The Leadership Styles in Academia: Four Faces of University Presidents

Amit J. Shah, Michael L. Monahan
Frostburg State University
Frostburg, MD 21532
(ashah@frostburg.edu , mmonahan@frostburg.edu)

DOI:10.26573/2008.2.2.1
Volume 2, *Number* 2
May 2008, *pp*. 81-91

This study examined the leadership style of university presidents by using the Bolman and Deal leadership survey. This instrument determines if a leader predominantly uses a one style, two styles, multiple, or no predominant leadership style. Most presidents utilized a multi-style leadership approach (43.7%), followed by a paired-style (22.4%), then a single-style (20.9%), and finally, a no-style (13%). While the presidents utilized a multi-frame leadership style in a statistically significant manner, there was no correlation between the leadership style when comparing gender, race, age, or marital status. However, descriptive statistics infer that female, non-Caucasian, and presidents under the age of 60 more frequently employed the multi-frame leadership style. Presidents who adopt a multi-frame approach may be able to better address problems and seek opportunities for the institution.

Keywords: University presidents, Leadership styles, Bolman and Deal, Multi-Style

1. Introduction

Institutions of higher education are complex organizations where issues are multifaceted and the solutions are often intertwined and compromised due to the people, politics, and culture of the situation. Their presidents face a myriad of issues from their multiple constituencies. Students, faculty, staff, the community, and local, state and federal governments all exert demands over limited resources.

Resources in higher education have generally been in short supply; however the current state deficits herald significant reductions in funds and subject public institutions to greater oversight and accountability. It is anticipated that higher education spending in 42 states will lag non-educational state expenditures [7]. To many, access is now viewed as an entitlement as minorities and under-prepared students demand admittance and tailor-made services to address their particular need [22]. These costly services place an additional drain on limited funds. Similarly, the needs of the workplace are transforming curriculum as employers demand better skilled and better-educated workers [24].

The president symbolizes the institution and all that it means to its varied constituents. As the embodiment of the institution, the president conveys many images to the public to reinforce the symbolic and ritual content of the position [1]. It is the task and responsibility of the president to confront issues, even as these varied

demands outrun the university's capacity to respond [10]. Green and Levine [17] contend that opportunity is implicit in adversity. However, the right president can successfully position the institution [21]. Leadership is the quality that enables presidents to move the institution forward. Although there are numerous definitions of leadership, leadership is essentially the act of influencing subordinates to accomplish goals or objectives in a particular situation [18].

The presidency is not simply a job or a position; it is a calling, imbued with a sense of moral obligation. Presidents have a moral responsibility to "minister" to society's needs and to offer a critical perspective of its values and behaviors [15]. DePree [13] characterized this perspective as a component of leadership. "The first responsibility of a leader is to define reality. The last is to say thank you. In between the two, the leader must become a servant and a debtor" (p.11). In other words, presidents are "managers of meaning" for their organizations.

Researchers and educational leaders reinforce the premise of the value of the presidency and the premise that the person holding the presidency makes a difference**.** Kaufman [20] notes, "The president is at the center of a vastly complex and fragile human organization. The president must be effective or the institution will suffer" (p. 14). Similarly, "a college or university cannot rise above the level of the president's leadership" [9]. It appears that for better or for worse, the fate of an institution is often directly related to its president. Cowley and Williams [12] assert:

> Name a great American college or university and you will find in its history a commanding leader or leaders who held its presidency. Name an institution with a brilliant but now-withered past, however, and you will probably have little difficulty in identifying the weak headman presidents who have blocked its progress. Colleges and universities, focal institutions in the life of the nation, need especially strong leaders. (p. 70)

Therefore, in order to gain insight into the men and women who guide these institutions, this study will ascertain the leadership styles of university presidents and see if leadership style is correlated with personal factors such as age, gender, race, or marital status.

2. Conceptual Design

Bolman and Deal created the *Leadership Orientations (Self) instrument* [4] to determine leadership orientation. In essence, the authors assert that frames open different windows of organizational reality and give leaders multiple strategies for addressing challenges. There are four dimensions to their model and they consist of (a) the structural frame, (b) the human resource frame, (c) the political frame, and (d) the symbolic frame. The authors devised these frames as an extension of previous theories and research.

The structural frame focuses on formal rules, hierarchy, and the goals of the organization. It further emphasizes goals and efficiency, formal roles and relationships, and creates rules, procedures and hierarchies [5].

The human resource frame focuses on the needs of the people within the organization. Human resource leaders concentrate on feelings and relationships, and seek to lead through support and empowerment. In essence, they seek to align the needs of the organization with the needs of the individuals [5].

The political frame views organizations as arenas where participants compete over resources, power, influence, and interests. It focuses on the ever-present conflict and maneuvering by various groups and interests over an organization's finite resources. The political frame views organizations as vibrant, forceful political arenas where a multitude of individual and group interests vie for attention [5].

Finally, the symbolic frame focuses on the intangible aspects of the organization such as culture, myths, ceremony, and rituals. This frame deals with culture, rituals, and symbols as opposed to rules and procedures [5].

Leaders tend to favor certain frameworks over others but a single framework style may limit their ability to successfully address situations. Therefore, in addition to the single frame, leaders may utilize a paired (using two frames) or multi-frame (utilizing three or more frames) strategy. This reframing will enable the leader to view, analyze, and develop solutions from one or more different perspectives. Bolman and Deal [5] contend that effective leaders are multi-framed; that is, they utilize at least three of the four frames. This multi-frame leadership provides the leader with more potential opportunities and solutions. In summary, each frame has its own unique characteristics. Table 1 depicts some major aspects of the theory.

Table 1 *Characteristics of the Bolman and Deal Four Frame Model**

Characteristics	**Structural**	**Human Resource**	**Political**	**Symbolic**
Metaphor	Machine	Family	Jungle	Carnival
Central Concepts	Rules, policies	Relationships, Needs	Power, Conflict	Culture, Rituals
Decision Making	Rational	Produce Commitment	Gain or Exercise Power	Confirm Values
Leader	Analyst	Servant	Negotiator	Prophet
Process	Design	Support, Empowerment	Builds Coalitions	Inspiration
Communication	Transmit Facts	Exchange Needs and Feelings	Influence Others	Tell Stories
Motivation	Economic	Growth	Coercion	Symbols
Challenge	Life Structure to Task	Align Needs	Develop Power Base	Create Meaning

*Source: Bolman and Deal, 1997, Reframing Organizations, Second Edition, Jossey-Bass

3. Literature Review

The only other studies conducted thus far on presidential leadership using the four-frames model centered on the ethnic, racial, gender, and length of experience of the respondents. Thus, in most of the leadership frame studies conducted thus far, including this one, the multi-frame approach surfaced with greater frequency than did the other approaches. Bensimon [3] studied presidential leadership styles

utilizing the Bolman and Deal framework. She found the majority of presidents in her sample had a single frame orientation. Other presidents utilized a paired frame orientation where two frames were used. The human resources/symbolic pairing were cited as being most practiced. Another group employed a multi-frame orientation where leadership was practiced from three vantage points. In addition, Bensimon [3] compared frame usage with the presidents' length of tenure and institutional type.

Echols Tobe [14] found two thirds of female African American presidents had multiple frame orientations. Becker [2] studied chief information officers and found multi-frame leadership was used by two thirds of the respondents.

Wolf [30] examined 343 campus safety directors at public four-year institutions and found two-thirds utilized multiple frames. Borden [6] studied campus administrators in Florida's state university and community college systems and found multiple frames were used by nearly half of the respondents.

Many studies were conducted in the area of primary and secondary education. Harlow [19] studied twenty Washington State public school superintendents and found the superintendents rarely used more than two frames and Flak [16] examined female superintendents and found multi-frame leadership orientation was used. Small [27] examined the relationship between the perceived leadership style of nursing chairpersons and the organizational effectiveness of baccalaureate nursing programs. It was interesting to note that chairs were perceived by faculty members as using no frames the most, followed by all four frames, single frame, multi-frame, and paired frame. Of the single leadership frames, faculty perceived chairs to use the human resource frames the most often. The structural frame, symbolic frame, and political frame followed in usage. However, there were no correlation between leadership style and effectiveness.

Suzuki [28] compared the leadership of California Asian and other public school principals. He found a larger number of Asian-American principals who used multiple leader orientations. Rivers [25] studied principal leadership in Florida and found over half of the elementary principals utilized multiple frames and three quarters of the high school principals utilized multiple frames. Cote [11] studied the leadership orientation frames of Florida elementary principals and found multi-frame leadership the most prevalent. Messer [23] also studied elementary principal leadership orientations in Florida public schools and found the use of multiple frames was reported by 60% of the principals.

In the field of health sciences, Turley [29] studied radiation therapy program directors and found forty-four percent of respondents' espoused multi-frame leadership.

4. Survey Design and Data Collection

The population for this study was comprised of 494 university presidents of Masters I institutions. These institutions award 40 or more Masters Degrees in three or more disciplines annually [8].

The survey instrument developed by Bolman and Deal [4] consists of thirty-two questions to elicit information about the preferred leadership style. Participants utilized a Likert-like scale to record their behaviors. The responses ranged from 1

(never) to 5 (always). A mean score of 4.0 or greater on a scale of 1-5 indicating "often" or "always" was the criterion for assigning a leadership style to the respondents. The data was solicited by way of a mailed survey simultaneously to all potential participants after permission from Dr. Lee Bolman was received. If after three weeks, the returns were below 50%, a reminder notification was sent to participants who have not responded. If responses were still below 50%, a final reminder was sent.

There are 4 major leadership styles: no style, single, paired, and multi-frame. The multi-frame encompasses usage of any three or all four styles. Contained within them are the specific leadership frames. Within the single leadership style exists the four major frames: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. These frames can be used alone, or in combination with other frames. In cases where the presidents' responses failed to reach the threshold for frame usage, the no-frame style was employed.

5. Results and Discussion

A total of 254 usable surveys were received yielding a return rate of 51.4 percent. The *Leadership Orientations (Self)* [4] instrument revealed the multi-style approach (43.7%), followed by a paired-style (22.4%), then a single-style (20.9%), and finally, a no-style (13%) leadership orientation was employed by the participants. A one-way Chi-Square test was performed, and the critical value of 7.82 was exceeded. This finding signals a significant difference at the .05 level, χ^2 (3, n=254) = 13.17, $p<.05$ pointing to the significant frequency of the multi-frame style and the no-style as the least used.

Next, the study sought to determine if the variables of age, gender, race, or marital status, had an impact on the leadership frames utilized.

Gender

Even though nearly 77% of the respondents were male, both female and male presidents employed the multi-frame leadership style most frequently; however females utilized the multi-frame style more often (7.1%). The paired-style was the second most utilized style for males (24.6%), however the single-frame style was the second most practiced style by females (23.7%). Both female and male presidents least utilized the no-frame leadership style (see Table 2).

Table 2 *Leadership Styles by Gender*

Frame Utilized	**Female**	**%**	**Male**	**%**	χ^2	*r*
					2.67	-0.002
No-frame	7	12	26	13		
Single-frame	14	24	39	20		
Paired-frame	9	15	48	25		
Tri-frame	11	19	33	17		
Four-frame	18	31	49	25		
Total	59	100	195	100		

Tests of statistical significance did not reveal any relationships. A Chi-Square analysis was conducted and found no significant relationship between leadership

style and gender at the .05 level, χ^2 (3, n=254) = 2.67, p>.05. This distribution must exceed the critical value 7.82 for significance. A Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated and found no statistically significant relationship between leadership style and gender, r = -.002, n = 254, p>.05.

Race

The initial analysis focused on descriptive statistics to examine the styles and frames by race. Then, a Chi-Square goodness of fit test was performed to determine if statistically significant differences occurred. The variables were then reformatted into two options so that this dummy variable could undergo a Pearson's correlation to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed. Caucasians accounted for most of the respondents (86.6%). African-American presidents were the largest minority (7.1%), followed by Hispanic (3.95), and Asian (1.2%). There were no Native American presidents. The 34 non-Caucasian respondents represented five races. Due to this small size of minority presidents, the data was aggregated by comparing Caucasian and non-Caucasian presidents. Although both Caucasians and non-Caucasian presidents most cited the multi-frame leadership style, non-Caucasian presidents employed this style more often (20.9%). Both groups equally employed the paired-frame style; however, Caucasian presidents more often utilized the single and no-frame style (see Table 3).

Tests of statistical significance did not reveal any relationships. A Chi-Square analysis was conducted and found no significant relationship between leadership styles and race at the .05 level, χ^2 (3, n=254) = 6.08, *p*>.05. Since this finding did not surpass the critical value of 7.82, significance did not result. Since the data was aggregated, it was possible to perform a Pearson's correlation coefficient. Unfortunately, there was no statistically significant relationship between leadership style and race at the .05 level, r = +. 053, n = 254, *p*>.05. Overall, Caucasian presidents utilized the no-frame, single-frame, and paired-frame leadership styles more frequently than Non-Caucasian presidents.

Table 3 *Leadership Styles and Frames by Race*

Frame Utilized	**Caucasian**	**%**	**Non-Caucasian**	**%**	χ^2	***r***
					6.08	0.053
No-frame	31	14	2	6		
Single-frame	49	22	4	12		
Paired-frame	50	23	7	21		
Tri-frame	39	18	5	15		
Four-frame	51	23	16	47		
Total	220	100	34	100		

Age

The initial analysis focused on descriptive statistics to examine the styles and frames by age. Then, a Chi-Square goodness of fit test was performed to determine if statistically significant differences occurred. The variables were then reformatted into two options so that this dummy variable could undergo a Pearson's correlation to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed. There were no Masters I

presidents under the age of forty; however, over half of the presidents were under the age of 60 (52.3%). These presidents tended to use the multi-frame style (46.6%) and the paired-style more frequently (24.1) than presidents over the age of 60, 5.4% and 3.9% respectively. Presidents over the age of 60 tended to employ a singe-frame style (23.5%) and a no-frame style more often (15.1%) than their peers (see Table 4). Nevertheless, presidents under the age of 60 practiced the full four-frame leadership style 3.8% more frequently (28.6%).

Tests of statistical significance did not reveal any relationships. A Chi-Square analysis was conducted and found no significant relationship between leadership styles and age at the .05 level, χ^2 (3, n=252) = 2.57, p>.05. The critical value of 7.82 was not transcended. A Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated and found no statistically significant relationship between leadership style and age, r = -.005, n = 252, p>.05.

Table 4 *Leadership Styles and Frames by Age*

Frame Utilized	**< 60**	**%**	**> 60**	**%**	χ^2	***r***
					2.57	-0.005
No-frame	14	11	18	15		
Single-frame	25	19	28	24		
Paired-frame	32	24	24	20		
Tri-frame	29	22	15	13		
Four frame	33	25	34	29		

Marital Status

The initial analysis focused on descriptive statistics to examine the styles and frames by marital status. Then, a Chi-Square goodness of fit test was performed to determine if statistically significant differences occurred. The variables were then reformatted into two options so that this dummy variable could undergo a Pearson's correlation to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed.

The vast majority of presidents were married (79.1%). The fifty-two unmarried presidents represented four types of single relationships. In addition, the unmarried presidents' statistic may be skewed due to posts held by members of the Catholic clergy (10.2%).

An analysis was conducted by comparing the responses of married and unmarried presidents. Even though both groups of presidents most frequently employed the multi-frame leadership style, married presidents utilized the full four-frame style more often (7.9%). Usage of the paired-frame was consistent by both groups; however, unmarried presidents employed single- style leadership more than married participants (6.0%) (see Table 5).

Tests of statistical significance did not reveal any noteworthy relationships. A Chi-Square analysis was conducted and found no significant relationship between leadership styles and marital status at the .05 level, χ^2 (3, n=252) = .77, p>.05. This very low result was distant from the critical value of 7.82. A Pearson's correlation was calculated and found no statistically significant relationship between leadership style and marital status, r = -.052, n = 253, p>.05.

Table 5 *Leadership Styles and Frames by Marital Status*

Frame Utilized	Married	%	Un-Married	%	χ^2	*r*
					0.77	-0.052
No-frame	26	13	6	12		
Single-frame	40	20	13	25		
Paired-frame	45	22	12	23		
Tri-frame	33	16	11	21		
Four Frame	57	28	10	19		

6. Conclusion and Managerial Implications

Higher education institutions are large, complex institutions with multiple constituencies. While the presidents of Masters I institutions utilized a multi-frame leadership style in a statistically significant manner, there was no correlation between the leadership style when comparing gender, race, age, or marital status.

Although no statistically significant differences were found using the attributes of gender, race, age or marital status, the descriptive statistics reveal some interesting findings:

- Even though nearly 77% of the respondents were male, both female and male presidents employed the multi-frame leadership style most frequently; however females utilized the multi-frame style more often. The paired-style was the second most utilized style for males; however the single-frame style was the second most practiced style by females.
- Although both Caucasians and non-Caucasian presidents most cited the multi-frame leadership style, non-Caucasian presidents employed this style more often.
- Over half of the presidents were under the age of 60. These presidents tended to use the multi-frame style and the paired-style more frequently than presidents over the age of 60.
- Married presidents utilized the full four-frame style more often than unmarried presidents.

The higher usage of the multi-framed style by married presidents may be the result of the conflict resolution and compromising skills that are often developed in marriage. These skills may assist in dealing with their diverse constituencies.

In addition, these descriptive statistics infer that female, non-Caucasian, and presidents under the age of 60 more frequently employed the multi-frame leadership style. This finding is worth noting due to the emphasis of diversity in higher education, the need to respond to the changing composition of students and shifting national population. Presidents who adopt a multi-frame approach may be able to better address problems and seek opportunities for the institution. Therefore, examining problems from multi-vantage points or multi-faces provides an advantage in confronting issues in complex organizations. Further, the non-majority presidents may be indeed responding to their environments and their constituencies to solve problems in a different way than their majority counterparts [26].

Similarly, business exists in dynamic environments that are often in a continuous state of flux as managers confront a never-ending variety of problems stemming

from internal and external environments. In addition, the pressure from various stakeholders and constituencies often complicate efforts to find workable solutions. The leader's individual skills, experiences or education often predisposes a certain course of action; however a singular viewpoint dramatically limits the range of alternatives and may interfere with arriving at potential agreeable solutions. Using multiple frames can allow the leader to see innovative solutions, place themselves in the shoes of the stakeholders, and enable them to persuade others toward the preferred course of action to benefit the organization.

7. Limitations of the Study and Scope for Future Research

Since the respondents themselves determined the president's leadership style, the results were a product of their self-perception and consequently limited by the accuracy of those perceptions. In addition, while the reliability and validity of the Bolman and Deal *Leadership Orientation Instrument (Self)* is very high, it nonetheless imposed a limitation on the results of the study. Finally, data from this study was from presidents of Masters I institutions and may not be generalized to other institutions

Recommendations for future research could include:

1) Since first time presidents comprised over 70% of this survey's respondents, future studies could concentrate on soliciting the responses of repeat presidents to achieve a more balanced representation to compare the leadership styles between the two groups. Further, additional research could determine if leadership styles change over time and with more experience.
2) The leadership style of Masters I presidents does not appear to be predicated on the demographic variables in this study. However, there may be another set of variables that are more closely related to their leadership style. For example, organizational climate, faculty job satisfaction, funding patterns, and changes in enrollment, changes in donor levels, senior administrative turnover, and other indices relating to institutional effectiveness. Subsequent studies could examine situational variables particularly the maturity and capability levels of the followers, executive team, and other significant followers inside and outside of the institution.
3) Subsequent research could include the Bolman and Deal (1990) *Leadership Orientations (Other)* instrument to survey the executive staff and members of the president's cabinet. This would assist in understanding if the president's leadership style is related to what the president perceives is being employed.
4) Masters II institutions and the Research Universities should be surveyed using th*e Bolman and Deal 1990* Leadership Orientations (Self) instrument to determine if differences in leadership styles exist at these institutions.
5) Future studies could compare Masters I institutions with Baccalaureate and Community Colleges. This may prove interesting since women presidents are more prevalent in community colleges and the governance and decision-making at community colleges is more bureaucratic.
6) Lastly, studies are needed to examine the turnover and appointment of new senior officers with a new president since presidents can have a great impact on

the future of their institutions by the staff selections they make. Relationships between leadership style and turnover of executive team could then be explored.

8. References

1. Balderson, F. (1995). *Managing today's university: Strategies for viability, change and excellence* (2nd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
2. Becker, N. (1999). Implementing technology in higher education: The leadership role and perspectives of the chief information officer. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60* (07), 2395A. (UMI No. 9939460)
3. Bensimon, E. (1989). The meaning of good presidential leadership: A frame analysis. In Peterson (Eds.), ASHE Reader of Organization and Governance in Higher Education (pp. 421-431). Lexington, MA: Ginn.
4. Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1990). Leadership Orientations (Self). Brookline, MA: Leadership Frameworks.
5. Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership.* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
6. Borden, M. (2000).Leadership orientations of area campus administrators in Florida's state university and community college systems: A frame analysis. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *61*, 3913.
7. Boyd, D. (2002). *State spending for higher education in the coming decade*. Boulder, CO.National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
8. Carnegie Foundation (2001). *Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education, 2000 edition*. Menlo Park, CA.
9. Chaffee, E., Whetton, D., & Cameron, K.(1983).*Case studies in college strategy.* Boulder,CO. National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
10. Clark, B. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
11. Cote, A. (1999). Leadership orientation frames of Florida elementary principals in relationship to school context and principal characteristics. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *60* (12), 4257A. (UMI No. 9956561)
12. Cowley, W., & Williams, D. (1980). *Presidents, professors and trustees: The evolution of American academic governance.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
13. DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art.* New York: Dell.
14. Echols Tobe, D. (1999). The development of cognitive leadership frames among African American female college presidents. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *60* (07), 2300A. (UMI No. 9939485)
15. Fisher, J., Tack, M., & Wheeler, K. (1988). *The effective college president.* New York: American Council on Education & Macmillan.

16. Flak, T. (1998). An inquiry into the leadership orientations of selected women school superintendents. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60* (02), 293A. (UMI No. 9920823)
17. Green, J. & Levine, A. (1985). *Opportunity in adversity: How colleges can succeed in hard times.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
18. Hackman, M., & Johnson, C. (2000). *Leadership: A communication perspective.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
19. Harlow, J. (1994). Educational leadership: A frame analysis. (Doctoral dissertation, Seattle University, 1994).*Dissertation Abstracts International*, *55*, 2227.
20. Kauffman, J. (1980). *At the pleasure of the board.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
21. Kerr, C. (1984). *Presidents make a difference: Strengthening leadership in colleges and universities*. A report of the commission on strengthening presidential leadership. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of University and Colleges.
22. Levine, A., & Cureton, J. (1998). *When hope and fear collide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
23. Messer, J. (2002). Elementary principal leadership orientations and selected professional and school variables. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63* (02), 450A. (UMI No. 3042963)
24. Pearson, G., & Young, A. (Eds.). (2002). *Technically speaking: Why all Americans need to know more about technology*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
25. Rivers, P.(1996). A frame analysis of principals' leadership orientations. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57* (07), 2785A. (UMI No. 9637016)
26. Shah, A. & Monahan, M., &. (2006). Do as I say, not as I do: American colleges preach to corporate america about diversity. *The Coastal Business Journal,* Spring
27. Small, T. (2002). A study of the relationship between the perceived leadership style of nursing chairpersons and the organizational effectiveness of baccalaureate nursing programs. (Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 2002).*Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63, 2077A.
28. Suzuki, Y. (1994). A comparative study of the leadership orientation frames of California Asian and other public school principals. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 55* (07), 1780A. (UMI No. 9426165)
29. Turley, C. (2002). Radiation therapy program directors: A frames analysis of leadership in higher education. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63* (03), 1246B. (UMI No.3045492)
30. Wolf, R.(1998). Campus safety directors: A leadership frame analysis. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59* (11), 4082A. (UMI No. 9910810)