman & Deal, 1994). The population and sample, overview of the survey instruments, data collection, validity and reliability, and data analysis were presented in the previous section.
Chapter IV

Analysis of Data

Introduction

This chapter investigated the self-perceived leadership styles and demographic profile for the nine responding presidents. Wilson (1989) noted HBCUs lead institutions in the development of women of color in administrative leadership positions. Nonetheless, literature reviews, research projects, and data collections with a focal point on African American women in higher education were deficient (Collier-Thomas, 1982; Dabney, 2003; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Perkins, 1990; Smith, 1982). Mosely (1980) added research was even more limited with concerns to African American women as administrators, especially as presidents. The limited scholarly works about African American women in higher education, more importantly HBCUs, led the researcher to select this topic.

Format of the Investigation

The questionnaire was separated into two sections based on the research questions. The first section linked to the overview of their career paths, career development, and personal demographics. The second section was an analysis of leadership styles and leadership behaviors based on Bolman and Deal’s Reframing Organization Leadership Model (Bolman & Deal, 1991). The research questions were:
1. What is the demographic profile of the cohort of African American women serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States as of November 2004?

2. What are the leadership characteristics of African American women serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States utilizing the Bolman and Deal's Reframing Organization Leadership Model (Bolman & Deal, 1991)?

The subsidiary research questions offered a more detailed research finding in comparing this group to national databases:

1. What professional development opportunities do African American women employ in order to advance to the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States?

2. What are the professional backgrounds of African American women serving as president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States as compared to all presidents of colleges and universities, all women presidents of colleges and universities, and all HBCU presidents in the United States?

3. What are the personal backgrounds of African American women serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States as compared to all presidents of colleges and universities, all women presidents of colleges and universities, and all HBCU presidents in the United States?
4. Is there a significant difference in the leadership behavior and styles of African American women presidents, according to Bolman and Deal Leadership Model (Bolman, 1991), compared to the established data set of other education and business leaders?

5. What are the most common dominant leadership styles and leadership behaviors exhibited by this cohort of African American women presidents at 4-year HBCUs in the United States?

6. What are the least common dominant leadership styles and leadership behaviors exhibited by this cohort of African American women presidents at 4-year HBCUs in the United States?

7. How many frames, from Bolman and Deal Leadership Model (Bolman & Deal, 1991), did African American women serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States engage during their administration?

8. What are the number of frames, from the Bolman and Deal Leadership Model (Bolman & Deal, 1991), African American women serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States used compared to other education and business leaders?

Summary of Presentation of Data and Analysis

This chapter presented data assembled on the above research questions and subsidiary questions. Due to small survey population and few responses from presidents,
the analysis included the number of respondents. The ensuing sections begin with presentation of the research question, summary of findings, and a detailed discussion of results. To provide an understanding of findings, each president was assigned a code and responses are presented in detail.

Research question 1: What is the demographic profile of the African American women serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States as of November 2004?

The following section presented a summation of the demographic overview of the respondents. The majority of women who are presidents at HBCUs were likely to begin their higher education careers, on average 25 years ago, as faculty members. Their career paths progressed from chair of a division or department then proceeded to vice presidencies. Search firms conducted the recruitment more often for these presidents than other methods. During their interviewing phases, these presidents did not confront inappropriate questions. It seemed these women’s perceptions of the interview process were positive. Nonetheless, six women did share that their current presidencies were thrust upon them; and once it began they enjoyed the experience. The other respondents believed it was a natural progression in their career to the presidency. Those presidents who were propelled into leadership enjoyed the experiences once they began. They attributed their positive outlooks to the administrative community’s awareness of their approachability and the ease in which people confided in them.

Demographic profile. These women were more likely to have:
1. entered into higher education as a faculty member
2. been employed as a chair of a department or division
3. served as a vice president
4. attained their presidential position through situational or traditional promotional ladder
5. been recruited by a search firm
6. been questioned during the interview with a question they felt that was not inappropriate
7. been members of an institutional board membership that had less than 10% women when term began
8. developed their professional skills as research assistants during doctoral studies
9. been a president for 6 years at the current institution

Also, these women:

1. started their presidencies at the average age of 53 years
2. been employed in higher education as a field for 25 years
3. most likely are the first women to serve in the position at their institution
4. most likely have worked on a corporate board, education organization, community service board, and college/university board
5. have been an executive officer for a professional organization
6. consulted with organizations, either educational or non-educational
7. directed a major grant
8. families' backgrounds are from the southern region of the United States
9. are married
10. are mothers of one or two children
11. are not the oldest child or only child of the family
12. more likely had parents who were educators

Also, results suggested most did not encounter limitations, personally or professionally, during their careers. Their careers commenced with their work as
research assistants during their doctoral studies. Next, professional developments contributed to their career advancement. At least once in their careers, they served a term as an executive officer of a professional organization and they have managed a grant that met or exceeded $40,000. The majority of these women presidents were consultants to educational or non-educational organizations prior to their tenure.

Furthermore, these individuals began their first presidencies at the average age of 53 and toiled in the position for an average of 6 years. They served on the following boards: corporate, community service, educational (e.g., Educational Testing Services), and college/university boards. Professional aspects of this group were equally important as the personal characteristics. These presidents were born and raised in the southern region of the United States to parents who were educators and were not the eldest of the children or were not they an only child. Currently, they are married with one or two children. The respondents shared commonalities with their career achievements, educational pursuits, and family histories.

Table 2 presented the path traveled by these individuals to their current presidencies. Their entrance into the field clarifier the common pathway they utilized to ascend to the presidency. Six of nine respondents (67%) began their career as faculty members. Most leaders (33%) continued to vice presidencies prior to their CEO positions. Other women (22%) have sought employment as deans and provosts (11%) or as an institutional advancement assistant (11%). Their previous leadership roles correlated with the development of skills and knowledge associated with presidential leadership.
Table 2

The Beginning of the Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Entry-level position</th>
<th>Position prior to presidency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President A</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>Executive head, fundraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President B</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>Dean, Academic affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President C</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>system vice chancellor, Academic affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President D</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>Assistant to president, provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President E</td>
<td>Director, office of development</td>
<td>Assistant to president, Institutional advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President F</td>
<td>Director, minority student program</td>
<td>Vice President, business/financial affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President G</td>
<td>Dean, student affairs</td>
<td>Vice President, student affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President H</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>Academic affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President I</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>Dean, student affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 illustrated recruitment and hiring practices these women encountered.

Four respondents (44%) did comment their current presidencies were “thrusting upon...
them,” but have grown to enjoy their experience. An equal number of presidents (44%) remarked the closer they climb the administrative ladder, the goal of their own presidency was realized. Nonetheless, a presidency was a constant career aspiration for one woman (11%). These individuals also were less likely to be recruited by search committee members (11%) and without nomination (11%) than by search firms (44%). Remaining presidents (33%) were nominated by other individuals.

As previously discussed in chapter 2, other persons’ understanding of gender and racial backgrounds often skewed these women’s leadership. The majority of the respondents (67%) believed they enjoy the role of president because their administrators, staff, and students confided in them. The confidence in the women’s abilities was primarily based on their gender. The campus community found these presidents more approachable than their men counterparts. However, 22% believed they did not experience any advantages as women.

Table 4 illustrated women’s perspectives on their recruitment to their positions, the process of hiring, and, if any, advantages serving as presidents. The perceptions of four respondents (44%) about their presidencies were thrust upon them for the organization. However, as the tenure progressed, they grew to enjoy their new position. An alternative perspective of hiring for four women (44%) was their movement up the career ladder, closer to senior-level management, the goal of their own presidency was realized. The career goal of becoming president of an institution was always the goal of one president (11%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Recruitment to presidency</th>
<th>Hiring for presidency</th>
<th>Advantages as women president</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President A</td>
<td>Thrust upon and grew to like</td>
<td>Nominated</td>
<td>Confidence and approachable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President B</td>
<td>Thrust upon and grew to like</td>
<td>Search firm</td>
<td>Confidence and approachable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President C</td>
<td>Became a career goal</td>
<td>Nominated</td>
<td>No advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President D</td>
<td>Thrust upon and grew to like</td>
<td>Contact via search committee</td>
<td>Not being a threat to men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President E</td>
<td>Thrust upon and grew to like</td>
<td>First served as “acting capacity”</td>
<td>Confidence and being approachable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President F</td>
<td>Was always a goal</td>
<td>From previous nomination</td>
<td>Confidence and being approachable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President G</td>
<td>Became a career goal</td>
<td>Search firm</td>
<td>Confidence and being approachable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President H</td>
<td>Thrust upon and grew to like</td>
<td>Search firm</td>
<td>People helped her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President I</td>
<td>Thrust upon and grew to like</td>
<td>Search firm</td>
<td>Confidence and being approachable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Years of Involvement in the Field of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Personal hindrances</th>
<th>Professional hindrances</th>
<th>Inappropriate questions during interviews</th>
<th>Percentage of institutional boards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Prejudice in hiring</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President B</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President C</td>
<td>Maternal responsibilities politics</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10% to 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President D</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40% to 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President F</td>
<td>Unsure of presidency from network</td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President G</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President H</td>
<td>Delayed state in career</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30% to 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President I</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 presented hindrances, both on personal and professional levels, women experience during their career. Six of nine presidents (67%) indicated they did not
experience personal hindrances in their respective pursuits of a presidency. The identical percentage also did not encounter hindrances in their professional development.

While the decision to become a president varied, the method to becoming a candidate also varied. Four respondents (44%) had been directly contacted by a search firm for their current presidencies. Three individuals (33%) were nominated by other individuals for their current presidential position. Once candidates were informed of their nomination, they accepted the nomination. One woman (11%) applied without a previous nomination and was offered the presidency. The final president (11%) was contacted by members of the search committee to apply for her current presidency. She did apply for the position and was selected to lead her institution.

Professional hindrances are also considered to be drawbacks for these presidents. The largest group (67%) shared they did not experience professional hindrances in their ascent to the presidency. But three individuals did experience professional hindrances. One woman (11%) explained she did encounter prejudice in hiring because she was a woman. Another individual (11%) described exclusion from the “ol boy’s network” was a professional hindrance. Institutional politics were a professional obstacle for one woman (11%) in her ascent to the role of president.

Hurdles encountered by these women assuming a presidency are critical to comprehending their upward movement on the administrative ladder. However, once hurdles were overcome, presidents began the interviewing process. During the interview process for their current presidencies, six of the nine presidents (67%) did not believe they were asked questions they perceived as inappropriate because of their gender. Yet, two respondents (22%) did believe they were posed inappropriate questions based on
their gender. The types of questions posed by the board were reflective of the gender composition of the board. When this cohort assumed their presidency, the greater number (67%) identified women serving on less than 10% of the governing boards of their respective institutions. One respondent (11%) reported her governing board membership consists of 10% to 19% women. Another individual (11%) stated that 30% to 39% of the governing board was women. Finally, one respondent (11%) described 40% to 49% of the governing board of her institution is composed of women. This suggested that in most institutions, less than 10% of their institutional board members were women.

The personal and professional hindrances were most often overturned by external professional activities. These external professional activities were contributing factors to these presidents’ advancement in higher education. Table 5 presented external professional activities that were aids in the leadership of institutions. Five of nine women were research assistants during their advanced studies, and four individuals were teaching assistant during master’s and doctoral studies. Yet, five presidents did not teach during their advanced studies. Only one respondent held an administrative assistantship during her doctoral studies. None of the respondents were employed as a program or resident hall assistant during their master’s and doctoral studies. When asked about fellowships/traineeships during their graduate studies, four individuals indicated they participated in fellowships/traineeships during their master’s and doctoral studies.
Table 5  
*Professional Development Prior to Presidency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Master’s studies</th>
<th>Doctoral studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President A</td>
<td>Fellowship/ traineeship</td>
<td>Research assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worked on grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President B</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Research assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President C</td>
<td>Teaching assistant</td>
<td>Fellowship/ traineeship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President D</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Research assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worked on grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President G</td>
<td>Fellowships/traineeships</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President H</td>
<td>Research assistant</td>
<td>Fellowship/ traineeship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Presidents E, F, and I did not participate in assistantships during graduate studies.*

Two of nine leaders participated in grants, one leader while earning her master’s degree and another leader during her doctoral studies. One respondent was a participant in another assistantship not previously mentioned in the survey and chose not to name the
assistantship. Five women were involved in graduate assistantships during post-graduate studies, mostly on the doctoral level. The most common assistantship utilized by this group was a doctoral research assistantship.

The service these nine presidents rendered to the field of higher education and their institutions varied. The backgrounds of the presidents are displayed in Table 7. These presidents have been employed in higher education for an average for 25 years. Collectively, these individuals have a span of service in higher education from 8 years to 40 years. The group has served as president of their respective institution for an average of 6 years. The tenure of service for this group of nine presidents at their current institution had a span from less than 1 year to 15 years. The average age of the nine presidents when they assumed their first presidencies was 53 years of age. In addition to the varying services these nine presidents rendered to the field, they began their first presidencies at different times. The youngest were four women who began at the age of 50 and the oldest began at the age of 61. In addition, their current presidencies were the first term for most of respondents (77%). One individual (11%) served as president of two institutions, and another woman (11%) reported she served as president of 11 institutions. The researcher believed the president’s response to the question of the number of institutions under her leadership was 11 institutions misunderstood the question as evidenced by her response.
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Years in higher education</th>
<th>Years at current institution</th>
<th>Number of presidencies</th>
<th>Age at first presidency</th>
<th>Internal candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President B</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President D</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President E</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President G</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President H</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President I</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 and table 7 displayed the career development and number of board participation of the nine presidents. This section listed the types of boards on which the respondents had participated. Six women served on at least one corporate board. Of the six presidents, four (66%) served on one corporate board. The remaining two individuals (34%) participated on two corporate boards. All of the presidents participated on educational organization and community service boards. One president (11%) participated on one community service board, and four women (44%) participated on two
Community service boards. Two presidents (22%) had participated on three community service boards. One president (11%) had participated on four community services boards, and one president (11%) had participated on five community service boards.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Board participation</th>
<th>Number of board membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President A</td>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College or university board</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President B</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President C</td>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governmental (elected or appointed)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President D</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governmental (elected or appointed)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Board participation</td>
<td>Number of board membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President E</td>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governmental (elected or appointed)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President F</td>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governmental (elected or appointed)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President G</td>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College/university</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary/secondary schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governmental (elected or appointed)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Board participation</th>
<th>Number of board membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President H</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(elected or appointed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President I</td>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary/secondary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five of nine presidents have served on a college or university board. Of the five presidents who served on a college or university board, three presidents (60%) had not participated on a college or university board. One president (20%) had served on two college or university boards, and one president (20%) had served on three college or university boards. Another area of educational influence for these presidents was that they served on a primary or secondary school board. Of the five presidents, two have served on a primary or secondary school board, four presidents (80%) had not served on a primary or secondary school board. The remaining president (20%) had served on one primary or secondary school board. Seven presidents answered the question that they had served on a governmental elected or appointed board. Of seven presidents, one president (14%) had not served on a governmental elected or appointed board. Five presidents
(71%) had served on one governmental elected or appointed board. One president (14%) has served on three governmental-elected or appointed boards. Of five presidents, four (80%) had not been a member of a board. One president (20%) had participated on a board that was not an original choice, “foundation board.”

The programs, organizations, and career incentives increased the likelihood of employment. Table 8 also illustrated the career development of the African American women in the role of president at HBCUs. Six of nine presidents (67%) did not participate in Harvard’s Institute for Educational Management (IEM). Three of nine presidents (33%) did participate in Harvard’s IEM. Of three presidents who did participate in the IEM, one president believed the experience was directly related to her career development, and one president believed it was not related to her career. One president participated in IEM did not to answer this question. Of nine presidents, one president participated in Bryn Mawr Summer Institute and believed it was indirectly related to her career development. None of the presidents participated in the ACE Fellowship/Internship, Leaders for Change, and Leaders for the 1980s.
### Table 8

*External Professional Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Programs/ institutes participation</th>
<th>Impact on career advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President A</td>
<td>ACE NIP</td>
<td>Not related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACE National Forum</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President B</td>
<td>Harvard’s Institute for Education</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President E</td>
<td>ACE National Forum</td>
<td>Not related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President F</td>
<td>Bryn Mawr Summer Institute</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACE NIP</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACE National Forum</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President G</td>
<td>Harvard’s Institute for</td>
<td>Not related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President H</td>
<td>Harvard’s Institute for</td>
<td>Not related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of nine presidents (22%) participated in the American Council on Education (ACE) National Identification Program. Seven of nine presidents (78%) did not utilize the ACE National Identification Program in their ascent towards a presidency. One president believed participating in ACE National Identification Program was indirectly related to her upward movement on the administrative ladder. The other
president supposed that participating in the ACE National Identification Program was not related in any form to her ascent in higher education administration.

Three presidents (33%) participated in another ACE-sponsored professional development program, the National Forum. The remaining six presidents (67%) were not participants in the National Forum. Of those who participated in the National Forum, two presidents (66%) believed the experience was indirectly related to their current presidency. One president who participated believed it was not related to her presidency.

*Development On campus and Off campus.* Career activities are a factor in establishing these presidents, and professional activities propelled them forward to a presidency. Table 9 explained the professional activities these surveyed presidents participated in during their external career development. All nine surveyed presidents (100%) participated in a professional organization on national, regional, or state levels, as either a board member or an officer. Four presidents (44%) believed their career development was directly related to participation in a professional organization. Four presidents (44%) believed the professional organization was indirectly related to their career development. One president (12%) who participated in professional organizations did not respond to the linkage portion of this question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Membership on board</th>
<th>Impact on career advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President A</td>
<td>Board/officer member</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professional organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College/university</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President B</td>
<td>Board/officer member</td>
<td>Direct related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>Direct related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President C</td>
<td>Board/officer member</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate board</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President D</td>
<td>Board/officer member</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Membership on board</td>
<td>Impact on career advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President E</td>
<td>Board/office member</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate board</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College/university board</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President F</td>
<td>Board/office member</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate board</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President G</td>
<td>Board/office member</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>corporate</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College/university</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Membership on board</th>
<th>Impact on career advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President H</td>
<td>Board/office member</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President I</td>
<td>Board/office member</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional organization</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>corporate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College/university</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community service</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of nine presidents questioned, six presidents (67%) served on a corporate board. Three presidents (33%) have not been members of a corporate board during their administrative career. Of these six, two presidents assumed their corporate board involvement helped with career advancement. Four presidents thought their career advancement was indirectly related to their membership on a corporate board.

Of nine presidents surveyed, four presidents (44%) served on a college or university board, and five presidents (55%) did not serve as a member of a college or university board. Three of the four presidents with memberships on a college or
university board explained their career development was directly related to these memberships. One president believed her career development was indirectly related to membership on a college or university board.

Eight (89%) of nine presidents served on community service boards, and one president (11%) did not work on community service boards. Four presidents believed participating on community service boards was directly linked to their career advancement. Three presidents believed that participation on community service boards was indirectly related to their career advancement. One president participated on a community service board did not draw a direct link for this question. Seven presidents (78%) participated on a government board or commission. The remaining two presidents (22%) had not been members of a government board or commission. Five presidents believed their career advancement was indirectly linked to participation on government boards or commissions. One president believed her career advancement was directly linked to her membership on governmental boards or commissions.

Additional activities that are contributing factors to these nine presidents’ movement to higher education are presented in Table 10. It is an overview of activities associated with professional development. Of nine surveyed presidents, four presidents (44%) participated as a member of evaluation teams for a regional accrediting association. Five presidents (56%) were not members of an evaluation team for a regional accrediting association. Of four presidents participated on accrediting teams, two presidents believed their career advancement was directly related to membership in a regional accrediting association. One president considered not being a member of a regional accrediting team
was related to her career advancement. One president who had participated in regional accrediting teams abstained from answering this career question.

Table 10

*External Professional Activities-Miscellaneous*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Additional activities</th>
<th>Impact on career advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President A</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External consultant</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>publications</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directed major grants</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President B</td>
<td>External consultant</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>publications</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directed major grants</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of medical education</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President C</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editor/assoc. editor of journal</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>publications</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directed major grants</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President D</td>
<td>External consultant</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>publications</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directed major grants</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Additional activities</th>
<th>Impact on career advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President E</td>
<td>External consultant publications</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directed major gifts</td>
<td>Directly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President F</td>
<td>External consultant publications</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directed major gifts</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundation boards</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President H</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External consultant publications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directed major gifts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President I</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>Not related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editor/assoc. editor of journal publications</td>
<td>Indirectly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directed major gifts</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the nine presidents, six (67%) were employed as a paid external consultant. Three presidents (33%) were not employed as a paid external consultant. Four presidents
believed their employment as a paid external consultant was indirectly related to their career advancement. One president believed her career advancement was directly linked to being a paid external consultant. One president chose not to answer the question related to external consultant and career advancement.

Seven of nine presidents (78%) had not served as an editor or associate editor of a professional or scholarly journal. Two presidents (22%) were editor or associate editor of a professional or scholarly journal. Two presidents had participated in editorships, and both presidents believed the experience did not contribute to their career advancement. Of nine presidents who participated in this survey, eight presidents had published books, monographs, or articles. Three presidents published and believed there was a direct relation to publishing and their career advancement. Three presidents professed it was an indirect relation to their career development and their presidency. Two presidents stated that publishing did not respond to the relation question.

Eight presidents (89%) had directed major grants. Of eight presidents who had directed a major grant, five presidents (71%) believed there was a direct relation between career advancement and direction of a major grant. Two presidents shared career advancement had an indirect relationship to directing major grants. One president who participated in major grants did not respond to this question.

Three presidents (60%) were associated in unnamed external professional activities that were contributors to their career development. Those activities were foundation boards, public speaking, and employment as director of education at a medical school. One president postulated professional activity was indirectly related to her career
development and attaining a presidency. Two presidents did not share if their external professional activities were connected to their current presidencies.

*Personal data.* Table 11 explained the demographic overview of the presidents of HBCUs who are led by African American women. The average age of the surveyed presidents was 61 years of age. The range of ages of the presidents was 54 years to 68 years.

Table 11

*Personal Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Current age</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Martial status</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President A</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President B</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President C</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President D</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President E</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President F</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Current Age</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President G</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Widowed-not remarried</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President H</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>West Indies</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President I</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presidents' birthplace represented the southeastern region of the United States.

Those states with one president were Maryland, District of Columbia, West Virginia, Florida, Louisiana, and Texas. Two presidents were from Mississippi.

Six presidents (67%) were currently married. Two presidents (22%) were divorced. One president (11%) was widowed and had not remarried. Most presidents had one child (44%) or two children (44%). One president had three children (11%).

Table 12 examined family background. Presidents' birth order in the family varied. Four of the presidents were first born or an only child. One president was the middle of three or more siblings. One president was the youngest of her siblings. Another president was the second oldest of six girls. Another was the second of eight siblings. One was second of five siblings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Birth order in family</th>
<th>Father’s occupation</th>
<th>Mother’s employment outside home</th>
<th>Mother’s occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President A</td>
<td>First or only child</td>
<td>High school teacher</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Housekeeper for others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President B</td>
<td>Middle of three siblings</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Elementary school counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President C</td>
<td>Next to the oldest of 6 girls</td>
<td>Farmer then store owner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maid then store owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President D</td>
<td>First or only child</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President E</td>
<td>Youngest sibling</td>
<td>Landowner/farmer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Full-time homemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President F</td>
<td>First or only child</td>
<td>Teacher/businessman</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President G</td>
<td>First or only child</td>
<td>Educator/administrator</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President H</td>
<td>Second of 8 siblings</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Birth order in family</td>
<td>Father’s occupation</td>
<td>Mother’s employment outside home</td>
<td>Mother’s occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President l</td>
<td>Second of 5 siblings</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Teacher/counselor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each president’s father had a different occupation or profession. One president’s father was a businessman. Another president’s father was a teacher and then became a businessman. One president’s father was an educator who became an administrator. One president’s father was employed as a coach, and another president’s father was a high school teacher. One president’s father was a lawyer. Two presidents’ fathers had occupations that were somewhat similar, landowner and farmer; the other father was a storeowner, and later, a farmer. Six presidents (67%) did have mothers who were employed outside of the home, before they graduated from high school. Two presidents’ mothers (22%) were not employed prior to high school graduation. One president (11%) answered that it was not applicable.

Of nine mothers of presidents, seven mothers were employed outside the home in the field of education. One mother was a principal, one was a teacher and counselor, and another was an elementary school counselor. Two mothers were educators. The two mothers who were not employed in education worked as housekeepers for others. The other mother was a maid and then became a storeowner.
Research question 2: What are the leadership characteristics of African American women presidents serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States utilizing the Bolman and Deal's Reframing Organization leadership model (Bolman, 1991) as of November 2004?

The authors of this survey constructed the instrument to assess the four frames and, with an option, an additional four subscale frames. The researcher only used the foundation of the four original frames. Presentation of the data began with results of each question and concluded with average results for each frame.

Questions 1 through 32 identified the self-perceived leadership style used by the surveyed presidents. Fifty-six percent of presidents (n = 5) believed they often thought very clearly and logically. Forty-four percent of presidents (n = 4) believed they always thought very clearly and logically.

When asked if they showed high levels of support and concern for others, one president (11%) thought sometimes, five presidents (56%) thought often, and three presidents (33%) thought always. Fifty-six percent of the presidents believed they often have shown exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done. Forty-four percent of the presidents (n = 4) believed they always have shown the same style. Fifty-six percent (n = 5) of presidents shared they often inspired others to do their best. Thirty-three percent of presidents (n = 3) trusted they always inspired others to do their best. One president (11%) believed she sometimes inspired others to do their best.

Seven of the nine presidents (78%) admitted they often "strongly emphasized careful planning and clear time lines" (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 5). The remaining two presidents (22%) stated they always were careful in planning with clear time lines. Five
presidents (56%) explained they often built trust through open and collaborative relationships. Two presidents (22%) maintained they sometimes trust others, and two presidents (22%) have always built trust through open and collaborative relationships. Six presidents (67%) speculated they were often very skillful and shrewd negotiators. Two presidents (22%) perceived themselves as always very skillful and shrewd negotiators. One president (11%) believed she was often a very skillful and shrewd negotiator. Five presidents always, and four presidents often, felt they are highly charismatic in their current career (57% and 44%, respectively).

Four presidents often, and four presidents always, approached problems through logical analysis and careful thinking (44% each). The remaining president (11%) thought she sometimes attended to problems through logical analysis and careful thinking. Five presidents (56%) believed they often showed high sensitivity and concern for others’ needs and feelings. Two presidents perceived themselves as always, and two presidents believed they were sometimes highly sensitive and concerned for others’ needs and feelings (22%, respectively). Fifty-six percent of presidents (n = 5) described themselves as often unusually persuasive and influential. Thirty-three percent (n = 3) gathered they were always unusually persuasive and influential. Eleven percent (n = 1) considered they were unusually persuasive and influential.

Of eight presidents, three presidents (38%) concluded they were always an inspiration to others. Three additional presidents (38%) shared they often inspired others. One president (13%) sometimes and another president (13%) occasionally affirmed they were an inspiration to others.
Seventy-eight percent of presidents ($n = 7$) thought they often developed and implemented clear, logical policies and procedures. Twenty-two percent of presidents ($n = 2$) postulated they sometimes developed and implemented clear, logical policies and procedures. Sixty-seven percent ($n = 6$) of presidents admitted they often foster high levels of participation and involvement in decisions. Twenty-two percent of remaining presidents ($n = 2$) affirmed they always foster very high levels of participation and involvement in decisions. Eleven percent of presidents ($n = 1$) postulated they occasionally encouraged a high level of participation and involvement in decisions on their campus.

Five presidents (56%) often anticipated and dealt adroitly with organizational conflict. Two presidents (22%) always dealt skillfully with organizational conflict. Two presidents (22%) sometimes handled organizational conflict. Fifty-five percent of presidents ($n = 5$) shared they were always highly imaginative and creative. Thirty-three percent of presidents ($n = 3$) perceived they often were highly imaginative and creative. Eleven percent of presidents ($n = 1$) were highly imaginative and creative in their approach to the leadership of their institution.

Fifty-six percent of the presidents ($n = 5$) stated they often approached problems with facts and logic. Thirty-three percent of presidents ($n = 3$) affirmed they always approached problems with facts and logic. Eleven percent of the presidents ($n = 1$) felt they sometimes approach problems with facts and logic. When interacting with others, fifty-six percent of presidents ($n = 5$) speculated they were often consistently helpful and responsive to others. Twenty-two percent of presidents ($n = 2$) considered they were sometimes consistently helpful and responsive to others. Twenty-two percent
of presidents \((n = 2)\) acknowledged they were always helpful and responsive to the institutional community.

Of nine presidents, five presidents \((56\%)\) reflected that they were very effective in getting support from people with influence and power. Three presidents \((33\%)\) felt engaged in getting support from people with influence and power. One president \((11\%)\) assumed she was supportive of people with influence and power. Six of nine presidents \((67\%)\) recognized they were always communicating a strong and challenging vision and sense of mission. The remaining three presidents \((33\%)\) identified they often strongly communicated a challenging vision and mission statement to the participants of the institution.

Seventy-nine percent of the presidents \((n = 7)\) reported that they often set specific, measurable goals and held people accountable for results. Twenty-two percent \((n = 2)\) considered that they often established specific, measurable goals and kept people accountable for results. Sixty-seven percent of the presidents \((n = 6)\) often listen well and were unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input. Twenty-two percent of the presidents \((n = 2)\) were often very attentive and approachable to other persons' ideas and input. Eleven percent of presidents \((n = 1)\) sometimes had listened well and was uncommonly accessible to individuals' ideas and input to the organization’s growth.

Five presidents \((56\%)\) were always, politically very sensitive and skillful. Two presidents \((22\%)\) were often sensitive and skillful politically. One president \((11\%)\) occasionally, and one president \((11\%)\) sometimes, was skillful and sensitive to the political environment of their campus. Seventy-eight percent of presidents \((n = 7)\) shared they always saw beyond current realities to create exciting new opportunities. Twenty-
two percent of presidents ($n = 2$) believed they often observed existing realities to originate innovative opportunities. Fifty-six percent of presidents ($n = 5$) responded they often paid extraordinary attention to detail. Forty-four percent of presidents ($n = 4$) considered they always paid close attention to the details connected to their HBCU.

These presidents continued to report additional leadership behaviors commonly used by the surveyed group. Four presidents (44%) deemed they often had given persons recognition for work well done. Four presidents (44%) always had given people recognition for work performed well. One president (11%) had sometimes given people recognition for work well done. Fifty-six percent of the sample ($n = 5$) had thought that they often developed alliances to build a strong base of support. This is more than the 22% percent of respondents ($n = 2$) established alliances to construct a strong base of support. Twenty-two percent ($n = 2$) cultivated an alliance to develop an intense support network within their respective institutions.

Of nine presidents, eight presidents (90%) believed they often generated loyalty and enthusiasm. One president (11%) perceived she always generated loyalty and enthusiasm. Six presidents (67%) often believed strongly in clear structure and chain of command. Two presidents (22%) were always invested in clear structure and a chain of command. One president (11%) was sometimes devoted to a structure that was unambiguous and an unclear succession to promotion.

The presidents were asked a reflection question about their managerial style. The question was posed as if others were speaking of them. The question was: "She is a highly participative manager." Fifty-five percent of presidents ($n = 5$) answered "always." Twenty-two percent ($n = 2$) responded "sometimes" to this question. Eleven
percent of presidents \((n = 1)\) replied “often.” The remaining 11\% of presidents responded “occasionally” to the question about managerial leadership.

In the face of conflict and opposition, 56\% percent of presidents often perceived themselves to have succeeded in conflict. Thirty-three percent of presidents “always” succeeded in the face of opposition. Eleven percent responded they “sometimes” thrived in discord and antagonism. Sixty-seven percent of presidents often served as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values. Thirty-three percent of presidents believed they were always a role model of organizational aspirations and values.

**Reframing the Leadership Styles**

When presidents responded to the question, “What is your strongest skill?”, two presidents (22\%) chose analytic skill as their strongest skill in comparison to two presidents (22\%) who described it as their weakest skill. Two presidents (22\%) explained their strongest skill was interpersonal skill in comparison to three presidents (33\%) who stated interpersonal skill was their weakest. One president (11\%) indicated political skill was her strongest skill in comparison to three presidents (33\%) who selected it as their weakest skill in leadership. Four presidents (44\%) designated their strongest skill was the ability to excite and motivate others, and one president (11\%) selected it as her weakness skill.

The participants were asked to respond to this question, “The best way to describe yourself is...” Six presidents (67\%) believed that “technical expert” least described them. Three presidents (33\%) said they perceived themselves best as good
listeners. None of the presidents chose good listener as the least apt description of themselves. One president (11%) selected “to build a strong alliances and a power base” as the best way to describe herself. Two presidents (22%) stated that “building strong alliances and a power base” was the least appropriate way to describe them. When asked the question, “The best way to describe yourself is,” five presidents (56%) expressed themselves best as an inspirational leader in comparison to one president (11%) who stated this skill least described her.

These presidents also focused on the best skills they possess. Of surveyed presidents, four presidents (44%) believed the skill they performed best was making good decisions. On the contrary, two presidents (22%) thought that making good decisions was least appropriate to describe them. Two presidents (22%) considered the ability to coach and develop people best portrayed them. Two presidents (22%) expressed the ability to prepare and cultivate others least described them. One president (11%) stated the capability to establish resilient alliances and power was the leadership skill that best describes her; nonetheless, three presidents (33%) felt their ability to build strong alliances and power was the least developed of their skills. Two presidents (22%) reflected their best skill was to energize and inspire others. Conversely, two presidents (22%) considered the experience of energizing and inspiring others as their least developed skill.

One president (11%) considered the leadership skill to best portrayed her was more likely to be her attention to detail, whereas four presidents (44%) said that “concentration to detail” was the least likely skill to be noticed. Two presidents (22%)
deemed that others would best describe presidents to have more concern for people. Yet, two presidents (22%) stated people would least likely notice what peers liked about them.

Of nine presidents, three presidents (33%) believed people were most likely to describe them as having the ability to succeed in the face of conflict and opposition. However, one president (11%) responded the ability to succeed in the face of conflict and opposition was the least likely skill to describe her. Three presidents (33%) considered charisma as a leadership skill that others would state would best describe them. Two presidents (22%) reacted that most people would least likely to notice them as having charisma.

When asked the question “What is your most important leadership trait?” none of the presidents selected “clear and logical thinking” as her most significant leadership trait. However, only one president described the leadership trait of “clear, logical thinking” as the least important. Two presidents (22%) thought being “caring and supportive of others” was the best way to describe their most important leadership traits. Five presidents (56%) explained their least developed trait that described them was “caring and support for others.” One president (11%) described her best trait and one president (11%) described her worst trait as toughness and aggressiveness.

Six presidents (67%) revealed their best skill describes them was being imaginative and creative. However, two presidents (22%) shared imagination and creativity their weakest traits. One president (11%) described herself as an analyst. Two presidents (22%) identified their perception of themselves as weak analysts. None of presidents selected the title of humanist to best describe themselves. Yet, one president (11%) did select humanist to least likely to describe herself.
One president (11%) best described herself as a politician. Nevertheless, five presidents (56%) stated the title of politician was a weak description. Of nine presidents, seven presidents (78%) identified with the title of visionary as one of their leadership traits. Only one president (11%) listed the title of visionary as a weak description of her leadership style.

Subsidiary Questions

Using the ACE National Database, three groups were formed to compare with the surveyed population. Those groups were presidents of HBCUs, all presidents who were women, and all presidents who participated in the 2002 edition of the ACE’s Center for Policy Analysis book titled, The American College President. Due to the small number of the surveyed presidents, the percentages in the comparisons might be perceive as skewed but are not because of the number.

1. What professional development opportunities do African American women employ in order to advance to the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States?

Under the heading of programs and institutions, the nine presidents answered questions related to their professional development. Three presidents participated in Harvard’s Institute for Educational Management (IEM) and the ACE’s National Forum. Two presidents participated in ACE’s National Identification Program. Only one president participated in the Bryn Mawr Summer Institute.
All nine presidents had worked as a board member of different organizations. Eight presidents served on a community service board. Seven presidents participated on a government board or government commissions. Six presidents served on a corporate board. Four presidents were a member of a college or university board.

Eight presidents published books, monographs, and articles and directed major grants. Six presidents were employed as external consultants. Four presidents served on evaluation teams for regional accrediting associations. Two presidents were editors or associate editors of a professional or scholarly journal. One president worked on a foundation board.

All presidents, all women presidents, and presidents of HBCUs, according to ACE (2002) were similar to the surveyed group in relation to professional development. All presidential groups worked on external boards, 79% of all presidents, 81% of all women presidents, 87% of HBCU presidents, and 100% of the surveyed population. In turn, there is no significant difference between groups. In addition, there are similarities with organizational memberships; the presidential groups are similar in scholarly publications. In the 2002 ACE database, all presidents (28%), all women presidents (26%), and all HBCU presidents (27%) continued research during their presidencies in correlation to the surveyed presidents (89%).

2. What are the professional backgrounds of African American women serving as president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States as compared to all presidents of colleges and universities, all HBCU presidents, and all women presidents of colleges and universities in the United States?
This question analyzed professional development: Within 5 years of your first appointment to a presidency, in how many presidential searches were you an active candidate? HBCU presidents participated in an average of 1.4 presidential searches. Women presidents and presidents as a collective group were involved in at least 1.5 presidential searches in the last 5 years. The surveyed presidents in this study, on an average, participated in .89 presidential searches in the last 5 years. There was no significant difference between the three established groups and the surveyed group.

Another question associated with professional development was: Total number of years you have served as a college president at your current institution? HBCU presidents have led their institution on average 8.3 years. Women serving as presidents were in the position an average 5.3 years at their current institutions. All presidents had served an average of 6.6 years at their current institutions. The surveyed population was employed an average of 6.3 years at their current institutions. There was no significant difference between the three established groups and the surveyed group.

The final question linked with professional development was: Total number of presidencies held (including your current presidency). HBCU presidents were leaders of 0.4 institutions. Women presidents and presidents as a collective group had served as president of 0.5 institutions. The surveyed population was presidents for 0.3 institutions. There was no significant difference between the three established groups and the surveyed group.

3. What are the personal background of African American women serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States as compared to all presidents
of colleges and universities, all HBCU presidents, and all women presidents of colleges and universities?

The only question related to personal background was: What was your birth date? According to American College President published by ACE, HBCU presidents were an average of 59.5 years of age in 2002, while women presidents, on average, were 56.6 years of age in 2002. Presidents serving in 2002 were an average age of 57.5 years. Presidents in the surveyed population were an average of 61.2 years of age. There was not a significant difference between the three established populations and the surveyed population.

4. Is there a significant difference in the leadership behavior and leadership styles of African American women presidents, according to the Bolman and Deal leadership model (Bolman, 1991), compared to the established data set of other educational and business leaders?

By means of the database created and maintained by Bolman, an established data set was compared to the surveyed population. Leadership behavior has a range of 8 to 40 points for the answers in this section for each frame respectively. Of nine presidents, six presidents managed by using the structural frame. The established population arrived at a score of 32.49 (n = 1,309) with a standard deviation of 5.70 on this frame. The surveyed population calculated a score of 33.78 (n = 9) with a standard deviation of 1.98 on the structural framework. The researcher compared the means of established and surveyed populations using a one tailed t test. The t score was 1.94 (df = 8). The mean difference was 1.28. There was not a significant difference between the two groups, $p < .08$. 


The second section was the human resources frame. Of nine presidents, six presidents used this frame. The established population amassed a score of 32.40 (n = 1331) with a standard deviation of 6.30. The surveyed population scored 32.78 (n = 9) with a standard deviation of 4.18 on the human resource frame. The human resource frame also was analyzed using a t test. The t score was .23, (df = 8). The mean difference was 32. There was not a significant difference between the two groups, .82 p > .05 level.

The next section was political frame. Of nine presidents, six presidents used the political frame in their leadership styles. The population established by Bolman (n = 1268) was a sum of 31.39 with a standard deviation of 5.74 on the political framework. The surveyed population (n = 9) was 33.44 with a standard deviation of 2.70. The t test result for the political frame was a t score of 2.28, (df = 8). The mean difference was 2.05. There was no significant difference between the two populations, which was .052 at a p > .05 significance level.

The final section was based on the symbolic frame. Of nine presidents, four presidents used the symbolic frame for their leadership styles. The established population scored 31.39 (n = 1315) with a standard deviation of 6.32. The surveyed population calculated 35 (n = 4) with a standard deviation of 4.90. The t test result for symbolic frame was a t score of 4.79, (df = 7). The mean difference was 3.62. There was a statistically significant difference between the two populations, which was .000 at .000 significance level. The researcher performed calculations for effect size only for the symbolic frame of leadership styles.

In this study, the two groups were Bolman’s established population and the surveyed population. According to Coe (2000), effect size was a statistical method to
measure the difference between two groups. Coe further explained the effect size was a
"standard deviations to contextualize the difference between the two groups" (p.1). An
effect size value of .63 was calculated between the two groups with an estimated 95%
confidence interval from .08 to 1.34. In establishing the confidence interval, it
strengthened the justification for the small sample size. According to Thalheimer and
Cook (2002), Cohen stated effect sizes should be gauged by .20 as small, .50 as medium,
and .80 as large to ascertain “benchmarks.” With an effect size of .63 for the symbolic
frame of leadership behavior, it was considered to be a medium effect between
established and surveyed populations.

The leadership behaviors systematized as structural, human resources, and
political frames were not statistically significant between the established dataset and the
surveyed database. However, the symbolic frame was the leadership behavior to be
statistically significant, p = .000. Based on the size of the surveyed population, effect
size calculation was performed to gauge the difference between the survey group (n = 9)
and the established group (n = 1315). The benchmarks formulated by Coe (2000) had a
medium correlation between two groups.

Table 13 revealed presidents’ averages for each of the four frames associated
with leadership behaviors.
### Table 13

Averages for Leadership Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Human resources</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President A</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>36[^a]</td>
<td>38[^a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President B</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33[^a]</td>
<td>36[^a]</td>
<td>37[^a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President C</td>
<td>37[^a]</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33[^a]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President D</td>
<td>37[^a]</td>
<td>36[^a]</td>
<td>33[^a]</td>
<td>37[^a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President E</td>
<td>34[^a]</td>
<td>38[^a]</td>
<td>35[^a]</td>
<td>35[^a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President F</td>
<td>34[^a]</td>
<td>35[^a]</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President G</td>
<td>33[^a]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President H</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33[^a]</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President I</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34[^a]</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages to Compare</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ^a^ indicated averages signals usage of the frame.
The leadership style used forced-choice answers with responses ranged 6 to 24 points for each question. Structural frame was the first frame. Of nine presidents, five presidents used the structural frame in their leadership style. The established population scored 15.77 (n = 1229) with a standard deviation of 4.96. The surveyed population was 13.33 (n = 9) with a standard deviation of 3.16. The t-test result was -2.31, (df = 8). The mean difference was -2.44. There was a significant difference of .04 between the two populations at a .05 significance level using a t test. An effect size was also computed for forced-choice answers associated with the structural frame. The value was .51 (medium) with an estimated 95% confidence interval from .14 to 1.16.

Human resource was the next frame. The established population averaged 16.37 (n = 1222) with a standard deviation of 4.85. The surveyed population scored 14.67 (n = 9) with a standard deviation of 4.90. The t-test result was a t score of -1.04 (df = 8). The mean difference was -1.70. The difference between the two groups was not significant at p = .33.

The third frame was the political frame. The established population scored 14.30 (n = 1218) with a standard deviation of 4.72. The surveyed population numbered 14.00 (n = 9) with a standard deviation of 4.53. The t-test result was a t score of -.20 (df = 8). The mean difference was -.30. The difference between the two groups was not significant at .85 at p>.05 level.

The final frame was the symbolic frame. The established population was 14.40 (n = 1221) with a standard deviation of 5.41. The surveyed population scored 18.00 (n = 9) with a standard deviation of 5.59. The t-test results were a t score of 1.93, (df = 8). The
mean difference was 3.60. There was not a significant difference between the two
groups, \( p = .09 \).

Of the four leadership styles, the structural frame was the one style that was
statistically significant, \( p = .04 \). Again, the effect size was computed with a medium
effect between the two groups.

Table 14 described presidents' averages for each of the four frames associated
with the leadership style.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17(^a)</td>
<td>24(^a)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President C</td>
<td>17(^a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15(^a)</td>
<td>21(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President D</td>
<td>18(^a)</td>
<td>19(^a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President E</td>
<td>16(^a)</td>
<td>17(^a)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President F</td>
<td>14(^a)</td>
<td>23(^a)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President G</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16(^a)</td>
<td>20(^a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President H</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15a</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15a</td>
<td>24a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages to</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. a denotes president used the leadership frame.

5. What are the most dominant leadership styles and leadership behaviors exhibited by this cohort of African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the United States?

The most common dominant leadership behaviors were structural, political, and human resources each, with six presidents to demonstrate these behaviors. Five presidents exhibited the political frame behavior. The most common dominant leadership style was symbolic frame reported by six presidents, but five presidents reported on a daily basis to using the human resources frame style.

6. What are the least common leadership behaviors and leadership styles among African American women presidents at 4-year HBCUs in the United States?
The least common leadership behavior was the symbolic frame, with four presidents self-identifying this frame. The least common leadership style was the political frame.

7. How many frames, from Bolman and Deal leadership model, do African American women serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States engage during their administration?

Based on the leadership behavior, the average number of frames shared by this group was 2.4 frames. Also, the nine presidents, on average, managed using 2.1 frames in their leadership styles.

8. What is the number of frames, from the Bolman and Deal leadership model, African American women serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States use compared to other education and business leaders?

The surveyed population used 2.4 leadership behavior frames and 2.1 leadership frames styles, which is a strong correlation with the other education and business leaders. In reference to this question, elaborations of these findings are included in chapter 5.

Summary

The findings from this study suggested there are more similarities between African American women serving as presidents at HBCUs and their peers at other institutions, regardless of gender and racial background, as stated in the hypotheses.
H1: There was no statistically significant difference between all presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUS in the position held prior to their current position.

H2: There was no statistically significant difference between all women presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the position held prior to their current position.

H3: There was no statistically significant difference between all HBCU presidents and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the position held prior to their current position.

Data suggested there was no significant difference between all presidents, all women presidents, HBCU presidents, and African American women presidents leading 4-year HBCUs in the positions held prior their current presidency. In addition, it rejected the null hypotheses.

H4: There was no statistically significant difference between all presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the method they used to become a candidate for their current position.

H5: There was no statistically significant difference between all women presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the method they used to become a candidate for their current position.

H6: There was no statistically significant difference between all HBCU presidents and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the method they used to become a candidate for their current position.
Data further suggested there was no significant difference between all presidents of colleges and universities and the surveyed population in the method they used to become a candidate for their current presidency, and it rejected the null hypothesis. Also, there was no significant difference between all women presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents in the method they used to become a candidate for their current position, and it also rejected the null hypothesis. Finally, there was no statistically significant difference between HBCU presidents and African American women presidents in the method they used to become a candidate for their current position. It rejected the presented null hypothesis.

H0: There is no statistically significant difference between all presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in total number of years served as college president of their current institution.

H0: There is no statistically significant difference between all women presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in total number of years served as college president of their current institution.

H0: There is no statistically significant difference between all HBCU presidents and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in total number of years served as college president of their current institution.

Data suggested there was no statistically significant difference between all presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the number of years served as institution, and it rejects the null hypothesis. It further suggested the difference between all women presidents of colleges and
universities and the surveyed population was no statistically significant and rejected the null hypothesis. Finally, there was no statistically significant difference between all HBCU presidents and African American women presidents questioned for this survey. It rejected the null hypothesis.

H0: There is no statistically significant difference between all presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in age during their presidency.

H1: There is no statistically significant difference between all women president of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in age during their presidency.

H2: There is no statistically significant difference between all HBCU presidents and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in age during their presidency.

Data suggested there were no statistical differences between all presidents, all women presidents, and HBCU presidents and African American women presidents and rejected the null hypotheses.

H3: There is no statistically significant difference between all presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the number of and types of external boards upon which they serve.

H4: There is no statistically significant difference between all women presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the number of and types of external boards upon which they serve.
H₀₅: There is no statistically significant difference between all HBCU presidents and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the number and types of external boards upon which they serve. Data suggested there was no statistically significant difference between all presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the number and types of external boards they served and, in turn, rejected the null hypothesis. In addition, there was no statistically significant difference between all women presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the number and types of external boards upon which they serve. Thus, it rejected the null hypothesis. Finally, research revealed there was no statistically significant difference between all HBCU presidents and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the number of and types of external boards they served. This concluded the finding rejected the null hypothesis.

H₀₆: There is no statistically significant difference between all presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the total number of presidencies held.

H₀₇: There is no statistically significant difference between all women presidents of colleges and universities and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the total number of presidencies held.

H₀₈: There is no statistically significant difference between all HBCU presidents and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the total number of presidencies held.
Research suggested that there is no statistically significant difference between all presidents of colleges and universities, all women presidents of colleges and universities, all HBCU presidents, and African American women presidents in the total number of presidencies held. The findings rejected the null hypothesis.

H₀: There is no statistically significant difference between all education and business leaders and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the leadership style frame exhibited during their current employment.

H₁: There is no statistically significant difference between all education and business leaders and African American women presidents of 4-year HBCUs in the leadership behavior frame exhibited during their current employment.

Research suggested there was no statistically significant difference between the established database and the surveyed population in the structural frame leadership style between education and business leaders and rejected the null hypothesis. It also revealed there was no statistically significant difference between the Bolman and Deal database and the African American women presidents in the human resources frame leadership style. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Data revealed there was no statistically significant difference between the established database and the African American women presidents in the political frame leadership style and rejected the null hypothesis.

Nonetheless, there was a significant difference between the established population and surveyed population, \( p = .000 \). Upon further analysis using effect size, which was a statistical method to measure the difference between two groups, results were medium difference between the two groups.
Findings also yielded there were no significant differences between other educational and business leaders and African American women presidents in the leadership behavior, human resources, political, and symbolism. It rejected the null hypothesis. However, there was a significant difference between the two groups in relation to the structural frame. Using the effect size to measure the difference, it scored a medium outcome.
Chapter V
Summary, Conclusion, and Recommendations

The evolution of the presidential post from Harvard University to present day institutions has been the center of research; however, the investigation related to HBCU and other minority serving institutions has been continuously overlooked. Modern day influences affect TWI and HBCUs’ leadership, such as the progression of technology, pressure to fundraise, and larger student populations. The shared mission statements of HBCUs have created a desire of activism and community service. A roundtable discussion with two HBCU presidents best personified the vision of their institutions. One president shared his institution was patient; it provided the environment for faculty to teach and to enrich students. The other president continued that his institution had rejected the elitism of other colleges and universities and strived to educate all students (Willie, 1994). A study by Pasarella and research peers (Pasarella, Smart, Ethington, & Nettes, 1987) discussed HBCUs’ influences on students. The results exposed that these institutions had a positive direct impact on the self-esteem of students, particularly White men. But as doors of TWIs continued to open wider, the philosophy and need of these institutions has been questioned. Additionally, HBCUs must contend with challenges about their current and future mission and purpose.

Two approaches to the HBCU system’s future have been debated. Charles Willie (1994) suggested one, which was integration and liberation. Michael I. omax (1998) advocated the other, which was to continue the multiplayer educational system. Willie (1994) suggested the increase of the White student population to 20% at all HBCUs. In doing so, White students would experience the excellent education and a welcoming
college environment. Willie referenced the words of W. E. B. DuBois as a major contributor to this change, by stating, when White students became the minority at the institution, they would experience "double consciousness." These students would become aware of their own and others' viewpoints, thus becoming liberated from their thought processes while integrating those of the institution and other students and faculty.

Michael Lomax (1984) argued the second option was to maintain the current system of HBCUs. With the 1986 Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) redefining of the Standards for Accrediting, most institutions were placed on probation. This is very important because most were located within the SACS region. He continued by emphasizing the placement of all institutions on the same financial and academic levels would cause them to appear identical. This would force institutions to lose their individual identity. Lomax offered the solution that institutions maintain their current characteristics because all institutions can become members of the Black Ivy League. Each HBCU should address their respective population's needs to accomplish their goals (Lomax, 1984).

The current study was a scholarly observation of new women leaders at HBCUs. With the questioning of these institutional futures, the presidential position was very important. The linkage between the HBCU presidency and African American women began with Dr. Willa Player. She was the first African American woman to lead a 4-year liberal arts institution in the United States, Bennett College for Women. Although Dr. Player's tenure began in modern history, it began but to fulfill a need. That same sense of purpose is being continued today in the newer generations of African American women presidents. The research questions were constructed to understand these
women's backgrounds, both personally and professionally, and methods they used to lead their institution.

Research question 1: What is the demographic profile of the current cohort of African American women serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States as of November 2004?

Forty-four percent of respondents were firstborn or the only child of the family. Most of these presidents were second eldest or middle children of the family. This is a sharp contradiction of the presented literature in chapter 2. Six of nine presidents were married, two were divorced, and one was widowed and had not remarried. According to Hennig (1970), women leaders were more likely to be first born or the only child of the family. Once more, the research does not support the literature concerning marital status. Also, they were often unmarried, either by choice (never married) or by circumstance (divorce). These presidents were high achievers with consideration of their birth orders. In addition, they maintained marriages while moving into the higher levels of management. This is continued proof that marriage is common among this group and does not affect their career.

Another characteristic of importance was the family structure. Of nine presidents, 78% had mothers employed outside of the household. More importantly, five of seven mothers working outside the home worked in the field of education. All fathers worked in varying fields outside the home. The literature and findings coincided to support mothers' employment outside the home does have a positive, long-term effect on daughters. Hennig (1970) discussed parents who had high expectations for their
daughters. This could translate into daughters having higher self-esteem and attaining to higher levels in their respective fields.

All presidents, except for a president born in the United States Virgin Islands, were born and raised in the southeastern United States. For the president born in the Virgin Islands, she currently is the president of a HBCU in that country. This signaled that most presidents are leading institutions near to their birthplace and are more familiar with the environment and needs of the community. While literature could not be discovered to affirm this finding, it did speak to their support of the missions of their institutions and the surrounding community.

The professional developments of these presidents were not dissimilar to their presidential peers. Shavlik and Touchton (1984) identified FMWA, sponsored by NIP/ACE, as a catalyst for the advancement of minority women presidents. Another program researchers spotlighted was the ACE Fellows Program. Graduates from the program after 1980 were more likely to become presidents of colleges and universities. Professional organizations constructed development programs to improve the upward movement of women and minorities, but these opportunities did not have a direct correlation with this survey group. There were no significant differences in the number of presidential searches in which they participated, tenure as president, and number of presidencies. Nonetheless, they were the oldest group compared to all HBCU presidents, all women presidents, and all presidents, as of 2002 (Corrigan, 2002). There was not a significant difference in the age factor, but it did support the literature. African American women administrators had the perception that they must have more work experience and advanced degrees. But according to the comparison analysis, the surveyed population
was less than 5 years older than their peers. The perception of working longer and having an advanced degree was not a factor in their career advancement.

Research question 2: What are the leadership characteristics of African American women presidents serving in the position of president at 4-year HBCUs in the United States utilizing the Bolman and Deal's reframing organization leadership model as of November 2004?

The common most dominant leadership behaviors were those within the human resources, political, and structural frames. These behaviors described presidents' leadership on a daily basis, and the literature correlated with the length of service and the number of leadership behaviors utilized. On average, the surveyed presidents used at least two behaviors with 6.3 years of service. This does support the number of behaviors these presidents exhibited are in line with their counterparts in business and education. The longest serving president of 15 years adopted all of the four frames. The president with the shortest term of 8 months employed one frame. Another important factor was the most dominant leadership behavior commonly used, the political frame. Usage of this frame was compelling; the literature stated African American women administrators perceived their presence in management often as babysitters. However, include the factor of president and results yielded they were active in the politics of institution. It is unclear if this was because the position required these activities or not.

Six of nine presidents identified their frequently used leadership style as the symbolic frame. Leadership style was the method of management over an extended period of time. The usage of this frame paralleled to the culture of a HBCU. These institutions rely heavily on traditions, folklore, and stories. Examples of HBCUs' deep
connection to symbols were the annual Homecoming, school’s archrivals, and other academic and social norms. Presidents were mindful of this bond and its importance to the institutional culture.

Conclusion

The intention of this study was to add to the field of higher education by moving the spotlight from the institution (HBCU) to emerging leaders (African American women). Through the literature review, an array of topics associated with the presidency, HBCUs, career path, and methods of leadership at their institutions were presented. Cunningham (1992) overviewed the perception of their selection for a position was linked to their ethnic and racial background. Once employment begins, factors to contribute to their employment are not referenced as valued. As African American women increase their presence as presidents, especially at HBCUs, some of these issues they addressed, personal or professional, warrant further research. In the duty of women, they have to complete tasks associated with their household and administrator careers. Women have added duties uncommon to their male counterparts. But they still complete their responsibilities in both areas.

African American women, regardless of the position or institution’s Carnegie Classification, have been rated last. With affirmative action and the women’s movement, their voices have been at least heard. This study was the opportunity to begin research and discussions on their importance, at least, at HBCUs.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study was a beginning for many opportunities for growth. While this study was focused on only African American women at HBCUs, it would be advantageous for
the population to be increased to all HBCU presidents. The population of African American women in leadership is high at these institutions, but it is suggested that all African American women presidents regardless of institutional identification should be the focus of research.

Additional suggestions for research are pipelines and professional development programs to increase their involvement in higher education. Bryn Mawr Summer Institute, NIP, and ACE Fellows have been identified as helping with increasing this population. Small and lesser known initiatives are making contributions and should be researched.

On the national level, the affirmative action's and women's movement's direct or indirect effects on the progress of this population should be researched. In recent months, affirmative action cases have been centered on student admission practices, but these policies affect administrators also.

In the preliminary research for this topic, a review of former presidents of HBCUs was performed. Depending on the institution, most had not had a woman as president. In the case of one institution, when a vacancy occurred, a woman temporarily filled it. However, when a permanent replacement was appointed, it was a man. Research associated with temporary leadership at HBCUs should be further investigated.

Finally, it would be of interest to have this study replicated for other minority groups, for example Hispanic Americans and Asian Americans. The growth of women in senior-level management is not confined to African Americans. Women from other minority backgrounds are also increasing their presence.
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Appendix A
March 11, 2005

Dear President:

Researcher's Affiliation

The researcher is named Tasha C. Toy and is a Ph.D. candidate in the Higher Education Administration Program through the College of Education and Human Services at Seton Hall University (SHU) located in South Orange, N.J. Currently, she is conducting research to complete her dissertation under the mentorship of Dr. Joseph Stetar (jstetarj@shu.edu or 973-275-2730).

Focus of the Study

The focus of the researcher’s dissertation is on the leadership and personal background of African-American women at their respective Historically Black College or University (HBCU). The title of the study is the self-perceived leadership styles and comprehensive demographic profile of African-American women in the role of President at four-year HBCUs in the United States. This study is intended to yield results that will reveal your background, such as personal, professional, and educational characteristics. According to research studies presented, there has been a lack of research in relation to African-American women in senior-level management positions. As an alumna of North Carolina Central University, a HBCU, this perceived research gap has guided the researcher’s interest in this subject area. The emerging era of the consideration and appointment of African-American women as president has been growing. Research gathered by this dissertation will facilitate the understanding of African-American women presidents’ contributions to the HBCU system of higher education and the overall higher education system.

Expectations During Participation

This survey is self-administered and will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. Directions are clearly stated at the beginning of the survey and at the beginning of each section. The researcher asks that you return the completed survey in the accompanied self-addressed stamped envelope.

Description of Procedures

During this survey, you will be asked a series of questions related to career development, career path and choice, and experiences during your current, in some cases, past presidencies. In addition to your professional and educational characteristics, questions about the style of leadership you use at your institution will be asked. This series of questions is based on the Bolman and Deal’s book titled “Reframing Organizations.” The first section of the survey is designed to obtain data regarding your career experiences as an administrator prior to your current presidency, factors associated with your aspirations to become president and any obstacles, professional or personal, that you perceived may have delayed your ascent to the presidency. Section two will gather data on your graduate background and professional activities that enhance your skills and knowledge base for preparation for your presidency. Presidential family background, i.e., birth information, marital status, and parental educational background, are included in section three of this survey. Sections four and five will ask questions designed to gather knowledge on your own leadership style at your current institution. These sections are entitled leader behavior and leadership styles, respectively.
Statement of Voluntary Nature
You reserve the right to decline participation in the study at anytime, and for any reason. Your failure to return the survey will notify the researcher that you have decided to not participate in this study. You may also request a copy of the dissertation abstract or the dissertation in its entirety at any point following the final completion of the study.

How Confidentiality Will be Preserved
Your responses to the survey will be confidential. Only the researcher will have access to your responses. Due to the small sample size, your anonymity can not be guaranteed. Every effort will be made to protect your identity and other identifiable information during data collection and in the final version of the dissertation document.

How Data Will be Secured
The actual completed notes and surveys will be destroyed three years following the date of completion. Prior to destruction of these records, they will not be released to any other persons for any reason and will be secured by the researcher in a locked cabinet in the researcher’s home office. Your name and other personal identifiable information will not appear on any notes or anywhere on the actual results of the study.

The researcher asks your support in this research endeavor to increase the scholarly representation of African-American women in leadership roles at HBCUs. Thank you in advance for your consideration and the researcher looks forward to your response and participation in this survey.

Sincerely,

Tasha C. Toy

APPROVED
MAR 02 2005
IHB
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY
Appendix B
Survey of
AFRICAN-AMERICAN WOMEN PRESIDENTS
AT FOUR-YEAR HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
(HBCUs)

This survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please complete and return the questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope to Tasha C. Toy, 147 Vose Ave., Apt. A3, South Orange, NJ 07079. If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Toy at (973) 489-2819 or (973) 273-0053. All responses will be kept confidential. Part One of this survey reflects the researcher’s interests in learning about several aspects of your presidency. Please check only one answer unless otherwise noted.

1. Career Path
   1. Position held prior to your current presidency:
      Assistant to the President
      Vice President
      Asst/Assoc. VP
      Dean
      Assistant/Associate Dean
      Other (specify): ____________

2. Area of position held prior to your current presidency:
   Academic Affairs
   Student Affairs
   Business/Financial Affairs
   Continuing Education
   Campus President/Provost
   Other (specify): ____________

3. What was your entry-level position in higher education:
   Faculty Member
   Coordinator
   Director
   Department Head/Chair
   Other (specify): ____________

4. Area of your entry-level position in higher education:
   Academics
   Student Affairs
   Business/Financial Affairs
   Office of Development
   Other (specify): ____________

5. Have you ever held the position of department/division chair?
   Yes
   No

6. What attracted you to the presidency?
   It has always been my goal.
   It became my goal as I moved up the administrative ladder.
   It was thrust upon me and I grew to like it
   It was suggested to me as my duty.
   Other (specify): ____________

7. How did you become a candidate for your current position?
   Was contacted by search firm
   Applied without previous nomination
   Was nominated and accepted nomination
   Served first in an “acting” capacity
   Was encouraged by members of the institution
   Was contacted by members of search committee
   Was appointed directly to the position
   Other (specify): ____________
8. Which of the following advantages do you feel you enjoy in the role of president because you are female?

Not being perceived as a threat to men because you are female: ___

Not having to be as authoritarian with male colleagues because you are female: ___

People confide in you more readily and find you more approachable because you are female: ___

Other (specify): __________________________

9. Within five years of your first appointment to a presidency, how many presidential searches were you an active candidate?

10. Which of the following personal events hindered your ascent to the presidency?

Marital responsibilities ___

Maternal responsibilities ___

Constrained geographically by spouse or other family member ___

Other family responsibilities ___

Late start in career ___

Other (specify): __________________________

11. Which of the following hindered your ascent to the presidency?

Prejudice in hiring because you are a woman ___

Assigning "housekeeping" duties (i.e., planning luncheons) because you are a woman ___

Excluded from the old boy's network Information withheld from you because you are a woman ___

Discouraged from applying for administrative positions because you are a woman ___

Other (specify): __________________________

12. In interviewing for the college presidency at any institution, were you ever asked a question you feel was inappropriate and was asked because you are a woman?

Yes ___

No ___

13. What percentage of governing board members at your institution comprised women when you were selected president?

Less than 10% ___ 10% - 19% ___ 20% - 29% ___ 30% - 39% ___ 40% - 49% ___ 50% - 59% ___ 60% or more ___

14. While enrolled in a graduate degree program, did you hold any of the following positions? (Please circle numbers of all that apply.)

Master's Doctorate

Research assistant 1 1

Teaching assistant 2 2

Administrative assistant 3 3

Program/residence hall assist 4 4

Fellowship/traineeship 5 5

Worked on grants 6 6

Other graduate appointment 7 7

15. How many years have you been employed in higher education?

16. Total number of years you have served as a college president at your current institution:

17. Total number of presidencies held (including your current presidency):

18. How old were you when you assumed your first presidency?

19. Were you an internal candidate at the college at which you assumed your current presidency?

Yes ___

No ___
20. If you currently serve on corporate, educational, governmental or community service boards, please indicate number of each type below. (*If none, please indicate.*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational organization boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or university boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary/secondary school boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental elected or appointed boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. We are interested in learning about external professional activities which you feel have contributed to your professional advancement as an administrator: Following is a list of activities other administrators have considered important. Using the scales identified below, read each item and (1) indicate with a checkmark whether or not you have participated, and (2) for those in which you participated, indicate the degree to which you view this activity as related to your advancement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs and Institutions</th>
<th>Participated</th>
<th>Relationship to Advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard's Institute for Educational Management (IEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryn Mawr Summer Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE Fellowship/Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE's National Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE National Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders for Change (AAWCJC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders for the '80s (AAWCJC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boards or Officers</th>
<th>Participated</th>
<th>Relationship to Advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member or officer of national</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional, or state professional organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of corporate board(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of college or university board(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of community service board(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of government board(s) or commission(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Participated</th>
<th>Relationship to Advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation team for regional accrediting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor or associate editor of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a professional or scholarly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications (books, monographs, articles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed major grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (<em>Please specify.</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Personal Data
Part three of this survey is a short section to collect demographic data.

22. Birthdate: ______/______/______

23. Birthplace (city, state): ______________________

24. What is your current marital status?
   1. Single, never married
   2. Married
   3. Separated
   4. Divorced
   5. Widowed-not remarried
   6. Not married-domestic partnership

25. How many children do you have? ______________

26. What is your birth order position in your family?
   1. First or only child
   2. Second of two
   3. Middle of three or more
   4. Youngest

27. What was/is your father’s occupation? ______________

28. Did your mother work outside the home at any time before you graduated from high school?
   1. No
   2. Yes

29. What was/is your mother’s occupation? ______________
Leadership Orientations

These sections will ask you to describe yourself in terms of leadership and management style.

IV. Leadership Behaviors

You are asked to indicate how often each item is true of yourself when rating. Please use the following scale in answering each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sometime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, you would answer ‘1’ for an item that is never true of yourself, ‘2’ for one that is occasionally true, ‘3’ for one that is sometimes true, and so on.

Be discriminating! The results will be more helpful to rate if you think about each item and distinguish the things that you often perform all the time from the things that you seldom or never.

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 adroitly 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 others’ 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 person 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. __________ She 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.

V. Leadership Styles

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 least describes you.

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

2. The best way to describe yourself is:
   a. Technical expert
   b. Good listener
   c. Build strong alliances and a power base
   d. Inspirational leader

3. What do you perform the best:
   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 you:
   a. Attention to detail
   b. Concern for people
   c. Ability to succeed, in the face of conflict and opposition
   d. Charisma

5. What is your most important leadership task?
   a. Clear, logical thinking
   b. Caring and support for others
   c. Toughness and aggressiveness
   d. Imagination and creativity

6. Which best described as:
   a. An analyst
   b. A humanist
   c. A political
   d. A visionary

© Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal
Dear President:

The researcher is named Tasha C. Toy and is a Ph.D. candidate in the Higher Education Administration Program through the College of Education and Human Services at Seton Hall University (SHU) located in South Orange, NJ.

Over a month ago, you received a survey titled "African-American Women Presidents at Four-Year Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)." The survey asked a series of questions related to career development, career path and choice, and experiences during your current, in some cases, past presidencies. Also questions about the style of leadership you used at your institution were asked, based on the book titled "Reframing Organizations" authored by Bolman and Deal in 2002.

The data collected from this study will bridge the gap of research concerned with African-American women in the role of Presidents at HBCUs and may inspire women to a select career path similar to yours to aspire to senior-level management positions.

I would appreciate your participation in this nationwide study of African-American women presidents at HBCUs. Your responses to this study are confidential. Due to the small sample size, your anonymity can not be guaranteed. However, every effort will be made to protect your identity and other identifiable information during data collection and in the final version of the dissertation document. Please take fifteen minutes to complete the survey and return it to the researcher in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope.

The researcher understands that Presidents' time during the academic year is valuable and is committed to the leadership of her institution. This survey will only take 15 minutes and will help a graduate of a HBCU complete the requirement for a terminal degree. Please return this survey by May 1, 2005.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Tasha C. Toy

Enclosures
College of Education and Human Services
Department of Education Leadership, Management and Policy
Tel: 973.761.3937
400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey 07079-2685