

ABSTRACT

William Sypawka. A STUDY OF DIVISION DEANS' IN THE NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM SELF PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP STYLE BASED ON BOLMAN AND DEAL'S FOUR FRAME THEORY (Under the direction of Dr. Cheryl McFadden) Department of Educational Leadership, April 2008.

This study was designed to expand the knowledge base of academic division deans by correlating differences in leadership styles (i.e., frames) of the division deans within the North Carolina Community College System. The data was collected using the Leadership Orientation Instrument–Self (LOI-Self) developed by Bolman and Deal (1990) to measure and identify the perceived organizational frames of leadership: human resource, political, structural and symbolic. The LOI-Self survey, the focus of this study, was completed by the North Carolina Community College System division deans. The North Carolina Community College System is the third largest in the nation, composed of 58 community colleges.

The first research question in this study identified the primary leadership orientation frame of the division deans. The remaining three research questions used one-way ANOVAs to test the perceived leadership orientation of North Carolina Community College System division deans in relation to educational level, prior business (non-educational) experience, and number of years of serving as dean. The research methodology used in this study is quantitative in design.

The results of this study indicate that the human resource frame was found to be most prevalent among the North Carolina Community College System deans along with a paired orientation with the structural frame. Statistical analysis of the findings revealed no significance in reference to the division deans' perceived orientation leadership frames and educational level, prior business (non-educational) experience, or number of years of serving as dean as described in the research questions. Cronbach's Alpha was used to establish reliability and demonstrates a high degree of consistency among the electronic survey respondents.

The results of this study correspond to Bolman and Deal's maintained population pool of total group means on the leadership orientations frames based on a collection of other studies. Implications of this study suggest programs which would facilitate the deans in their development and utilization of the lesser used leadership skills of the political and symbolic frame orientations.

A STUDY OF DIVISION DEANS' IN THE NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY
COLLEGE SYSTEM SELF PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP STYLE BASED ON
BOLMAN AND DEAL'S FOUR FRAME THEORY

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership
East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

William Sypawka

April, 2008

©Copyright 2008
William Sypawka

A STUDY OF DIVISION DEANS' IN THE NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY
COLLEGE SYSTEM SELF PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP STYLE BASED ON
BOLMAN AND DEAL'S FOUR FRAME THEORY

by

William Sypawka

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF DISSERTATION: _____
Cheryl McFadden

COMMITTEE MEMBER: _____
William Shelton

COMMITTEE MEMBER: _____
David Siegel

COMMITTEE MEMBER: _____
Kermit Buckner

COMMITTEE MEMBER: _____
James Zemanek

CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP:

Lynn Bradshaw

DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL:

Patrick Pellicane

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	6
Research Questions.....	9
Assumptions.....	9
Significance of the Study.....	9
Limitations.....	12
Overview of Research Methodology.....	12
Impact.....	13
Operational Definitions.....	13
Organization of the Dissertation.....	16
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	17
Significant Theories of Leadership.....	17
Trait Theories.....	17
Management Theories.....	19
Relationship (Transformational) Theories.....	21
Behavioral Theories.....	23
Participative Theories.....	24
Situational Leadership Theories.....	26
Contingency Theories.....	27
Bolman and Deal's Four Frames of Leadership.....	28

Human Resource Frame.....	29
Political Frame.....	30
Structural Frame.....	31
Symbolic Frame.....	31
Literature on Divisional Dean Leadership Roles Within the Institutions.....	33
Literature on Leadership Research in Higher Education Pertaining to Bolman and Deal’s Frameworks.....	34
Overview.....	34
Literature on Bolman and Deal’s Leadership Frame at Four- Year Institutions.....	35
Literature on Leadership at Community College and Two- Year Institutions.....	36
Deans’ Educational Level.....	38
Years in Business.....	40
Number of Years in Position.....	41
Summary.....	42
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	43
Problem Statement.....	43
Research Questions.....	43
Null Hypotheses.....	44
Population Sample.....	46
Research Design.....	46
Data Collection.....	49

Survey Instrument.....	50
Method of Analysis.....	52
Summary.....	52
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	54
Population.....	54
Descriptive Results.....	55
Inferential Results.....	68
Summary.....	73
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	74
Summary.....	74
Conclusions.....	79
Discussion and Recommendations.....	82
Implications.....	85
Further Research.....	86
REFERENCES.....	89
APPENDIX A: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER	101
APPENDIX B: BOLMAN PERMISSION LETTER.....	102
APPENDIX C: INITIAL EMAIL WITH SURVEY.....	103
APPENDIX D: FOLLOW-UP EMAIL WITH SURVEY.....	104
APPENDIX E: SURVEY.....	105

LIST OF TABLES

1. Internal Consistency of Bolman and Deal's LOI.....	5
2. 58 Community Colleges Institutions of the North Carolina Community College System.....	47
3. Reliability on the Leadership Orientation Survey Instrument – Self.....	57
4. A Comparison of Leadership Orientations.....	59
5. Highest Educational Level Achieved.....	61
6. A Comparison of Leadership Orientation Across Educational Level.....	62
7. Number of Years in Your Current Position.....	63
8. A Comparison of Leadership Orientation Across Years in Position.....	65
9. Number of Years of Prior Non-Educational Business Experience.....	66
10. A Comparison of Leadership Orientation Across Prior Years of Business Experience.....	67
11. Analysis of Variance in the Educational Level and Perceived Leadership Frame Orientation.....	70
12. Analysis of Variance in the Prior Years of Non-Educational Business Experience and Perceived Leadership Frame Orientation.....	71
13. ANOVA.....	72

INTRODUCTION

Leadership is not easily defined. As Bennis (1989) states, “leadership is much like beauty: it is hard to define, but you know it when you see it” (p. xxvi). This study was designed to expand the knowledge base of academic division deans by researching differences in leadership styles (i.e., frames) of the division deans within the North Carolina Community College System. Bolman and Deal’s (1984) theory of leadership was utilized in this research of the leadership frames used by academic division deans.

Understanding the principles of leadership is an important element in the success of all components within an institution and thus to the institution itself (Leubsdorf, 2006). Nowhere else in the institution is the understanding of leadership more important than in the various divisions and departments within the community college (McArthur, 2002). Broad directives are formulated from top levels in the organization and are subsequently channeled down through the structural hierarchy that affects such areas as enrollment, budget, training, curriculum, and the overall quality of each program. The implementation of these subsequent directives is where the goals and missions of the institutions are ultimately reached or fall short of the desired benchmarks. The division deans within the community colleges are designated to lead and implement the initiatives set forth by the presidents and board of trustees. The success or failure of these programs is highly influenced by the division deans. Therefore, the

ability of the division deans to lead effectively will weigh heavily on the eventual outcome of these senior level initiatives (Leftwich, 2001).

United States President George W. Bush (2004), in his 2004 State of the Union address, challenged community colleges to take a leadership role in training workers for industries that are creating the majority of new jobs. This challenge comes at a time when many community college leaders are retiring (Mizelle, 2006). The community colleges are at a crossroads of inadequate funding coupled with high enrollment. For example, in the course of a year the community colleges in Massachusetts and Colorado saw their appropriations shrink by 13.6% and 10%, respectively; other states such as Maryland, Illinois, and Missouri also experienced significant declines in state support (Evelyn, 2004). The North Carolina Community College System, which is composed of 58 community colleges, estimates that in 2004 it turned away up to 56,000 students. Due to budget shortfalls the system could not add enough courses to meet demand (Evelyn, 2004). In addition to budget shortfalls, other problems are making it increasingly difficult for institutions to adapt to the rapidly increasing enrollment. Some states forecast community college enrollment to increase as much as 50% in the next decade. Dual-enrollment programs that give college credit to high-school students have seen double-digit increases each year. Institutions are largely unprepared for what lies ahead, and the ways in which the colleges confront these problems will define the institution for years to come (Leubsdorf, 2006).

Research shows that in the United States the community college system is facing an impending leadership shortage. Forty-five percent of current college presidents planned to retire by 2007 along with a quarter of senior faculty (Mizelle, 2006). Faculty members are a vital component of community college leadership through their involvement as department chairs and their participation on committees (Shults, 2001). North Carolina is no exception. According to the North Carolina Community College fact book, a disproportionate number of senior administrators, staff, and technical/paraprofessionals have been with the system over 26 years, making them eligible for retirement (Mizelle). New presidents have been shown to use a single-frame or one leadership style orientation, whereas longer standing presidents make greater use of paired-framed and multi-framed orientations (Chang, 2004). This wave of retirees, with proven paired framed or multi-framed orientations, could have a direct effect on the orientation frames or styles used by inward bound leaders with potentially little or no experience. Cantu's (1997) research supports this premise. Cantu found significant differences between the less experienced dean leaders (5.1 to 7.5 years) compared with randomly selected deans with more experience (10.1 or more years). The study showed that deans with less experience had a lower political frame orientation than did deans with more experience, thus concluding that years of experience plays a role in frame orientation.

In addressing leadership styles, the concept of leadership set forth by Bolman and Deal (2003) uses a comprehensive multi-frame approach which

categorizes leaders into one of four conceptually distinct “frames.” The capacity of leaders to identify and use combinations of these frames in a leadership position can aid them in their ability to be attentive to various aspects of an organization. The frames include: (1) structural frame – accentuates formal roles, rules, policies and procedures; (2) human resource frame – accentuates needs satisfaction, motivation and relationships; (3) political frame – accentuates bargaining, persuasiveness and negotiation; and (4) symbolic frame – accentuates culture, inspiration, social solidarity and constancy of meaning (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Bolman and Deal suggest most issues inherent in any organization correspond to a specific frame. The theory explains that these frames are lenses through which leaders perceive organizational occurrences. These four lenses or frames enable the leader to decipher situations from different perspectives and determine the probability of favorable outcomes (Bolman & Deal, 1984).

Bolman and Deal's (1990) instrument was selected for this study because of its established reliability and validity in the identification of leadership frames using the leadership orientation instrument. Bolman and Deal (see Table 1) shows a high internal reliability of the leadership orientation instrument. Other studies also support this finding. The results of a study on leadership behaviors in schools conducted by Duncan (2004) showed a high overall internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha at .80 or higher. Bolman and Deal's theory is also comprehensive in comparison to past theoretical approaches, such as

Table 1

Internal Consistency of Bolman and Deal's LOI

	Structural (Section I)	Human Resource (Section I)	Political (Section I)	Symbolic (Section I)
Split-half correlation	.875	.867	.837	.882
Spearman-Brown coefficient	.933	.929	.911	.937
Guttman coefficient	.933	.929	.911	.936
Coefficient Alpha	.834	.843	.842	.887

Note. (Guidry, 2007).

trait, contingency and situational, in the cognitive understanding of leadership perspectives, where the focus was on the leader, situation, or combinations thereof (Bolman & Deal, 1984). A review of the frames reveals the balance between theory and practice, placing recent works along side long-standing research traditions, particularly on organizational structure and symbolism (Scarselletta, 1994). This theoretical approach has also been tested in numerous educational studies involving four-year institutional faculty and administrators (Cantu, 1997; Chang, 2004; Crist, 1999; Beck-Frazier, 2005; Guidry, 2007; McGlone, 2005; Peterson & Bercik, 1995; Yerkes, 1992) as well as community college presidents and senior level administrators (Borden, 2000; Harrell, 2006; Mann, 2006; Russell, 2000). It stands to reason that this theoretical approach provides well established parameters for the identification of the leadership frame orientations of North Carolina community college divisional deans.

Statement of the Problem

An extensive review of literature revealed that there is a lack of adequate research related to academic deans in the community college systems. Although the topic of academic leaders was the focus in an assortment of studies, the review found limited research on division deans at four-year institutions (Cantu, 1997; Beck-Frazier, 2005; Gmelch, 2003; Guidry, 2007) and community colleges (Russell, 2000). The review of literature found negligible research on how community college academic deans incorporate leadership styles (i.e., frames) into their work and if those styles differ among deans with variable levels of

education, business experience, and years serving as dean. A summarization of both four-year and community college studies indicates that academic leaders are predominantly oriented to the human resource frame, and multiple frame orientation is correlated with an increase in years of experience.

The future of the community college system will depend on its leaders, and the success of these colleges will be subject to how well these leaders can lead effectively (Shults, 2001). The relationship between community college division deans and the associated division plays a vital role in the effectiveness of the institution. It is at this level of the institution where daily decisions are made that have an effect on academic programs.

The community college environment differs significantly from four-year institutions in both faculty and students. Despite an array of size differences among community colleges, most share a common mission that everyone can benefit from a college education. Community colleges have only minimal entrance requirements for students (Hata, American Historical Association, & Organization of American Historians, 1999). Faculty educational requirements in community colleges also vary. Typically, community colleges require faculty to hold at least a master's degree plus 18 graduate hours in the field in which they teach (Bureau of Labor Statistics, Retrieved November 28, 2007, from <http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos066.htm>). Because community colleges teach general survey courses in which instructional employment is highly competitive, a number of faculty do hold doctoral degrees (Hata et al., 1999). Conversely,

according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (Retrieved November 28, 2007, from <http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos066.htm>), vocational education teachers in community colleges such as welders, auto mechanics, cosmetologists, and dental hygienists may not require four-year degrees. In North Carolina, community colleges originated as technical colleges and retain a strong vocational orientation. Career and technical education teachers with more external work experience and less education perform many of the same functions as college faculty and thus work their way into leadership roles through committees and by way of promotion (Hata et al.). Education levels have been shown to affect leadership styles (McFarlin & Ebbers, 1997). Other studies showed a positive correlation between educational levels and leadership behaviors (Stout-Stewart, 2005; Wilson, 1984). The external work environments outside educational settings have also been shown to gravitate towards a structural leadership frame (Aggestam, 2004; Pun, 2001). It would stand to reason that the leadership styles of those leaders in a community college which originate from these backgrounds would be affected by the predominantly structural orientation found in business and/or the lack of a post-secondary education.

In clarifying the leadership orientation of the division deans in community colleges, this research will evaluate the perceived frame orientation of leadership resulting from the deans self-rating survey. Specifically, this study will answer the following research questions:

Research Questions

1. What do North Carolina community college division deans perceive as their primary leadership styles (as measured by the four frames)?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference between the educational level achieved and the division dean's perceived primary leadership frame?
3. Is there a statistically significant difference between the division dean's prior years of business experience and the dean's perceived primary leadership frame?
4. Is there a statistically significant difference between the number of years serving as division dean and the dean's perceived primary leadership frame?

Limitations

The following assumptions are made in this research.

1. The participants of the study gave accurate information based on their experiences as division deans.
2. The survey instruments are reliable and valid (see Table 1) for the purpose of this study.

Significance of the Study

This study is designed to enhance the knowledge base about division deans by assessing the leadership styles (i.e., frames) of the division deans in the North Carolina Community College System. While considerable research has

been conducted at senior levels of leadership at community colleges (Bush, 2006; Clark, 2006; Gagliardo, 2006; Goldman & Smith, 1991; McGlone, 2005; Yim, 2003), along with studies on leadership at departmental levels at universities (Cantu, 1997; Beck-Frazier, 2005; Gmelch, 2003; Guidry, 2007; Leftwich, 2001), there is a lack of research focusing on leadership orientation of the division deans in the community college systems.

The community college system is unique from the university setting in that faculty educational levels differ significantly. This study uses North Carolina community colleges as a sample of convenience. The North Carolina Community College System is the third largest in the nation, composed of 58 community colleges serving close to 800,000 students. According to the North Carolina Statistical Abstract of Higher Education 05-06 (2006), 80% of faculty in the University of North Carolina System holds doctoral or first professional degrees. In the North Carolina Community College System the number of faculty holding doctoral level or first professional degrees is 6% (Mizelle, 2006). There is a significant difference in the educational levels in the community college systems verses similar positions in the university systems. This difference may be pivotal in the leadership orientation utilized in the community colleges and yield different findings than those studies about four-year institutions. This study will contribute to an understanding of how these educational level differences affect the leadership frames used by the community college deans.

Community colleges are also unique in the sources of leadership it uses to fill positions. As opposed to four-year institutions, community colleges have filled traditionally held faculty positions with administrative personnel. By the incorporation of administrative personnel into positions traditionally held by faculty, the result has been a businesslike approach towards education and a more structured type of leadership frame (Evelyn, 2002). The position of division dean, for purposes of this study, is considered the first level within the organization that has a primarily administrative role. The position is essential to hearing faculty concerns and communicating the directives of senior-level administrators. This position is also the external link to area business, colleges and community organizations (Green, 2000). By studying the leadership styles of the division deans, we can identify the existing frameworks of division deans set forth by Bolman and Deal.

Community college groups can use the findings in this study to better understand the contexts of leadership that exist within the organization and perhaps utilize educational leadership programs to prepare academic deans in the styles of leadership most closely aligned with a particular position, in relation to the Bolman and Deal leadership frames. Researchers may also find the results of this study useful for future comparative studies within relative methodologies and environments.

Limitations

There are three acknowledged limitations to this study.

1. This study focuses on the community college deans in the state of North Carolina. The North Carolina Community College System consists of 58 community colleges located throughout the state. These results may limit the generalization to other states and setting.
2. This study is limited by the use of only one instrument, Bolman and Deal LOI, to measure leadership frames.

Overview of Research Methodology

The research methodology used in this study is quantitative in design. The data was collected using the Leadership Orientation Instrument (LOI) developed by Bolman and Deal (1990) to measure and identify the organizational frames of leadership: human resource, political, structural and symbolic. The LOI comes in matching versions identified as Leadership Orientation Self and Leadership Orientation Other. The LOI Self study has been deemed valid and reliable as a means of determining the leadership frame orientation. The LOI Self survey, the focus of this study, was completed by the North Carolina division deans.

Quantitative research was conducted to ascertain the perceived frame orientation of leadership used by division deans and relation to the years in the position, educational levels, and business experience. The Self survey group, used in this study, included division deans in the North Carolina Community College System and is intended to ascertain their own leadership frame

perspective. Additionally demographic questions was included as determined by the independent variables (years in position, educational levels, business experience) included in the hypotheses.

The Perseus Web based Survey Solutions software was used to distribute the survey via email to the study participants, and passive consent will be used in determining group participation. Follow-up emails will be used as a reminder for the participants to be included in the study. Perseus software will keep track of responses, and only those not responding to the survey will be sent a reminder. All responses are anonymous and confidential by design.

Data from the survey responses will then be imported from Perseus into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Software for data analysis. Data Analysis will be both descriptive and inferential in nature.

Impact

The goal of the study is to provide an association of education and experience on the leadership orientations of the community college division deans. This study will contribute to the growing knowledge base related to the factors that may influence leadership perceptions based on the Bolman and Deal LOI.

Operational Definitions

Division Dean - The college leader of a division or collection of departmental units within a community college. This position is considered the

initial level in the organization where the administrative duties, as opposed to instruction, constitute the primary job function.

First Professional Degree - An academic degree designed to prepare the holder for a particular career or profession.

Human Resource Frame - The leadership frame that emphasizes the importance of people. Evidence of this frame is the commitment of management to develop a good fit between people and organizations. These leaders believe in the importance of coaching, participation, motivation, teamwork and good interpersonal relations.

Leadership Frame - One of four leadership categories defined by Bolman and Deal (2003): structural, human-resource, political, symbolic.

Leadership Orientation - The tendency for a person to gravitate towards a certain leadership style or frame.

Leadership Orientations Instrument (LOI)-A leadership survey created by Bolman and Deal to measure leadership perceptions of self and others.

Leadership Orientations Instrument Self - The leadership survey to measure the dean's own leadership perceptions.

Multiple-Frame Orientation Leadership Style - The multiple-frame orientation leadership style means that the division deans adopt more than two frames.

No Frame Orientation Leadership Style - The division deans who do not adopt any frame orientation are assumed to demonstrate a leadership style with no frame orientation.

Paired-Frame Orientation Leadership Style - A division dean using any two of the four frames is designated to have this leadership style.

Perceptions - The resultant data gathered from the leadership orientation survey instrument completed by the Division Deans, revealing frame orientations.

Political Frame - The leadership frame that views an organization as a place of conflict and scarce resources. The focus of management is to mobilize the resources needed to advocate and fight for the organization's goals and objectives. Political leaders emphasize the importance of building allies, networks, and coalitions.

Single-Frame Orientation Leadership Style - This leadership style means that a division dean only uses a single leadership frame

Structural Frame - The leadership frame that emphasizes rationality, analysis, logic, facts and data. Leaders using this orientation believe strongly in the importance of clear structure and well-developed management systems. It emphasizes formal relationships, specialized roles and focuses on the architecture of the organization.

Symbolic Frame - The leadership frame that provides vision and inspiration as the essential task of management. This leadership orientation

relies on charisma, symbols, rituals and ceremonies to get followers committed to the organizational mission.

Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1 consists of an overview and background of the dissertation. Chapter 2 offers a review of related literature on the study subject matter. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology and the procedures used in conducting the study. Chapter 4 is an analysis of the data and presentation of the findings of the study. Chapter 5 summarizes the results and discusses the conclusions of the study.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature is categorized into four distinct sections. The first section gives an overview of leadership theories. While many different leadership theories have emerged, most can be classified as one of the seven described. These are: trait theories, management theories, relationship theories, behavioral theories, participative theories, situational leadership theories and contingency theories. The second section will explore Bolman and Deal's (1990) four frames of leadership as a method to categorize styles of leadership. Research studies that have used the LOI will be reviewed. These frames are: human resource, political, structural and symbolic. The fourth section will discuss the current literature on leadership at higher education institutions and, more extensively, the literature dealing with the leadership roles within the institution, such as division deans. This section will also include studies in higher education that have used Bolman and Deal's LOI as the research instrument, as well as studies pertaining to the research hypotheses.

Significant Theories of Leadership

Trait Theories

The trait theories attempt to identify a set of characteristics common among successful leaders. Dating back to the early 1900s the "great man" theory of leadership served as the predecessor to the trait approach to leadership. The principal belief of the great man theory was that there are only a few rare individuals in any society at any time with the distinctive characteristics to shape

history (Stogdill, 1948). The primary focus of the trait theory in these early research efforts was to determine which individual characteristics such as personality traits, physical attributes, intellect, and personal values were prevalent among leaders. The implicit notion was to quickly determine probable leaders and put them into positions of leadership (Northouse, 2004). Many of the identified leadership traits undoubtedly develop in early life. Yet, it was found that those persons who possess many of the traits are often not effective leaders. On the other hand, Gill's (2006) research found that often effective leaders do not possess these traits. Many early works on trait leadership perceptions focus on the distinctions between leaders and non-leaders.

The difficulty with the trait theory approach in selecting leaders is an inconsistency in the collection of traits a leader must possess in order to be effective. Further, the lack of any one particular trait from the collection of traits did not necessarily eliminate that person as an effective leader (Stogdill, 1948). Initially there was a set of traits that emerged more frequently; these traits included characteristics such as charisma, intelligence, friendliness, motivation, emotional stability, supportiveness and administrative skills. From this collection of attributes, charisma was studied most frequently, in an attempt to pinpoint one common trait among leaders (Bolden, Gosling, Marturano, & Dennison, 2003). Other recent work contradicts this position and emphasizes the importance of a "quieter", humbler, less charismatic leader who is determined to be seen as part

of a broader management team actively encouraging others to succeed (Bennis & Nanus, 2003).

The trait theory has seen a recent resurgence in research explaining how traits influence leadership (Northouse, 2004). It is apparent that most successful managers think in complex ways; they are flexible in the adaptation of management styles or their mental models to varied circumstances. Being a complex thinker is, therefore, an important characteristic of a good manager (Peterson, 2004). This line of thinking is consistent with Bolman and Deal's viewpoint that managers who understand their own style (frame) and can view more than one perspective are better equipped to manage the complex organizations of today (Bolman & Deal, 1984). Other traits central to this list include intelligence, self confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability (Northouse).

Management Theories

Management theories, also known as transactional theories, emphasize the relationships among supervisors, organizations and performance. Transactional leaders seek to motivate the organization by appealing to its self interests. The relationship between the manager and subordinate is administered in terms of rewards and punishment. Managerial theories are often used in business, where subordinates are rewarded when desired achievements are met, or reprimanded if the response is unacceptable or deviates from accepted standards. This bottom line approach where management constantly measures

net gains relies on a person's need to make a living and is short-termed in nature, with the goal of simply maximizing efficiency and profits (Bratton & Gold, 2000). These management theories seek to influence workers by simply exchanging wages for work; it does not build on a person's need for meaningful work, nor does it utilize one's creative ability (Bolden et al., 2003). Bolman and Deal termed this use of management theory as management by objective. The use of the management by objective approach is meant to evaluate subordinates not on subjective personality traits, but on objective, observable results (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p. 80). Bolman and Deal further rationalize that subordinates are often manipulated by managers into unrealistic goals and then punished for not achieving those goals. There is a disparity in the managers' ability to carry out the intentions of the practice (Bolman & Deal, 1984). Management theory, also termed transactional theories, has been compared to simply managing an organization versus leading an organization. In a study comparing the two leadership styles, results supported the hypothesis that those organizations using transformational leadership styles over transactional outperformed the latter in terms of fluency and flexibility as measured by group brainstorming tasks (Jung, 2001). Jung's study identified fluency and flexibility in terms of divergent thinking as a measure of potential creative problem solving behaviors. For example, fluency was measured as the total number of unduplicated ideas generated in the identification of crucial cognitive processes (Jung).

Relationship (Transformational) Theories

In contrast to management theories, the utilization of relationship theories attempts to motivate an individual's sense of purpose. Leaders applying this theory attempt to change the perspective of followers to view their work in terms of the group and societal needs. James Burns (1978), differentiates between transactional and transformational forms of leadership. According to Burns, the foundation of the transformational process is the hierarchy of needs, and the outcome of this transformation is a rise in that hierarchy. Burns notes that in the transformational relationship the focus shifts from an exchange and compliance approach of workers to an approach based on change in the beliefs, desires, and values of followers.

Transformational leadership theory goes beyond transactional leadership and the simple exchanges or agreements within the organization and specifying conditions and awards appropriate with the attainment of specific objectives. A transformational leader uses techniques such as motivation above self interests, awareness of mission, and development of colleagues' abilities to achieve this level of leadership. Transformational leaders' endeavor is to achieve superior results by employing one or more of the "four I's": idealized influence (role modeling), inspirational motivation (providing meaning and challenge to followers), intellectual stimulation (encouraging followers to be innovative and creative) and individualized consideration (acting as mentor for individuals' needs and growth) (Bass & Avolio, 1994). A study on transformational leadership theory

showed that charismatic leaders in project groups inspired a sense of mission and purpose of the work being done and stimulated new ways of thinking and problem solving (Keller, 1992). Corresponding to this reasoning are the cases described by Bass and Riggio (2005), summarizing that transformational leadership positively affects performance regardless of how it was measured. The cases also note that “The critical element is to understand the process of how transformational leaders affect follower and unit performance.” Keller’s summary substantiates this reasoning, noting that the direction of causality between transformational leadership and group performance remains unclear. Another study by Judge and Bono (2000) found that individuals who are rated by their followers as exhibiting transformational behaviors are judged by their superiors to be more effective leaders. In opposition to these findings, a study by Kirkman (2004) found non-significant correlations. She noted that although the literature indicated that transformational leadership should have been associated with greater job satisfaction, the finding of the study did not confirm and even implied a possible reversal of the notion that transformational leadership led to greater job satisfaction (Kirkman). Judge and Bono’s study notes that it’s unclear whether transformational theory should be classified under the trait theory or behavioral theory. The study states that the primary component of transformational leadership is charisma, which implies a trait, or at least charisma is influenced by traits. This study questions whether transformational leaders’ behaviors are innate or “made.” The results of the study do indicate that

behaviors of a transformational leader are predictable from several personality traits (Judge & Bono). For purposes of this study, separation of the transformational theory from both the trait and behavior theories is based on the inconsistencies among studies in jointly correlating the two sets of theories.

Behavioral Theories

Rooted in behavioral theories is the belief that leaders can be made, not just born. This category of leadership theory focuses on the actions of leaders, not on intellectual qualities or internal traits. In the 1940s Stogdill (1948) compared results of various traits studies, finding them inconclusive in the identification of leaders. He later attempted, but failed, to isolate key behavioral patterns of leadership abilities. Behavioral theory focuses on the actions of leaders, not on mental or innate qualities contained within the individual. Contained in the behavioral theory is the concept that people can learn to become leaders through education and observation (Hogan & Kaiser, 2004). In one noted study (Burbach, Matkin, & Fritz, 2004), it was concluded that an introductory level college leadership course did increase leadership proficiency. The course integrated active learning techniques to increase critical thinking skills. The study involved a pre- and post-assessment of critical thinking skills and found a significant increase in the deduction and interpretation subtests and total critical thinking. Based on the results of that study, student engagement in active learning techniques, within the context of studying interpersonal skills for

leadership, appeared to increase the leadership proficiency of critical thinking (Burbach et al., 2004).

There is a growing awareness of the limitations of traditional approaches to teaching leadership (Storey, 2003). While the transmission of knowledge about leadership is useful, it stops short of developing leadership. The premise of this line of reasoning is that leadership is not taught nor learned, but leadership “is” learning. The primary role of leaders is to keep learning and facilitate the learning of those around them. This permanent state of change, or “white water,” requires learning whether changing conditions are altering the landscape, and thus, requiring a change in existing plans to an alternate course (Storey). Bolman and Deal subscribe to this line of reasoning, noting that the leadership frames serve as “stencils,” providing the opportunity to learn and relearn from organizational experience. Through the use of frames, managers become better attuned to and more able to learn from people around them. The frame approach provides a way for leaders to continue to learn from their experience long after leaving the classroom (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

Participative Theories

Participative theories incorporate subordinates in the decision making process. The role of the participative manager is more facilitative in nature than directive, guiding discussions and helping to resolve differences. As such, managers may take recommendations into account when making final decisions. The goal of participative leadership is to build a cohesive team rather than an

array of individuals. This category of theory suggests that the leader retains the final decision-making right and is not absolved of responsibility. This democratic style of leadership was found to result in a high level of productivity, but only when the leader was present (Chemers, 1997). Later research found that employee characteristics affect the performance of this leadership style. Employees high in authoritarianism and low in the need for independence performed best under the participative leadership style. Kurt Lewin took the first steps in attempting to link social and cognitive aspects of life and, therefore, joins theory and research to social practice. In the Lewin equation of behavior, a person's momentary situation was given importance in understanding his or her behavior rather than relying entirely on the past. This linking would focus on group membership and adapt to the continuously changing dynamics of the social world and individual action (Cherry & Deaux, 2004). Bolman and Deal look to the human resource frame as the focus on the use of participation in the organization. They explain that this managerial approach has been criticized in two major areas. The first criticism is that the participative method is ineffective and heavily dependent on contextual factors such as workflow, technology, and environment. The second criticism is based on the belief that participation is often a guise, giving subordinates the impression of participation, when in reality they have no genuine power (Bolman & Deal, 1984). Studies show inconsistent findings in the outcomes of participative leadership style, and it is clear that the participative style of leadership is not advantageous for all environments. On the

one hand there are correlations found on participative leadership and job satisfaction in overall employment roles among student workers and county employees (Kim, 2002; Pechlivanidis & Katsimpra, 2004). Correlations were also found in intrinsic motivation, revealing that the use of authoritarian leadership style resulted in a passive resistance of group members in manufacturing environments (Casal, 2002). Conversely, other studies found that participative leadership resulted in a decrease of job satisfaction when groups interact electronically (Kahai, Sosik, & Avolio, 2004), as well as no impact on effectiveness and efficiency among employees working in hospitals (Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006).

Situational Leadership Theories

Situational leadership theory implies that leadership is specific to a particular situation or circumstance. The basic premise of the theory is that different situations demand different types of leadership. To be an effective leader an individual must adapt his or her style to the requirements of a situation (Northouse, 2004). To determine the needs of a particular situation the leader must first assess the competence and motivation of the subordinates. Based on these assessments the leader can then alter his or her leadership style and adapt to the particular situation. Bolman and Deal's four-frame theory (Bolman & Deal, 2003) argues that effective leadership and management requires the ability to utilize different orientations of leadership style. It is further assumed that a leader possessing leadership orientations complimentary to these frames will

yield the most effective leadership style for a given situation. Blanchard, Zigarmi, and Zigarmi's (1985) model of leadership supports this claim, in describing the four leadership styles in the situational theory as delegating, supporting, coaching and directing. Based on this theory a leader gauges the amount of direction (task behavior) and socio-emotional support (relationship behavior) they must provide based on the situation and development levels of the followers (Blanchard et al., 1985).

Contingency Theories

In further refining situational leadership theories, contingency theories attempt to identify the situational variables that determine the most appropriate style of leadership that will fit particular circumstances. Fiedler's contingency theory is one of the most recognized along these lines (Northouse, 2004). Fiedler's contingency theory suggests that the most effective style of leadership depends on the quality of relationships between the leader and the follower and the nature of the task (Bolden et al., 2003). Fiedler looked at three ingredients that are measured in the identification of the leadership style. These are leader's member relations, task structure, and position power. Based on these three ingredients, Fiedler was able to make generalizations about which style of leadership was best and which styles were worst for a given organizational context (Taylor, Peplau, & Sears, 1997). In Fiedler's leadership match concept, environmental variables were gathered through a series of questions combined in a weighted sum on a spectrum from "favorable" to "unfavorable." Through

these measures managers are rated as relationship oriented or task oriented. Task oriented styles are preferable at the extremes of "favorable" and "unfavorable" environments, but the relationship orientations excel in the middle ground (Fiedler, Chemers, & Mahar, 1976). In this way, the theory provides a method of effectively matching a leader with a situation (Taylor et al., 1997). According to Bolman and Deal (1991), the contingency theories are limited in their conceptualization of leadership and fail to distinguish between leadership and management, thus assuming that leadership is limited to the relationships between manager and their immediate subordinate. Bolman and Deal (1991) go on to state that research into the contingency theories is sparse and in need of further research, to determine the wide varying circumstances required in the different forms of leadership. Other studies concur with this statement. Studies found in the literature use varying degrees of focus on particular situations of leadership as well as the subordinates and these confines are described as an limitation in those studies (Grint, 2005; Shenhar, 2001; Yun, Cox, & Sims, 2006).

Bolman and Deal's Four Frames of Leadership

Bolman and Deal's (1984) leadership frame theory suggests that life's daily challenges are rarely clear and precise; instead, they are immersed in a muddy turbulent river. Organizations are complex, surprising, deceptive and ambiguous; therefore, they are difficult to manage and comprehend (Bolman & Deal, 2003). The leadership frames take into account existing research on leadership, organizations, and management, then classifies the types of

leadership into four distinct frames or styles. These frames are classifications that describe the ways leaders think and react to situations. Bolman and Deal (1984) suggest that organizations have multiple realities, and leaders need multiple lenses or perspectives with which to view a particular situation. Each of the four frames set forth by Bolman and Deal is focused on different aspects of organizational behavior (Bolman & Deal, 2003). The four frames are human resource, political, structural and symbolic (Bolman & Deal, 1984).

Reviewers do vary on the Bolman and Deal framework approach. It is described as a “workable and illuminating balance between theory and practice” (Scarselletta, 1994, p. 342), where past theoretical overviews often lack real world experience and only view specific situations of organizational life (Scarselletta). Another review is a bit more critical of the theoretical aspect. Although it effectively integrates theory and application, it describes the perspectives as limited and impractical in the possible implementation of the frames into actual management operations. It goes on to suggest that the framework neglects actual perspectives of the bottom organizational structure (Laudicina, 1992).

Human Resource Frame

The human resource leadership frame uses assumptions from psychology and organizational behavior to emphasize relations between human needs and the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2003). A human resource frame leader values relationships and feelings and leads through empowering the worker. The

organization itself is adjusted to solve problems and fit the needs of people. The human resource frame defines problems and issues in interpersonal terms and looks for ways to adjust the organization to meet human needs (Daft, 2005). This frame recognizes people as the organization's most valuable resource. Effective leaders use the human resource perspective to involve others and give them opportunities for personal and professional development. The characteristics associated with this frame are the sense of belonging, unity, and the organization as a family (Bolman & Deal, 1984). Ineffective leaders in this frame can lead to the perception of bending to the whims of others, and in effect using compassion and participation as an excuse to avoid leadership responsibility (Daft).

Political Frame

The political frame of reference views organizations as arenas of ongoing conflict or tension over the allocation of scarce resources. This frame borrows the idea from political science that organizations compete for scarce resources, and conflict is a normal consequence of this competition (Bolman & Deal, 1984), "Organizations are both arenas for internal politics and political agents with their own agenda, resources, and strategies" (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 238). Leaders spend much of their time networking and building alliances and coalitions to influence decisions. The metaphor for the political frame is a jungle, and political plays are a natural part of organizational culture (Bolman & Deal, 1984). These leaders continuously strive to build a power base, and they frequently employ both personal and organizational power to achieve their desired goals. Brought to

the extreme, the political frame leader can be perceived as deceptive, dishonest and using power for purposes of individual agendas (Daft, 2005). An effective political leader will use negotiating, bargaining, and coalition-building skills to achieve organizational goals (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Structural Frame

The structural leadership frame emphasizes clear goals and efficiency (Bolman & Deal, 1984). A leader using the structural frame distinguishes clear goals, designates people-specific roles, and coordinates activities using policies, procedures, and a formal chain of command (Bolman & Deal, 1984). These policies and procedures ensure both predictability and uniformity within an organization. This helps to ensure that comparable situations are handled in a consistent way. Organizations operating in simpler and more stable environments are likely to employ less complex and more centralized structures (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Structural leaders value hard data and analysis, keep an eye on the bottom line, and stress adherence to accepted standards and conformity to the rules as a way to bring order and logic to the organization (Daft, 2005).

Symbolic Frame

The symbolic frame idealizes the sense of mission and identity within the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2003). This cultural aspect of an organization is noted by Bolman and Deal as the “glue that holds an organization together and unites people around shared values and beliefs” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 243).

Through the symbolic frame a leader views an organization as a system of shared vision and values. This culture of shared beliefs and values gives organizations a sense of purpose, promotes cohesion, and offers a vision as to what the future may hold (Daft, 2005). Leaders use symbols as a means of leading the organization. Often symbolic leaders rely on organizational traditions and values as a base for building cohesiveness, meaning, and a common vision. The symbolic leader is effective when the leader places symbolic value on intentions rather than relying on formal power and the use of politics (Bennis, 2003). Bolman and Deal (1991) state that no conceptual perspective is value neutral. Symbolic perspectives can be seen as embodiment and expression of meaning; the other symbolic perspective can be seen as a camouflage and distortion (p. 304). Rituals, protocols and manners can be used by symbolic leaders for unethical and self-serving purposes. Daft concurs with Bolman and Deal, noting that one danger of relying too heavily on the symbolic frame is that leaders risk developing a “messiah” complex, shifting the focus from the organization to the leader (Daft). Bolman and Deal draw a parallel to the messiah complex, noting that leaders often have the ability to define and impose meaning by which organizations define values and beliefs. This position of power gives elites the ability to convince the powerless to accept and support structures and processes that are not in their best interests (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

Identifying and using a combination of the human resource, political, structural, and symbolic frames allows leaders to better understand the

complexities of an organization (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Bolman and Deal (2003) describe the organization as having multiple realities which produce confusion and conflict as the individuals interpret the same events through their own lenses (frames). An effective leader can use this knowledge and match a particular frame or combination of frames to a situation. When a person's actions appear to make no sense, a leader should use these lenses and peer into contrasting realities. An individual's frame can help explain his or her actions: "Their frame, not yours, determines how they act" (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 309).

Literature on Divisional Dean Leadership Roles

Within the Institutions

Literature on divisional deans varied in subject and methods of study. Investigations on style, traits, qualitative accounts, effectiveness, and comparative studies were all found. Research on division deans' positions was also labeled under various titles (e.g., chair, division chair, division director, academic dean, assistant dean, etc.). Regardless of the title, these divisional academic leaders carry out the day-to-day business of the colleges (Shults, 2001). These midlevel college leaders are found to manage the priorities, interests, and agendas of various administrators and faculty members of their respective colleges (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). Community college division deans have an expanded role; for example, community colleges typically lack internal faculty oversight committees, resulting in loose departmental structures.

Division deans will often handle these personnel matters that would typically be resolved by department chairs in a university (Franke, 2006).

The importance of division deans is described as the strongest link in the chain of leadership (Green, 2000). Academic deans have traditionally held an important historical role in the administration of colleges. This position internally links faculty, administrators and students as well as external links to high schools, universities, businesses, and community organizations. Green's findings do correlate with other studies, indicating that division deans are generally satisfied with their jobs, and satisfaction is correlated with an increase in supporting staff (Green). Satisfaction and stress were also positively correlated with multiple frame preferences (Russell, 2000).

The future of academic deans' leadership is pivotal for the colleges' future (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). Today's academy finds itself reliant on emergent leaders who can negotiate the political and economic environment. These leaders need to reinvent academia to keep it current and relevant to the changing world (Smith & Hughey, 2006).

*Literature on Leadership Research in Higher Education
Pertaining to Bolman and Deal's Frameworks*

Overview

Bolman and Deal's LOI has been used in a number higher education studies. This section will divide the research into two parts. The first part will look at the use of Bolman and Deal's LOI at four year institutions and community

colleges and two-year institutions. The second part examines current literature pertaining to the hypotheses described in this study.

Literature on Bolman & Deal's Leadership Frame at Four-Year Institutions

According to studies conducted at four-year institutions, the human resource frame was the most frequently found frame used by higher education administrators (Borden, 2000; Cantu, 1997; Chang, 2004; Crist, 1999; Beck-Frazier, 2005; Mathis, 1999; Russell, 2000). These results are consistent with those reported by Bolman and Deal (1992) in their studies. The structural frame was also widely used and found to be primary in the Chang study, although followed closely by the human resource frame. The political and symbolic frames were the least used frames by institutions (Borden; Cantu; Beck-Frazier; Mathis; Russell). However, the symbolic frame was demonstrated to have significant positive influence on leaders' effectiveness (Chang) and overall worker satisfaction (Peterson & Bercik, 1995). The one exception in the university organization was shown at the presidential level. The human resource frame was found to be utilized the least by university presidents (McGlone, 2005). A study by Mathis concurred on the predominance of the human resource frame as most used among department chairs; in tandem, both the political and symbolic frames were used the least. This study found department chairs using multiple frames had the highest job satisfaction in terms of intrinsic and extrinsic values. Also noted in this study was the significance of the symbolic frame. Faculty with chairs using a symbolic predominant frame expressed higher overall job satisfaction

than that of faculty with chairs using any other predominant frame. In the case of extrinsic job satisfaction the symbolic frame was found superior to both the structural and political frames (Mathis).

Studies (Crist, 1999; Mathis, 1999; Russell, 2000; Yerkes, 1992) indicated that higher education administrators use some degree of multi-frame leadership approaches. Bolman and Deal's (1992) findings are proportionally larger. However, the studies concur that leaders using multiple frames in leadership are more effective in terms of job satisfaction, stress levels and communication. Administrators new to a position with limited experience tend to use a single leadership frame; whereas more experienced leaders use the paired-framed and multi-framed orientations (Chang, 2004; Russell). This coincided with a study of female deans (Guidry, 2007), which found most female deans surveyed were relatively new in the positions (0-5 years) and showed no secondary frame. This study of female deans also found no primary frame usage as the second most common leadership trait (Guidry). Similarly, a study comparing years in position and age concluded that presidents serving 11-15 years reported use of the highest number of leadership frames, along with presidents between the ages of 51-70 (McGlone, 2005). The interpretations of the results were not reported as to whether the frame usage was due to years of service, age, or experience.

Literature on Leadership at Community College and Two-Year Institutions

The studies completed at the community college level were found to be similar to studies conducted at four-year institutions. Community college

leadership frames did not vary, with most studies showing human resource as the primary frame (Borden, 2000; Harrell, 2006; Mann, 2006; Russell, 2000). There was a higher prevalence of the human resource frame and structural frames as a primary frame reference, as opposed to the political and symbolic frames.

Studies also concurred with the four-year institutions in finding a positive correlation between symbolic frame and worker satisfaction. Symbolic leadership was found to be significantly linked with higher satisfaction (Harrell, 2006).

Studies of community colleges varied in the organizational level studied. Russell (2000) studied the leadership frames of academic deans in the community college, finding deans with multiple leadership orientations reporting lower stress and higher satisfaction when compared with division deans using one primary leadership frame.

In results of a study by Kirkman (2004), the effectiveness of department chairs' leadership style as it relates to faculty job satisfaction stood alone in contrasted to previous studies. She found that there was no correlation in the leadership style of community college department chairs and faculty job satisfaction. She further implies a possible reversal of the association between the notions. Kirkman goes on to note that there appears to be a leadership crisis in higher education that has resulted from the complexity of the leaders' roles. Transformational style leaders noted in this study are described as inspirational, nurturing, visionary and providing intellectual stimulation (Kirkman). This study

stands in stark contrast to the other findings in the closely related symbolic and human resource frames of Bolman and Deal.

Deans' Educational Level

Literature varied on the effects of education on leadership. Most literature showed a positive correlation between educational levels and leadership.

Leadership variables used in these studies varied from instruments such as the Leadership Practices Inventory (Stout-Steward, 2005), Leadership Orientation Instrument (Guidry, 2007; Russell, 2000) and other measurable variables such as job satisfaction (Kirkman, 2004), and critical thinking (Jung, 2001; Keller, 1992). A study by Stout-Stewart comparing five leadership patterns and educational levels found that presidents with terminal degrees averaged higher on all patterns (models, inspires, challenges, enables and encourages). There was also a significant difference between the educational level and "inspiring a shared vision." In studying the perceptions of school climate, age, gender, race, years of experience, and level of education were compared from randomly selected schools in Gary, Indiana. Only age and gender had positive influences on perceptions of school climate. Educational experience, along with teacher level of education and race, was found not to exert any effect on the teacher perception of school climate (Wilson, 1984).

Educational levels were also found to play a role in preparation programs. A study by Hughes, Johnson and Madjidi (1999) on the efficacy of administrator preparation programs found that a disproportionately higher number of those

administrators who held a master's or doctorate degree were more likely to complete a college/university level administrator preparation program. There were, however, no significant differences based on gender, ethnicity, years of experience, and age in correlation with administrative preparation programs. Also, a larger proportion of administrators at larger schools completed administrative preparation programs than those at smaller schools. To further this line of thought, a study by McFarlin and Ebbers (1997) on outstanding/leading community college presidents defined nine preparation factors: possession of a terminal degree, specific study of community college leadership as a degree, active personal research and publication agenda, specific preparation as a change agent, identification as a community college insider, participation as a protégée in a protégée/mentor relationship, involvement in a peer network, leadership development activities outside of graduate program, and knowledge of technology. The study showed that the "leading/outstanding" group of community college presidents, based on the peer rating method described, reported that their highest academic degree focused on the study of higher education/community college leadership at a significantly greater rate than the normative sample. In addition, presidents of smaller colleges and universities were least likely to earn their highest degree at a prestigious university, but followed a more logical career progression (i.e. promotional advancement) through the organizational levels to their respective presidencies (Fincher, 1997).

Years in Business

There is little research pertaining to the effects of an individual working in a business environment prior to working in a community college. No literature has been found on the results of those working in structural environments then relocating to a predominantly human resource framed environment such as community colleges. Case studies done by Aggestam (2004) noted the importance of examining different perspectives within the organization. According to Aggestam, this analysis is a way that everyone involved can better understand both the complexities and difficult processes within the organization. The case explains that the use of the Bolman and Deal frames is a commonly accepted means in this analysis. Aggestam also distinguishes the structural frame as predominant when relating the frames of Bolman and Deal in a business environment. She also complemented the four frames by constructing a fifth frame (neutral frame). The neutral frame aims to capture the neutral and objective perspectives of the organization such as the business plan and objectives, ownership, turnover and number of employees. This neutral frame is the starting point for the other frames. When defining systems' boundaries an analysis is conducted first from the neutral frame, then the other frames, to define both management and other relevant stakeholders' assessment and attitudes. The goal of this approach is to prepare the stakeholders for a positive adaptive process and buy-in of new system implementations (Aggestam).

A study by Pun (2001) supports the frame orientation by comparing organizational styles in businesses. Although concluding that organizations could achieve better performance and higher efficiency through establishing a “quality” culture, he found that western methodologies want to control all aspects of the work environment. This “corporate culture” falls along the lines of the organizational structure (structural frame) by design. He further explains that the process of total quality management (TQM) conducted by corporations is advancing the organizational (structural frame) development and is a method of managing the cultural dynamics and organizational complexities.

Number of Years in Position

Professional experience in a position is a variable that has been recognized as significant when examining leadership in higher education. In a study by Cantu (1997) comparing the number of years of experience of deans at four year institutions, it was found that deans with less experience (5.1 to 7.5 years) used significantly fewer political frames than did deans with more years of experience (10.1 and greater). This same research supported the findings of other studies with regard to the predominance of the human resource style of leadership (Crist, 1999; Russell, 2000). The results also indicate that the political frame may be more influential in effective educational leadership as measured by studying randomly selected deans versus those nominated as exceptionally effective deans than previously portrayed in earlier studies (Cantu).

A study by Yim (2003) using the Teaching as Leading Inventory (TALI) instrument showed that years of experience in teaching did not have an effect on the leadership styles of faculty in the North Carolina Community College System. Conversely in previous studies by Yim (2000) using an interval scale as opposed to the nominal scale used in 2003, the findings indicated that years of teaching experience had a positive correlation with leadership orientation.

Summary

This chapter has presented an overview of the literature in leadership research. The chapter divided this literature into three main sections. The first section explored the major cluster of theories of leadership: trait theories, management (transactional) theories, relationship (transformational) theories, behavioral theories, participative theories, situational leadership theories and contingency theories. The second section provided an overview of the four frame model approach defined by the Bolman and Deal's model of leadership theory. The four frames are structural, human resource, political and symbolic. The last section reviewed the current literature and analyzed the effects of leadership styles based on the hypotheses: years at a community college or two year institution, years in the position, and the number of years of prior business experience.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research is to examine the perceived leadership orientation of North Carolina community college division deans in relation to educational level, prior business (non-educational) experience, and number of years of serving as dean. The research methodology used in this study is quantitative in design. This chapter is organized into the following sections: problem statement, research questions, population sample, research design, data collection, survey instrument, method of analysis and summary.

Problem Statement

To better understand the heretofore unexplored leadership styles of division deans in community colleges, this study examined the perceived leadership orientation of division deans based on Bolman and Deal's (1984) four frame model of leadership using the LOI self survey instrument. Bolman and Deal's (1990) theory was chosen for this study because of its demonstrated effectiveness in identifying leadership styles. The identification and understanding of leadership frame orientation and combinations thereof may relate to the overall effectiveness of a leader (Chang, 2004).

Research Questions

This research answers the following questions:

5. What do North Carolina community college division deans perceive as their primary leadership styles (as measured by the four frames)?

6. Is there a statistically significant difference between the educational level achieved and the division dean's perceived primary leadership frame?
7. Is there a statistically significant difference between the division dean's prior years of business experience and the dean's perceived primary leadership frame?
8. Is there a statistically significant difference between the number of years serving as division dean and the dean's perceived primary leadership frame?

Null Hypotheses

1. There is no statistically significant difference across the educational level achieved for the division dean's perceived primary leadership frame.

One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to investigate the highest mean for the four frames derived from the LOI (i.e., perceived primary leadership frame) (dependent variable) across groups defined by the educational level (independent variable). The six categories used as the independent variable (educational level) were: No degree, Associate degree, Bachelor's degree, Master's degree, Professional degree, Doctorate. If a significant effect is found for the independent variable, an assessment was conducted on the differences among the six educational levels using Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference

(HSD) post hoc test to adjust for multiple comparisons (to maintain an overall level of significance of $\alpha=0.05$).

2. There is no statistically significant difference across the dean's prior years of non-educational business experience for the dean's perceived primary leadership frame.

One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to investigate the highest mean for the four frames derived from the LOI (i.e., perceived primary leadership frame) (dependent variable) across groups defined by the deans' prior years of non-educational experience (independent variable). The five categories used in the independent variable (prior years of non-educational experience) are in 5 year increments: 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, and over 20 years. If a significant effect is found for the independent variable, Tukey's HSD Post hoc test was used to determine which experience levels.

3. There is no statistically significant difference across the number of years serving as dean for the dean's perceived primary leadership frame.

One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to investigate the highest mean for the four frames derived from the LOI (i.e., perceived primary leadership frame) (dependent variable) across groups defined by the number of years serving as dean (independent variable). The five categories used in the independent variable (number of years serving as dean) are in 5 year

increments: 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years and over 20 years. If a significant effect is found for the independent variable, Tukey's HSD Post hoc test was used to determine which tenure levels differ.

Population Sample

The participants for this study include the division deans from the 58 community college institutions that constitute the North Carolina Community College System (see Table 2). The division deans were identified through college websites, organizational charts and Novell directory services contained within the North Carolina Community College Groupwise® emailing system.

Division deans have been selected as the population of this study because they are organizationally situated as a middle manager leader with a dual responsibility of guiding the direction of the academic programs and handling the daily tasks of administration (Russell, 2000). This position in the organization is typically where administrative leadership interacts with and manages faculty and staff.

Research Design

The methodology used for this study is quantitative in design. The design is structured to determine whether, for the division deans in the North Carolina Community College System, there is a statistically significant difference between perceived leadership style across categories of educational level, business experience, and tenure in the dean's position. In this study, the categorical

Table 2

58 Community Colleges Institutions of the North Carolina Community College System

Surveyed Colleges

Alamance Community College	Davidson County Community College
Asheville-Buncombe Tech Comm. College	Durham Technical Community College
Beaufort County Community College	Edgecombe Community College
Bladen Community College	Fayetteville Technical Community College
Blue Ridge Community College	Forsyth Technical Community College
Brunswick Community College	Gaston College
Caldwell Comm. Coll. & Tech. Institute	Guilford Technical Community College
Cape Fear Community College	Halifax Community College
Carteret Community College	Haywood Community College
Catawba Valley Community College	Isothermal Community College
Central Carolina Community College	James Sprunt Community College
Central Piedmont Community College	Johnston Community College
Cleveland Community College	Lenoir Community College
Coastal Carolina Community College	Martin Community College
College of The Albemarle	Mayland Community College
Craven Community College	McDowell Technical Community College

Table 2

58 Community Colleges Institutions of the North Carolina Community College System (continued)

Surveyed Colleges

Mitchell Community College	Sandhills Community College
Montgomery Community College	South Piedmont Community College
Nash Community College	Southeastern Community College
Pamlico Community College	Southwestern Community College
Piedmont Community College	Stanly Community College
Pitt Community College	Surry Community College
Randolph Community College	Tri-County Community College
Richmond Community College	Vance-Granville Community College
Roanoke-Chowan Community College	Wake Technical Community College
Robeson Community College	Wayne Community College
Rockingham Community College	Western Piedmont Community College
Rowan-Cabarrus Community College	Wilkes Community College
Sampson Community College	Wilson Technical Community College

dependent variable is the leadership frame of the division dean based on the self survey of Bolman and Deal's four frames. The deans may either aspire to a single-frame, paired-frame, multi-frame or even no-frame orientation. The highest mean of 4.0 or above is used to determine the primary leadership frame. The independent variables are the educational levels, number of years of non-educational experience, and number of years serving in the dean's position.

Data Collection

This study utilized internet-based cross-sectional surveys for data collection. After securing institutional review board approval, the participants were contacted via email and passive consent was assumed for those responding to the survey. A list of participants' email addresses were compiled and maintained within Perseus Survey Solutions Software (Perseus). Perseus software emailed each participant a description of the study along with the respondent's own unique uniform resource locator (URL): a web address link that specifies the location of the survey on the Internet. Clicking on this unique URL (or copy-pasting it to a browser) directed each participant to the Internet LOI survey. Responses to the survey were automatically compiled along with a code for each participant (maintained by the Perseus software). Perseus tracked which participants have not responded based on the unique identifier within the URL while keeping the participants' identity disassociated from the survey responses. Reminder emails were sent by Perseus every two days to those participants who have yet to complete the survey, with a maximum of three reminders. Invited

participants had two weeks to complete the survey. A sample size of 100 respondents is deemed sufficient for factor analysis and validity. A factor analysis was utilized in determining the validity of this study. A coefficient alpha was used in determining the internal consistency reliability of this research.

Survey Instrument

Data were collected using the Leadership Orientation Instrument (LOI) developed by Bolman and Deal (1990) to measure and identify the organizational frames of leadership: Human Recourse, political, structural and symbolic. The survey has been shown to be both valid and reliable in numerous studies using Bolman and Deal's LOI (Cantu, 1997; Chang, 2004; Beck-Frazier, 2005; Guidry, 2007; McGlone, 2005). Table 1 (see chapter 1, p. 5) shows internal consistency numbers (Guidry). Other studies using the Bolman and Deal LOI (Aggestam, 2004; Crist, 1999) have shown a high degree of internal consistency and added to its common acceptance as a proven leadership measurement instrument.

The preliminary section of the survey distinguishes the independent demographic variables contained in the research questions. These demographics include educational level, prior business (non-educational) experience, and number of years serving as dean.

The second section of the survey contained the LOI Self. The LOI comes in two matching versions identified as Leadership Orientation Instrument Self

(LOI Self) and Leadership Orientation Instrument Other (LOI Other). This study sent the LOI Self survey to the community college division deans. Although the survey is broken into three sections the first section of the LOI identifies the behavioral frame or frames based on individual perceptions of their own depicted behavior. Only this first section was used in conducting this research since it deals primarily with identifying the leadership frames and whether the leader uses paired or multiple frames.

The LOI Self survey is composed of thirty-two forced choice questions. The respondents indicate the degree of self-exhibiting behavior that is used regularly. Each of the questions is answered and statistically analyzed on a five point Likert-like (summative) scale with the selections: never (1), occasionally (2), sometimes (3), often (4), and always (5). The items are in a consistent frame group sequence: structural (items 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29), human resource (items 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30), political (items 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31), symbolic (items 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32). Scores are tallied by summing the four groups of responses for each of the eight frame sequence questions.

The highest mean score for the group sequence frame determined the primary leadership orientation for that division dean indicating “often” or “always” exhibiting the particular leadership frame. The LOI was created by Bolman and Deal and copyrighted in 1990. Written permission was given by Bolman (see Appendix B) for the use of the LOI in this study.

Method of Analyses

The analyses of anonymous survey responses were performed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Software. This computer program provided descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics, including the frequency of responses for each variable, as well as the mean and standard deviation, was used as part of the exploratory analyses. The SPSS statistical software computes sums, means, and ratios with standard errors. SPSS is a proven statistical package used by more than 95% of the Fortune 1,000 companies. Perseus software responses were exported directly into SPSS for quantitative analysis. Descriptive statistics summarized responses in terms of frequency distributions including means and standard deviations. In addition to descriptive statistics, a series of univariate models (ANOVAs) tested for significance in frame orientation as it relates to the independent variables. A significance level of .05 was utilized on the appropriate statistical tests to investigate the three research questions. If the overall F-test shows significance, post-hoc univariate tests of group differences determined which groups differ significantly.

Summary

This chapter described the methodology to be applied in the study, the target population, data collection procedures, the survey instrument and the data analysis process. The procedures described in this chapter were designed to

determine the leadership frames used by division deans in the North Carolina Community College System.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter presents the data collected and analyzed for this study which examined the perceived leadership orientation of North Carolina community college division deans based on the four frames of leadership (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) derived from Bolman and Deal's (1990) leadership frame theory. This study sought to identify differences based on the selected demographics: educational level, prior business (non-educational) experience, and number of years serving as dean. This chapter is organized into the following sections: population, descriptive results, inferential results, and a summary of the chapter.

Population

The sample population in this study consisted of division deans in the North Carolina Community College System. Division deans were initially identified using the North Carolina community college GroupWise® email system. Deans were identified by position title field within the email system. Organizational structures varied by community college and the position titles within the email system were maintained by individual institutions, as such the position titles varied. Further refinement of the sample population's email list was completed through title identification utilizing the institutional websites and telephone call confirmations, where emails and titles were unclear. Data collection was completed by the use of Perseus Survey Solutions Software. The software enabled a web based survey with invitation tracking capabilities using

an email list. Initial invitation emails were sent in February, 2008 to 340 identified deans within the 58 community colleges in the North Carolina Community College System. Of the 340 email invitations 25 (7%) were returned as invalid email addresses due to job changes, retirements, or email filters.

Descriptive Results

Data collection through Bolman and Deal's leadership orientation instrument-self web-based survey was completed by March of 2008 with 149 responses. These 149 responses resulted in a response rate of 47%. From the 149 responses, 17 (11%) were excluded because of incomplete surveys, leaving 132 valid responses.

Section one of the survey consisted of forced-choice demographic questions pertaining to the independent variables identified in the research questions. The questions included educational level (no degree, associate degree, bachelor's degree, master's degree, professional degree, doctorate), prior business (non-educational) experience (0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-plus), and number of years of serving as dean (0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-plus). The second section of the survey consisted of 32 group sequenced items with eight items relating to each of the four leadership orientation frames (structural, human resource, political, symbolic). The division deans used a 5-point Likert-like scale in response to each of the 32 forced choice questions. Deans were asked to indicate how often each of the items is "true for you" (never [1], occasionally [2],

sometimes [3], often [4], always [5]). Scores were tallied by taking the mean of the four groups of responses for each of the eight frame sequence questions.

Cronbach's Alpha was used to establish reliability of the 32 responses in the second section of the survey. Each of the four leadership orientation frames shown in Table 3 indicate a high degree of consistency in the items rankings. This internal consistency measure of .70 or higher on the Cronbach's Alpha indicates that the ratings by the deans were consistently in the high or low ranges for each group sequence frames. Cronbach's Alpha total of .905 demonstrates that this consistency among all items is constant across all frame orientation groups.

In a second reliability check using Cronbach's Alpha, in comparison to Bolman and Deal's orientation across studies (Bolman, 2008), Table 3 shows that total group means of this study are similar to what Bolman and Deal have found, in that they show a high consistency among frame orientation groups (Bolman). This study shows face validity in that it appears to maintain this consistency and correlates with the Bolman population pool.

A final reliability comparison with Bolman and Deal's population pool of the behavioral section on the Leadership Orientation Survey Instrument also used in this study shows similar means. Of 1309 cases, total group means for the leadership orientations conducted from Bolman and Deal's population were similar to group means in this study (Bolman, 2008). The highest means for both this study's population and Bolman and Deal's populations were the structural

Table 3

Reliability on the Leadership Orientation Survey Instrument – Self

Leadership Orientation	Cronbach's Alpha	
	Division Dean Respondents	Bolman and Deal All Research Groups
Structural	.801	.920
Human Resource	.783	.931
Political	.823	.913
Symbolic	.809	.931
Total	.905	

(4.336 vs. 4.062) and human resource (4.099 vs. 4.057) frames. The orientations with the lowest means in both this study's population and Bolman and Deal's populations were the political (3.849 versus 3.924) and symbolic (3.808 versus 3.923). Support for discriminate validity was found in examining the relationship between this sample and the Bolman population pool. Because this sample population of educators has been found to score lower in the political and symbolic frames, the instrument also showed discriminant validity.

The first research question of this study was: What do North Carolina community college division deans perceive as their primary leadership styles (as measured by the four frames)? Demographic data were analyzed for the dean participants in relation to educational level, prior business (non-educational) experience, and number of years of serving as dean. Table 4 reports the means of the four leadership orientations for all respondent groups. The means for all responding groups were calculated from the responses to the 5-point Likert-like scale across the 32 survey questions used in defining each of the four orientations. For example, the structural leadership frame orientation mean, 4.0994, was determined by taking the average of all division dean responses to the eight questions pertaining to structural orientation. Similarly, means for each of the other leadership orientations were also calculated for all responding groups.

The human resource frame was the primary frame orientation across all responding deans based on the average scores in the four-to-five range

Table 4

A Comparison of Leadership Orientations

Leadership Frame	N	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Human Resource	132	3.25	5.00	4.3362	.39713
Structural	132	2.50	5.00	4.0994	.45261
Symbolic	132	2.62	5.00	3.8485	.50310
Political	132	2.25	4.88	3.8078	.48729

indicating that deans perceived themselves as “often” to “always” exhibiting characteristics of this frame. The structural frame also had a mean in the four-to-five range, showing it as the secondary orientation frame as well as a paired frame usage among division dean respondents.

The frequency numbers and percentages for educational levels are shown in Table 5. The educational level of division deans with a Master’s degree is the largest group at 63.6% (n=84), with doctorates making up the second largest group with 26.5% (n=35) of the valid responses. The smallest educational level group was 3.8% (n=5) holding a bachelor’s degree.

Table 6 reports the means of the four leadership frames in relation to the highest educational level achieved by division dean respondents. The human resource frame was the perceived primary frame used by all group categories with the highest mean within the four-to-five range. The structural frame was also within the four-to-five mean range in all groups, making each a paired frame usage with a response of “often” to “always” for each leadership frame question group. The bachelor’s degree level solely perceived themselves as “often” or “always” exhibiting characteristics in all four frame orientations resulting in multiple frame usage.

The frequency numbers and percentages for years in position are shown in Table 7. As indicated in Table 7, the majority (54.5%) of deans responding has been in the current dean’s position less than six years, and the second largest

Table 5

Highest Educational Level Achieved

	<i>F</i>	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Valid				
Bachelor's degree	5	3.4	3.8	3.8
Master's degree	84	56.4	63.6	67.4
Professional degree	8	5.4	6.1	73.5
Doctorate	35	23.5	26.5	100.0
Total	132	88.6	100.0	
Missing	17	11.4		
Total	149	100.0		

Table 6

A Comparison of Leadership Orientation Across Educational Level

Highest Educational level achieved	Structural	Human Resource	Political	Symbolic
Bachelor's degree				
Mean	4.2500	4.3750	4.0500	4.1250
N	5	5	5	5
SD	.27951	.19764	.25921	.29315
Master's degree				
Mean	4.1235	4.2961	3.7887	3.8185
N	84	84	84	84
SD	.46265	.40086	.50672	.53927
Professional degree				
Mean	4.0000	4.3281	3.7344	3.5938
N	8	8	8	8
SD	.38960	.34028	.41960	.41592
Doctorate				
Mean	4.0429	4.4286	3.8357	3.9393
N	35	35	35	35
SD	.46469	.41710	.48200	.42700

Table 7

Number of Years in Your Current Position

	<i>F</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>
Valid				
0-5	72	48.3	54.5	54.5
6-10	30	20.1	22.7	77.3
11-15	14	9.4	10.6	87.9
16-20	3	2.0	2.3	90.2
21-plus	13	8.7	9.8	100.0
Total	132	88.6	100.0	
Missing				
	17	11.4		
Total	149	100.0		

group (22.7%) of valid responses is in the ranges of six-to-ten years, making the cumulative percentage for these two groups 77.3%.

Table 8 reports the means of the four leadership frames in relation to the number of years in current position by division dean respondents. Table 8 indicates that the human resource frame was perceived as the primary frame used by all group categories, showing the highest mean within the four-to-five range in relation to the other three frame orientations. This indicates that all group categories regardless of years in position primarily perceive themselves as exhibiting characteristics as “often” to “always” in the human resource frame. The two groups 16-20 and 21-over means indicate that their perceived leadership orientation is “often” to “always” in all four orientation frames, resulting in multiple frame usage of more than two frames. The structural frame was perceived by all group categories as the secondary frame orientation, with the exception of the six-to-ten year category, which had no secondary frame usage.

The frequency numbers and percentages for years of prior non-educational business experience are shown in Table 9. As indicated, the majority (58.3%) of valid responses have zero-to-five years of prior non-educational business experience. The second largest group (15.97%) of valid responses is in the ranges of six-to-ten years, making the cumulative percentage for the zero-to-five and six-to-ten groups 74.2%.

Table 10 reports the means of the four leadership frames in relation to the years of prior non-educational business experience by the division dean

Table 8

A Comparison of Leadership Orientation Across Years in Position

Number of years in your current position	Structural	Human Resource	Political	Symbolic
0-5				
<i>M</i>	4.1441	4.3194	3.7569	3.8108
<i>N</i>	72	72	72	72
<i>SD</i>	.40500	.40240	.40675	.46629
6-10				
<i>M</i>	3.9250	4.2667	3.7458	3.7625
<i>N</i>	30	30	30	30
<i>SD</i>	.54496	.39899	.55659	.45290
11-15				
<i>M</i>	4.0893	4.3929	3.9375	3.9732
<i>N</i>	14	14	14	14
<i>SD</i>	.39354	.30562	.59596	.65077
16-20				
<i>M</i>	4.5833	4.6250	4.2083	4.1667
<i>N</i>	3	3	3	3
<i>SD</i>	.19094	.37500	.14434	.43899
21-plus				
<i>M</i>	4.1538	4.4615	4.0000	4.0481
<i>N</i>	13	13	13	13
<i>SD</i>	.47367	.44600	.59293	.61352

Table 9

Number of Years of Prior Non-Educational Business Experience

	<i>F</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>
Valid				
0-5	77	51.7	58.3	58.3
6-10	21	14.1	15.9	74.2
11-15	10	6.7	7.6	81.8
16-20	6	4.0	4.5	86.4
21-plus	18	12.1	13.6	100.0
Total	132	88.6	100.0	
Missing				
	17	11.4		
Total	149	100.0		

Table 10

*A Comparison of Leadership Orientation Across Prior Years of Business**Experience*

Number of years prior non-educational business experience	Structural	Human Resource	Political	Symbolic
0-5				
<i>M</i>	4.0714	4.3328	3.7338	3.7760
<i>N</i>	77	77	77	77
<i>SD</i>	.48515	.40077	.51353	.46609
6-10				
<i>M</i>	4.2024	4.4643	3.9107	4.0060
<i>N</i>	21	21	21	21
<i>SD</i>	.48166	.33106	.46961	.51307
11-15				
<i>M</i>	4.2250	4.3750	3.9250	4.0625
<i>N</i>	10	10	10	10
<i>SD</i>	.38097	.61237	.35940	.61024
16-20				
<i>M</i>	4.0625	4.2708	3.9583	3.9583
<i>N</i>	6	6	6	6
<i>SD</i>	.43839	.33927	.49791	.52836
21-plus				
<i>M</i>	4.0417	4.2014	3.8889	3.8194
<i>N</i>	18	18	18	18
<i>SD</i>	.30012	.30660	.43490	.55111

respondents. As indicated in Table 10, the human resource frame was perceived as the primary frame used by all years of the non-educational business experience category, showing the highest mean within the four-to-five range in relation to the other three frame orientation averages. This indicates that all group categories regardless of years of prior non-educational business experience primarily perceive themselves as exhibiting characteristics as “often” to “always” in the human resource frame. The table also indicates that the group of 11-15 years perceives their leadership orientation as “often” to “always” in three orientation frames (human resource, structural, symbolic), resulting in multiple frame usage. The structural frame was perceived by all group categories as the secondary frame orientation without exception.

Inferential Results

The focus of this study was to determine the leadership orientation of deans in the North Carolina Community College System based on the demographic questions in part one of the survey. One-way ANOVAs of the responses were run to identify if there was significance in the relationship of these demographic variables with the second section of the survey consisting of the 32 grouped sequence questions identifying the perceived leadership orientations of those deans.

The demographic variable of highest educational level achieved was included in the second research question: Is there a statistically significant

difference between the educational level achieved and the division dean's perceived primary leadership frame? The educational levels were divided into four categories (no degree, associate's degree, bachelor's degree, master's degree, professional degree, doctorate). The result of the ANOVA identified in Table 11 indicates that there is no significant difference in the educational level of division dean responders and each of the perceived leadership orientation frames.

The demographic variable of prior years of non-educational business experience was included in the third research question: Is there a statistically significant difference between the division dean's prior years of business experience and the dean's perceived primary leadership frame? The prior years of experience were divided into five categories (0 - 5, 6 - 10, 11 - 15, 16 - 20, 21 - plus). The result of the ANOVA identified in Table 12 indicates that there is no significant difference in the prior non-educational business experience of division dean responders and each of the perceived leadership orientation frames.

The independent variable of prior years of non-educational business experience was included in the third research question: Is there a statistically significant difference between the number of years serving as division dean and the dean's perceived primary leadership frame? The years in current position were divided into five categories (0 - 5, 6 - 10, 11 - 15, 16 - 20, 21 - plus). The result of the ANOVA identified in Table 13 indicates that there is no significant

Table 11

Analysis of Variance in the Educational Level and Perceived Leadership Frame Orientation

	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Structural					
Between Groups	.353	3	.118	.569	.636
Within Groups	26.482	128	.207		
Total	26.836	131			
Human Resource					
Between Groups	.442	3	.147	.932	.427
Within Groups	20.219	128	.158		
Total	20.660	131			
Political					
Between Groups	.394	3	.131	.548	.650
Within Groups	30.712	128	.240		
Total	31.106	131			
Symbolic					
Between Groups	1.266	3	.422	1.693	.172
Within Groups	31.891	128	.249		
Total	33.157	131			

Table 12

*Analysis of Variance in the Prior Years of Non-Educational Business Experience
and Perceived Leadership Frame Orientation*

	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Structural					
Between Groups	.509	4	.127	.614	.654
Within Groups	26.327	127	.207		
Total	26.836	131			
Human Resource					
Between Groups	.713	4	.178	1.135	.343
Within Groups	19.947	127	.157		
Total	20.660	131			
Political					
Between Groups	1.036	4	.259	1.094	.362
Within Groups	30.070	127	.237		
Total	31.106	131			
Symbolic					
Between Groups	1.471	4	.368	1.474	.214
Within Groups	31.686	127	.249		
Total	33.157	131			

Table 13

*Analysis of Variance in the Years in Current Position and Perceived Leadership
Frame Orientation*

	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Structural					
Between Groups	1.799	4	.450	2.281	.064
Within Groups	25.037	127	.197		
Total	26.836	131			
Human Resource					
Between Groups	.665	4	.166	1.055	.382
Within Groups	19.996	127	.157		
Total	20.660	131			
Political					
Between Groups	1.498	4	.375	1.607	.177
Within Groups	29.608	127	.233		
Total	31.106	131			
Symbolic					
Between Groups	1.364	4	.341	1.362	.251
Within Groups	31.794	127	.250		
Total	33.157	131			

difference in the number of years serving as division dean of division dean responders and each of the perceived leadership orientation frames.

Summary

This chapter presented the results regarding the leadership orientation of division deans in the North Carolina Community College System based on Bolman and Deal's (1990) leadership frame theory. This chapter was divided into three sections: population, descriptive results, and inferential results. The second section discusses reliability of the study and the finding of the first research question as to the primary leadership frame of division deans. The human resource frame was found to be most prevalent among the deans' survey responses along with a high orientation to the structural frame. These results reflect findings in the Bolman and Deal's population pool.

The third section was relevant to the other three research questions explored by this study: educational level, prior business (non-educational) experience, and number of years of serving as dean. Using one-way ANOVA as the inferential method, there was no significance found in reference to the division deans' perceived orientation leadership frames and the three independent variables described in the research questions.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is divided into the following three sections: summary, conclusions, and recommendations. The first section summarizes the purpose of this study, the review of literature, the research methodology, and the findings through the analysis of the data. The next section presents the conclusions drawn from this study, and the last section presents discussions and recommendations for further research.

Summary

The intent of this study was to expand the knowledge base of academic division deans leadership orientation frames based on Bolman and Deal's (1984) theory on leadership. The theory of leadership consists of four leadership orientations (frames) which provide a different view of an organization: The structural frame, which accentuates formal roles, rules, policies and procedures; the human resource frame, which accentuates needs satisfaction, motivation and relationships; the political frame, which accentuates bargaining, persuasiveness and negotiation; and the symbolic frame, which accentuates culture, inspiration, social solidarity and constancy of meaning (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Bolman and Deal (1990) theorized that a person has a dominant leadership orientation and that person as a leader would be able to use this understanding of their dominant leadership orientation to make better decisions in complex organizational situations. Furthermore, by the use of multiple frame orientations a leader can adapt to given situations and increase the chances of favorable outcomes.

The sample population in this study consisted of division deans in the North Carolina Community College System. Division deans were selected for this study because they are organizationally situated as a middle manager leader with a dual responsibility of guiding the direction of the academic programs and handling the daily tasks of administration (Russell, 2000). The relationship between community college division deans and the associated division plays a vital role in the effectiveness of the institution. It is at this level of the institution where daily decisions are made that affect every academic program. Deans in community colleges have an expanded role versus chairs at universities; community colleges typically lack internal oversight committees, resulting in loose departmental structures (Franke, 2006). The dean position internally links faculty, administrators and students, as well as external links to high schools, universities, businesses, and community organizations (Green, 2000).

The review of literature found little in the way of research on how community college academic deans incorporate leadership styles (i.e., frames) into their work and if those styles differ among deans with variable levels of education, business experience, and years serving as dean. This gap in the research of community college deans served as the basis for this study.

The research methodology used in this study was quantitative in design. Data were collected using the Leadership Orientation Instrument (LOI) Self developed by Bolman and Deal (1990) to measure and identify the organizational frames of leadership. Each of the questions was answered and statistically

analyzed on a five point Likert-like scale. The analysis of the data consisted of both descriptive and inferential statistics. The highest mean score for the group sequence frame determines the primary leadership orientation for that division dean related to research question one. For the remaining three research questions, a one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to investigate the highest mean for the four frames derived from the LOI. If a significant effect had been found for the independent variable, Tukey's HSD Post hoc test would have been used to determine which levels differ.

This study utilized internet-based cross-sectional surveys for data collection. The participants were contacted via email and a list of participants' email addresses were compiled and maintained within Perseus Survey Solutions Software (Perseus), which was used as the survey tool. The analysis of the survey responses was performed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Software.

The intention of this research was to study the leadership styles used by the division deans in the North Carolina Community College System. The following four research questions were researched to identify the primary leadership frame orientation of the deans and to test for a relationship between the leadership frame orientations and the independent variables identified in each question.

1. What do North Carolina community college division deans perceive as their primary leadership styles?

The analysis of the survey responses reveal that division deans perceive the human resource frame as their primary leadership orientation with a mean score of 4.3. The structural frame was also measured in the range of “often” or “always” with a mean of 4.1, making it the secondary frame used by deans. The two means of four or above indicate that the division deans perceived themselves as utilizing a paired frames orientation in their leadership styles. Lower scores were found in the symbolic and political frames, with both tallying means of 3.8, indicating that these frames were less utilized falling in the range of “sometimes” and “often.” Based on the research methodology described in chapter 3, the symbolic and political frames mean scores below a 4.0 indicate that they are not paired in usage along with the structural and human resource frames of means greater than and equal to 4.0.

2. Is there a statistically significant difference between the educational level achieved and the division dean’s perceived primary leadership frame?

A one-way ANOVA was used to measure the significance between educational levels and frame orientation. The result of the one-way ANOVA indicates that there are no significant differences in the educational level of division dean responders and each of the perceived leadership orientation frames. Based on this result, the perceived leadership orientation used by the North Carolina division deans is not related to level of educational degrees held by those division deans.

3. Is there a statistically significant difference between the division dean's prior years of business experience and the dean's perceived primary leadership frame?

A one-way ANOVA was used to measure significance between prior years of non-educational experience and frame orientation. The result of the one-way ANOVA indicates there are no significant differences in the prior years of non-educational business experience of division dean responders and their perceived leadership orientation frames. Based on this result, the perceived leadership orientation used by the North Carolina division deans is not related to past business experience of those division deans.

4. Is there a statistically significant difference between the number of years serving as division dean and the dean's perceived primary leadership frame?

A one-way ANOVA was used in determining significance between number of years serving as dean and frame orientation. The result of the one-way ANOVA indicates there are no significant differences in the years serving in current position of division dean responders and their perceived leadership orientation frames. Based on this result, the perceived leadership orientation used by the North Carolina division deans is not related to the number of years a division dean is serving in the position.

Cronbach's Alpha was used to establish reliability of the survey. Each of the four leadership orientation frames indicated a high degree of consistency in the item rankings (above .70). Cronbach's Alpha total of .905 shows this consistency among all items and constant across all frame orientation groups. These numbers were similar to what the Bolman and Deal (Bolman, 2008) population pool.

Conclusions

The demographic data collected in this study show that over half of the responding division deans in the North Carolina Community College System are 51 – 60 years of age, consisting of 53% of the valid responses. The 41 – 50 age range group is the second largest at 26% making the majority of deans (79%) falling in the forty and above age group. The category measuring the number of years in the current position shows that over half (55%) of division deans have been in their current position for less than six years. The second largest group, six to ten years, makes up another 23%, leaving 22% who have more than ten years of experience. This demographic of relatively few years in the position is consistent with the research that showed that a disproportionate number of senior administrators had over 26 years in the system and where eligible for retirement in 2006 (Mizelle, 2006).

Based on the findings of the first research question, the human resource frame was the primary orientation perceived by deans, followed by the structural frame as the secondary leadership orientation frame. These findings support the

pool of data from Bolman (2008); finding the human resource and structural frame both being in the range of “often” to “always”. The findings also correlate with the same pool showing symbolic and political frames falling in the “sometimes” to “often” range. Other studies on community colleges using the Bolman and Deal LOI instrument also support these findings (Borden, 2000; Harrell, 2006; Mann, 2006; Russell, 2000) of the human resource and structural frames being paired as the most prevalent. Although these findings were not unexpected, this study confirms that middle management positions within the NCCCS are consistent with the findings of other studies using different population samples. North Carolina is the third largest community college system in the nation, ranking behind only California (111) and Texas (66). North Carolina is also ranked second to the lowest in faculty pay in the southern regional board region (Mizelle, 2006). Considering distinguishing properties such as these, North Carolina community colleges showed no noteworthy differences on the leadership orientation styles of the division deans in comparison to other findings or Bolman’s data pool set.

The second research question findings on educational levels concluded that there was no significance found on the educational levels and perceived leadership orientation frame usage. Literature varied as to the affects of education on leadership styles, and although the majority of literature showed a correlation between the two (McFarlin & Ebbers, 1997; Stout-Stewart, 2005), this study stands in contrast to those findings and supports others that found no

significance (Wilson, 1984). This study does, however, reveal that the majority of division deans do hold a postgraduate degree.

The third research question findings on prior years of non-educational business experience demonstrate that there was no significance found related to years of prior non-educational business experience and perceived leadership orientation frames. No literature was found on business oriented leaders transferring to an educational setting and the effects it has on the leadership orientations in the organization. There was some literature that supported the premise that non-educational business environments do house a structural leadership style (Aggestam, 2004; Pun, 2001). This study's premise is that there is no relation between business experience and leadership frame orientation. The range "zero to five years" of prior non-educational business experience comprised 58% of the valid respondents. With such a substantial proportion of the population falling in this category, the number of participants with zero years of experience is unknown versus one to five years and whether results relative to leadership orientation frames in this zero category would have been significant. In light of this finding, a better demographic identifier in the number of years of prior non-business experience would have been a designation of those with zero years of experience, distinguishing it from the range used in this study of zero to five years. The data pool gathered by Bolman (2008) is a multi sector sample combining managers in both business and education. With the grouping of the two sectors it is unspecified whether the pool of data follows the findings in this

Aggestam study for business environment frame orientation or if business environments echo those primary human resource orientations found in education.

Based on the findings of the fourth research question it can be concluded that the years serving in the current dean position has no significant effect on the perceived leadership orientation frames used by division deans. This stands in contrast to the results by Cantu (1997), who found significance in this area, and supports those by Yim (2003) who showed no significance in the number of years tenure relating to the leadership orientation frames. In exploring the differences in these studies there are several possible explanations for the varied results. The Cantu study was a cross sectional sampling of 600 deans throughout the United States. Both Yim's study and this study used regional population samples. North Carolina, for example, has no tenured positions or unions, which could affect the frame orientations versus deans from within those systems that do have some kind of permanent status. Another difference in the studies is the time period in which the deans were surveyed. The Cantu study was completed in 1997, Yim in 2003, and this study in 2008. Perhaps varying global environments or other external influences are reflected in different frame orientations perceived by those deans at the time those studies were conducted.

Discussion and Recommendations

This study revealed a snapshot of the demographics of the deans in the North Carolina Community College System. This snapshot shows that the typical

division dean is between 51 and 60 years of age, holds a master's degree, has five or less years of prior business experience, and has been in the position less than five years.

Although significance was not found relating education, years of experience, and prior business experience to frame orientation, these results do add to the body of knowledge surrounding leadership frames. This study also raises questions as to the meaning these independent variables have on leadership perceptions. For example, those deans with bachelor degrees perceived themselves as using all four frame orientations falling within the "often" to "always" range. One must question if those deans are misperceiving themselves as multiple frame leaders utilizing all four frames, or possibly the results reflect that those deans with higher education levels are more critical of their perceived leadership behaviors than are those with less education. Further, perhaps those with higher educational levels are better able to perceive a more accurate picture of their actual leadership orientations, and those differences are subsequently portrayed in the results of this study.

The results of this study also draw attention to Aggestam's (2004) study, which showed a more structural style of leadership predominant in the business environments. The findings in this study showed no relation between those experiences and leadership orientations. A question arises as to the prevailing human resource frame orientation found in educators. What happens to those structurally oriented leaders entering positions in education? Are those leaders

working in education because they are human resource oriented people by nature and as such are drawn to education? Or are those structural oriented leaders somehow transformed into a human resource orientation as a result of being immersed in an educational system which is predominantly populated with human resource leaders? A study using an interval sampling technique should be conducted on a structural oriented population entering an educational setting to see of the leadership frames shifts over time.

Many lessons were learned in conducting this study. The first is a new found appreciation for the power of the internet and the use of software programs in making the data collection fast, effective, and convenient. The software program sent 340 survey invitations and immediately started tallying survey responses. The program subsequently sent a follow-up email reminder after two days to those of the 340 deans yet to complete the survey. This process was fast and efficient, with ample survey size being reach within a week. This process was not without shortcomings. Position titles within the state's emailing system, which were used in the identification of divisional deans, were maintained by individual institutions and with obvious differences in consistency, accuracy and detail. These differences in titles made the process of identifying the deans difficult. This impediment, coupled with a variety of institutional internet firewalls which blocked a number of survey email invitations, made this efficient process a little less efficient.

Secondly, the abundance of emails a dean receives daily is reflected in the 47% response rate. The Perseus software package used in sending invitations had the ability to send reminders at given time intervals. This proved helpful in getting an adequate number of responses for this study, and it also gave a reflection of how often emails are unintentionally deleted or forgotten.

Implications

Although many deans have been shown to have limited experience in the dean position, the passing of leadership from the more tenured personnel to these new leaders has coincided with leadership styles seen in the historical pool of data. What the research has found is that leadership frames used by North Carolina community college deans are consistent with those frames studied at other institutions.

Research also found that the political and symbolic leadership orientations used by the North Carolina community college deans are secondary to the human resource and structural frame orientations. The North Carolina Community College System could benefit in a leadership developmental or mentoring program which would facilitate the development of leadership skills in the political and symbolic frame orientations. The resultant understanding would enable the deans to take advantage of these lesser used leadership frames in pursuit of multiple frame orientations and increase the chances to more appropriately engage with and respond to the situations encountered within their organizations.

Another implication found by this study is the lack of significant external non-educational experience of the North Carolina community college deans. The majority of deans (58%) have five or less years of experience outside the educational setting. The colleges may be better situated in having a balance of deans with external workforce experience. This could impact the ability of colleges to meet the mission of the North Carolina community college system in the workforce development of its students. With more external experience, a dean may be better established in working with area industries in student placement and industry partnerships.

Lastly, the lack of significance found in the education, years in position, and non-educational experience of the deans in relation to the leadership frame orientations could be of use by organizations when seeking new leaders to replace that group of tenured deans (10%) looking to soon retire from their positions. Emphasis could now be placed on other areas of a potential new hire's resume that may better depict a person's ability to be successful in the role as division dean.

Further Research

The following recommendations are made for further study based on the results and conclusions of this study regarding leadership orientations of division deans in the North Carolina Community College System. A replication of this study of the North Carolina community college deans should be conducted using the leadership orientation instrument - other. This study would survey the North

Carolina community college department chairs perception of the deans' leadership orientations and compare those findings to those self survey results of deans in this study. The replication of this study would broaden the sampling pool and give verification to the various perceptions of leadership orientations in the North Carolina Community College System.

Secondly, this study found that those deans with the least education levels (bachelor degrees) perceived themselves as making the most use of multiple frame orientations, where other educational levels perceived paired frames only. This stands in contrast to research that shows a correlation in an increased use of leadership orientations with higher levels of education. A qualitative study to examine these perceptions of leadership orientations should be done using this population. Specific characteristics of the different perceptions of leadership orientation in this educational level sample could surface.

Other replications of this study with different cross-sections of the population should be pursued to find if there are significant populations in the systems that have varying leadership orientations. Replications also should be pursued in other state community college systems to verify or rebut these findings and to determine if they are consistent among varying systems and demographics.

In conclusion, this study examined the leadership orientations of the North Carolina community college division deans. The results of this study reinforce the growing knowledge base of other studies completed using the Bolman and Deal

leadership orientation survey instrument. The results of this study show that the human resource frame is the primary leadership frame used by division deans paired with the secondary structural frame orientation. These results are similar the existing pool of data based on the Bolman and Deal LOI (Bolman, 2008). Other replications and cross sectional samples would be of interest to compare leadership orientations based on other defining independent variables or the LOI- other survey. The impact of this study is a better understanding as to the leadership orientations used in the North Carolina Community College System.

REFERENCES

- Aggestam, L. (2004). A framework for supporting the preparation of ISD, in Proceedings of the Doctoral Consortium, held in conjunction with the Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering (CAiSE'04).
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage Publications, Inc.
- Bass B. M. & Riggio, R. E. (2005). *Transformational Leadership*, Second Edition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. Cambridge, MA; Perseus books group.
- Bennis, W. (2003). *On becoming a leader*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books Group.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (2003). *Leaders: Strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Blanchard, K., Zigarmi, P., & Zigarmi, D. (1985). *Leadership and the one minute manager: Increasing effectiveness through situational leadership*. New York, NY: Blanchard Management Corporation.
- Bolman, L. G. (2008). Reliability of leadership orientations scales. Retrieved March 12, 2008, from Lee Bolman Web site:
<http://www.leebolman.com/orientations.htm>

- Bolden, R., Gosling, J., Marturano, A., & Dennison, P. (2003, June). *A review of leadership theory and competency frameworks*. Centre for Leadership Studies, University of Exeter.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1984). *Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1990). *Leadership orientations instrument*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1992). Leading and managing: Effects of context, culture, and gender. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 314-29.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Borden, M. (2000). Leadership orientations of area campus administrators in Florida's state university and community college systems: A frame analysis. University of Central Florida, Dissertation.
- Bratton, J., & Gold, J. (2000). *Human resource management: Theory and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: MacMillan Press LTD.
- Burbach, M. E., Matkin, G. S., & Fritz, S. M. (2004, September). Teaching critical thinking in an introductory leadership course utilizing active learning strategies: A confirmatory study. *College Student Journal*.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper Row.

- Bush, G. W. (2004). State of the Union Address . The White House.
Retrieved April 23, 2007, from
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/01/20040120-7.html>
- Bush, T. (2006). *Theories of educational management*. Creative commons organization., Version 1.1.
- Cantu, D. (1997). *The leadership frames of academic deans randomly selected and nominated as exceptionally effective at public colleges and universities*. Arkansas State University.
- Casal, T. (2002). Authoritarian leadership style and intrinsic motivation. (Doctoral Dissertation, Kean University, 2002). Retrieved January 24, 2008, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT EP12306).
- Chang, T. (2004). *Leadership styles of department chairs and faculty utilization of instructional technology*. West Virginia University, WV.
- Chemers, M. (1997). *An integrative theory of leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Cherry, F., & Deaux, K. (2004, September 10-12). *The Lewinian Legacy in SPSSI*, The society for the psychological study of social issues.
- Clark, M. (Ed.). (2006). *An assessment of the community college leadership doctoral program at Mississippi State university as perceived by former and current students*. Mississippi State, Mississippi.

- Crist, B. (1999). *A study of the relationship of the job satisfaction of chief academic officers of institutions of higher education and the perceived leadership style of the institution's president*. West Virginia University, WV.
- Daft, R. (2005). *The leadership experience*. Mason, OH; South-Western
- Duncan, D. A. (2004). School culture: Exploring its relationship with mental models and leadership behaviors in schools. (Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, 2004). Retrieved January 20, 2008, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3160552).
- Evelyn, J. (2002). Diminished power. *Chronicle of Higher education*, 49(2). Retrieved September 20, 2006, from the ERIC database.
- Evelyn, J. (2004). Community colleges at a crossroads. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(34).
- Fiedler, F. E., Chemers, M. M., & Mahar, L. (1976). *Improving leadership effectiveness: The leader match concept*. New York: Wiley.
- Fincher, C. (1997). Presidential qualifications and institutional structure. Retrieved April 9, 2007, from the ERIC database.
- Franke, A. H. (2006). How strong is academic freedom in community colleges? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(10), B19.

Beck-Frazier, S. G. (2005). Perceptions of selected university deans' leadership behavior. (Doctoral Dissertation, East Carolina University, 2005).

Retrieved October 17, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3162932).

Gagliardo, J. C. M. (2006). Temperament types and perceived leadership styles of North Carolina community college Chief Academic Officers. (Doctoral Dissertation, East Carolina University, 2006. Retrieved November 29, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3209568).

Gill, R. (2006). *Theory and practice of leadership*. Publisher: Sage Publications.

Gmelch, W. (2003). *Deans' balancing acts: Education leaders and the challenges they face*. AACTE Publications, Washington, DC.

Goldman, P., & Smith, N. (1991). *Filling the frames: Using Bolman and Deal to analyze an educational innovation*. EDRS, Kingston, Ontario.

Green, J. (2000). Job satisfaction of community college chairpersons. (Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2000).

Retrieved January 22, 2008, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 9991273).

Grint, K. (2005). Problems, problems, problems: The social construction of 'leadership'. *Human Relations*, 58(11), 1467-1494. Retrieved January 24, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 964773211).

- Guidry, T. C. (2007). Women deans' perceptions of their leadership styles: A study based on Bolman and Deal's four frame theory (Doctoral Dissertation, East Carolina University, 2007). Retrieved October 17, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3255414).
- Harrell, A. (2006). An analysis of the perceived leadership orientation of senior student affairs officers and the work satisfaction of their professional staff subordinates in the North Carolina Community College System. (Doctoral Dissertation, East Carolina University, 2006).
- Hata, N., American Historical Association, W., & Organization of American Historians, B. (1999, January 1). Community college historians in the United States. A status report from the organization of American historians' committee on community colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED438000) Retrieved November 29, 2007, from ERIC database.
- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. (2004). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology, 9*(2), 169-180.
- Hughes, H., Johnson, R., & Madjidi, F. (1999). *The efficacy of administrator preparation programs: Private school administrators' attitudes*. Retrieved April 09, 2007, from the ERIC database.

- Judge, T., & Bono, J. (2000). Five-factor model of Personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(5), 751-765.
- Jung, D. I. (2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and their effects on creativity in groups. *Creativity Research Journal, 13*, 185–195.
- Kahai, S. S., Sosik, J. J., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). Effects of participative and directive leadership in electronic groups. *Group & Organization Management, 29*(1), 67-105. Retrieved January 24, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 535372581).
- Keller, R. T. (1992, September), Transformational leadership and the performance of research and development project groups. *Journal of Management.*
- Kim, S. (2002). Participative management and job satisfaction: Lessons for management leadership. *Public Administration Review, 62*(2), 231-241. Retrieved January 24, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 111279503).
- Kirkman, M. (2004). Leadership style of community college department chairs and the effects of faculty job satisfaction. (Doctoral D dissertation, University of Missouri - Columbia, 2004. Retrieved December 10, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3164520).

- Laudicina, E. (1992, Spring). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 15(3), 389-393.
- Leftwich, P. (2001). *Transformational leadership at the department chair level in North Carolina community colleges*. Retrieved September 20, 2006, from the ERIC database.
- Leubsdorf, B. (2006). Boomers' retirement may create talent squeeze. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(2).
- Mann, G. (2006). Temperament types and perceived leadership styles of North Carolina community college Chief Academic Officers. East Carolina University, Dissertation.
- Mathis, S. G. (1999). The relationship of leadership frame use of departmental chairs to faculty job satisfaction as perceived by selected departmental faculty members. (Doctoral Dissertation, West Virginia University, 1999). Retrieved December 10, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 9926704).
- McArthur, R. (2002). Democratic leadership and faculty empowerment at the community college: A theoretical model for the department chair. *Community College Review*, 30(3), 1-10. Retrieved September 20, 2006, from the ERIC database.
- McFarlin, C., & Ebbers, L. (1997). Preparation factors common in outstanding community college presidents. Retrieved April 9, 2007, from the ERIC database.

- McGlone, J. (2005). University presidents: A study of leadership perceptions using Bolman and Deal's four frame theory. East Carolina University, Dissertation.
- Mizelle, T. (2006). The North Carolina community college system fact book 2006. Retrieved April 23, 2007, from The North Carolina community college system fact book 2006 Web site:
<http://www.ncccs.cc.nc.us/Publications/docs/Publications/fb2007.pdf>
- North Carolina Statistical Abstract of Higher Education 05-06 (2006). Retrieved November 11, 2007, from The university of North Carolina Web site:
<http://www.northcarolina.edu/content.php/assessment/reports/abstract-current.htm>
- Northouse, P. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage Publications, Inc.
- Pechlivanidis, P., & Katsimpra, A. (2004). *Supervisory leadership and implementation phase. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 25(1/2)*, 201-215. Retrieved January 24, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 626512061).
- Peterson, A. (2004). *Managing pharmacy practice: Principles, strategies, and systems*, CRC Press.
- Peterson, K., & Bercik, J. (1995). *Frame theory analysis of the cultures of three outstanding teacher induction programs*. Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

- Pun, K. F. (2001, May). Cultural influences on total quality management adoption in Chinese enterprise: An empirical study. *Total Quality Management*, 12(3), 323, 20p.
- Rad, A. M. M., & Yarmohammadian, M. H. (2006). A study of relationship between managers' leadership style and employees' job satisfaction. *Leadership in Health Services*, 19(2), 11-28. Retrieved January 24, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 1074250671).
- Russell, C. (2000). Community college academic deans: Leadership frames and stress. Iowa State University, Dissertation.
- Scarselletta, M. (1994, January). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 47(2), 342.
- Shenhar, A. J. (2001). One size does not fit all projects: Exploring classical contingency domains. *Management Science*, 47(3), 394-414. Retrieved January 24, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 70104177).
- Shults, C. (2001). *The critical impact of impending retirements on community college leadership*. American Association of Community Colleges. Retrieved September 13, 2006, from the ERIC database.
- Smith, B., & Hughey, A. (2006, June), Leadership in higher education--its evolution and potential: A unique role facing critical challenges. *Industry and Higher Education*, 20(3), 157-163.

- Stogdill, R. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology, 25*, 35-71.
- Storey, J. (2003). *Leadership in organizations: Current issues and key trends*. Taylor & Francis, Inc.
- Stout-Stewart, S. (2005). Female community-college presidents: Effective leadership patterns and behaviors. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29*(4), 303. Retrieved April 9, 2007, from the ERIC database.
- Taylor, S., Peplau, L., & Sears, D. (1997). *Social Psychology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wilson, J. (1984). The influences of sex, age, teacher experience and race on teacher perception of school climate. *Education, 104*(4), 444. Retrieved April 9, 2007 from the ERIC database.
- Wolverton, M., & Gmelch, W. H. (2002). *College deans leading from within*. American Council on Education, ORYX Press.
- Yerkes, D. (1992). Towards an understanding of organizational culture in schools of education: Implications for leadership development. California State University, Presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, San Francisco California, Session Number: 30.26.

Yim, S. (2000). A comparative study of community college faculty teaching as leading styles: Technical college faculty in South Carolina, US and Ontario, Canada, North Carolina State University. Raleigh, NC.

Yim, S. (2003). A comparative study of community college faculty. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College*, 10(1), 7-18.

Yun, S., Cox, J., & Sims Jr., H. P. (2006). The forgotten follower: a contingency model of leadership and follower self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology: Self-leadership*, 21(4), 374-388. Retrieved January 24, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 1073440751).

APPENDIX A: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER



University and Medical Center Institutional Review Board
East Carolina University
Ed Warren Life Sciences Building • 600 Moyer Boulevard • LSB 104 • Greenville, NC 27834
Office 252-744-2914 • Fax 252-744-3284 • www.ecu.edu/irb
Chair and Director of Biomedical IRB: L. Wiley Nkeng, MD
Chair and Director of Behavioral and Social Science IRB: Susan L. McCammon, PhD

TO: Bill Sypawka, College of Education, ECU
FROM: UMCIRB^(S)
DATE: February 20, 2008
RE: Exempt Category Research Study
TITLE: "A Study of Division Deans in the North Carolina Community College System Self Perceived Leadership Style Based on Bolman and Deal's Four Frame Theory"

UMCIRB #08-0169

This research study has undergone expedited review on 2/20/08. This research study meets the criteria for an exempt status because it is research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects and any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation. Dr. S. McCammon deemed this unfunded study no more than minimal risk. This research study does not require any additional interaction with the UMCIRB unless there are changes in this study because the changes may impact the level of review required.

The following items were reviewed:


- Internal Processing Form
- Cover letters to participants
- Survey

Dr. S. McCammon does not have a potential for conflict of interest on this study.

The UMCIRB applies 45 CFR 46, Subparts A-D, to all research reviewed by the UMCIRB regardless of the funding source. 21 CFR 50 and 21 CFR 56 are applied to all research studies under the Food and Drug Administration regulation. The UMCIRB follows applicable International Conference on Harmonisation Good Clinical Practice guidelines.

APPENIDX B: BOLMAN PERMISSION LETTER

Page 1 of 1

 You forwarded this message on 3/16/2007 12:22 PM.

Sypawka, William

From: Lee Bolman [bolman@umkc.edu] **Sent:** Tue 9/5/2006 5:34 PM
To: Sypawka, William
Cc:
Subject: RE: [1] Permission to use the Leadership Orientation Instrument
Attachments:

Dear Mr. Sypawka,

Based on your agreement to share results of your research as stated in your email message, I'm happy to grant you permission to use the instrument in your doctoral research. Best wishes on your dissertation.

Lee Bolman

Professor and Marion Bloch/Missouri Chair in Leadership

Bloch School of Business and Public Administration

University of Missouri-Kansas City

From: Sypawka, William [mailto:W50928@ecu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, September 05, 2006 8:36 AM
To: BolmanL@umkc.edu
Subject: Permission to use the Leadership Orientation Instrument

Dr. Bolman,

I am writing to you in hopes for permission to use the Bolman & Deal's Leadership Orientations Instrument for my dissertation towards my doctoral degree in the Educational Leadership Department at East Carolina University in Greenville, North Carolina. The topic of the dissertation is to study the perceptions of leadership styles in community colleges throughout North Carolina. I'd be more than happy to share the results of this dissertation along with the research data upon request.

Thanks in advance for your consideration and I'd be appreciative of any additional ideas you may have toward my studies.

Sincerely,

Bill Sypawka

[https://piratemail.ecu.edu/exchange/WS0928/Dissertation/RE:%20\[1\]%20Permission%20t...](https://piratemail.ecu.edu/exchange/WS0928/Dissertation/RE:%20[1]%20Permission%20t...) 3/27/2008

APPENIDIX C: INITIAL EMAIL WITH SURVEY

Deans of North Carolina community college system - Dissertation survey

Sypawka, William <WS0928@ecu.edu>
Reply-To: WS0928@ecu.edu
To: xxxxxx@xxxxx.edu

Mon, Feb 25, 2008 at 2:20 PM

Dear Deans,

My name is Bill Sypawka, and I'm a doctoral student in the Educational leadership (Higher Education) Program at East Carolina University. I am writing to request your assistance with data collection for my dissertation.

The title of my dissertation is: A STUDY OF DIVISION DEANS IN THE NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM SELF PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP STYLE BASED ON BOLMAN AND DEAL'S FOUR FRAME THEORY. The purpose of this study is to identify the leadership frames that are most frequently utilized by Division Deans in the North Carolina Community College System.

My methodology involves the completion of a survey by Division Deans in the North Carolina Community College system. The survey is short and will take approximately five minutes of your time. Thank you in advance for your consideration in taking part in my research endeavors. As a dean, your responses to these items are very important.

Please note: The survey information collected is recorded anonymously. Neither the survey administrators nor anyone else will be able to associate your name with your survey responses so you may respond with complete candor.

[Survey Link](#)

Regards,
Bill Sypawka

Ws0928@ecu.edu

bsypawka@email.pittcc.edu

(252) 916-5872

APPENDIX E: SURVEY

Introduction

Dear North Carolina community college dean,

Thank you for participating in this research study. The results will contribute to an understanding of the perceived leadership frameworks of North Carolina community college deans.

The survey is short and will take approximately five minutes of your time. As a dean, your responses to these items are very important. Please complete the survey by February 29, 2008.

Please note: The survey information collected is recorded anonymously. Neither the survey administrators nor anyone else will be able to associate your name with your survey responses so you may respond with complete candor.

Please complete the following demographic questions first.

1. Age category:

- Under 30
- 30-40
- 41-50
- 51-60
- Over 61

2. Number of years in your current position:

- 0-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21-plus

3. Number of years of prior non-educational business experience:

- 0-5
- 6-10
- 11-15

- 16-20
 21-plus

4. Highest Educational level achieved:

- No Degree
 Associate degree
 Bachelor's degree
 Master's degree
 Professional degree
 Doctorate

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATIONS (Self).

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

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

You are asked to indicate how often each of the items below is true for you. Please use the following scale in answering each item.

	Never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Always
1. Think very clearly and logically.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Show high levels of support and concern for others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Inspire others to do their best.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Strongly emphasize careful planning and clear time lines.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Build trust through open and collaborative relationships.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Am a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Am highly charismatic.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Always
9. Approach problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Show high sensitivity and concern for	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Always
others' needs and feelings.					
11. Am unusually persuasive and influential.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Am able to be an inspiration to others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Foster high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Anticipate and deal adroitly with organizational conflict.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Am highly imaginative and creative.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Always
17. Approach problems with facts and logic.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Am consistently helpful and responsive to others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Am very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Communicate a strong and challenging sense of vision and mission.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Set specific, measurable goals and hold people accountable for results.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Listen well and am unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. Am politically very sensitive and skillful.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. See beyond current realities to generate exciting new opportunities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Always
25. Have extraordinary attention to detail.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26. Give personal recognition for work well done.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27. Develop alliances to build a strong base of support.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28. Generate loyalty and enthusiasm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29. Strongly believe in clear structure and a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Always
chain of command.					
30. Am a highly participative manager.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31. Succeed in the face of conflict and opposition.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32. Serve as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[Submit Survey](#)

Powered by SurveySolutions [online survey software](#)