DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 402 825 HE 029 742

AUTHOR Kezar, Adrianna
TITLE Toward Pluralistic Leadership Cultures: Beyond Policy Making, Being Transformed by Stories. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 96
NOTE 53p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (21st, Memphis, TN, October 31 - November 3, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility; Case Studies; Community Colleges; Cultural Pluralism; Higher Education; *Instructional Leadership; Intergroup Relations; *Leadership; Leadership Responsibility; *Leadership Styles; Organizational Climate; Social Change; Social Values
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; Organizational Culture

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to explore avenues for achieving pluralistic leadership cultures and present three principles: (1) awareness of identity, positionality, and power conditions; (2) acknowledgment of multiple descriptions of campus leadership and personal philosophies of leadership; and (3) negotiation among multiple descriptions of campus leadership and personal philosophies of leadership. A review of the literature shows that previous monocultural and male-dominated definitions of leadership fail to allow full participation by members of all groups. Through multiple definitions of campus leadership, more organizational participants can become involved and this in part leads to better resolution of conflict. Further, pluralistic leadership should lead to more diverse groups of people being identified, hired, and advanced to leadership positions. Pluralistic leadership cultures will lead to the expansion of curriculum within leadership training to include a broader range of traits, behaviors, power/influence processes, and cognitive processes. Finally, being aware of the multiple ways that leadership is defined can facilitate sounder organizational communication as organizational participants realize the necessity of explaining their assumptions about leadership. Two case studies or in-depth narrative portraits are also presented. These cases are taken from a community college transitioning from a traditional hierarchical model to a servant leadership model. (Contains 96 references.) (JLS)

Toward Pluralistic Leadership Cultures:
Beyond policy making, being transformed by stories

by

Adrianna Kezar

for the ASHE Conference in Memphis,

November 1996

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held in Memphis, Tennessee, October 31 - November 3, 1996. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Toward Pluralistic Leadership Cultures:
Beyond policy making, being transformed by stories

INTRODUCTION

Research on both women's leadership and subcultures within higher education institutions illustrates that our current notions of leadership are simplistic, exclusive, and monistic since they do not reflect how some leaders with different social experiences (based on gender, race/ethnicity) or people with different roles within the institution represent and understand leadership (Astin & Leland, 1991; Bensimon, 1989; Bensimon & Neumann, 1993, Martin, 1992; Rosener, 1990; Shakeshaft, 1987). This situation is becoming more urgent and complicated as increased numbers of women and people of color assume leadership positions and the context for leadership becomes increasingly diverse, i.e., changing student enrollments, staff and faculty employment (Touchton, Shavlick, & Davis, 1993). Simultaneously, many higher education institutions are moving away from traditional models of leadership toward participatory models, which rely on interdependence and collective efforts (Astin, 1994; Bensimon & Neumann, 1993). These models necessitate that campus participants feel included in the leadership process and emphasize communication throughout the organization as critical for organizational success (Rosener, 1990; Tierney, 1988; Weick, 1995)

In addition to the growing awareness that traditional models are limited in reflecting the multiple ways that people understand leadership, researchers identified three problems associated with exclusive models that suggest the need to reformulate our notions of leadership. First of all, exclusive images of leadership serve as a barrier to women and people of color (and others who don't fit into these monastically defined models) assuming leadership positions and inhibit their full participation in higher education leadership (Kitch, 1980; Millman & Kanter, 1986; Morrison, 1991). Second, exclusive, hierarchical images of leadership produce simplistic representations, e.g., one individual as a leader within an institution, that prevent organizational participants from being able to meet the challenges ascribed to leadership, such

as curriculum reform, internationalization of the campus, and meeting community needs (Cronin, 1993; Lee, 1993). Third, if there is not an awareness that people might construct leadership differently, then there is a strong possibility of miscommunication and conflict (Cox, 1993). Research focused on cultural diversity in organizations illustrates that stifling, or not acknowledging difference leads to inefficiency and inability to meet organizational goals. In contrast, knowledge of cultural differences enhances work relationships, effectiveness, and the ability to reach organizational goals (Cox, 1993). It is these problems that compelled me to begin a research agenda focused on moving beyond traditional notions of leadership and that lead to the proposal of pluralistic leadership cultures as an avenue for encompassing the diverse ways that leadership is understood by different groups of people. The defining characteristic of pluralistic leadership cultures is that they assume multiple constructions of leadership rather than singularly defined models.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to explore avenues for achieving pluralistic leadership cultures. In a paper presented at AERA in April of 1996, I proposed several institutional policy measures (not presented in this paper) and three principles that might help to achieve pluralistic leadership cultures: (1) awareness of identity, positionality, and power conditions; (2) acknowledgment of multiple descriptions of campus leadership and personal philosophies of leadership; and, (3) negotiation among multiple descriptions of campus leadership and personal philosophies of leadership. The policy recommendations could be utilized immediately, however, my initial paper did not address how these three principles might be realized. This paper continues this dialogue begun at AERA by proposing a strategy for putting these three principles into practice.[1]

[1]I plan to conduct a study where the narrative strategy is used as a catalyst for personal transformation and examine the success of this technique. At this point, I am presenting a theoretical piece on the possibilities of this strategy and presenting my attempts at systematically developing narratives for use in this future study.

These principles require, in large part, personal transformation among individuals within institutions. Although it is difficult to make recommendations related to issues that require personal change, these are often the most important transformations necessary to implement initiatives. Toward the effort of trying to develop a method for assisting individuals toward personal transformation related to their beliefs about leadership, I have developed case studies that can be used to facilitate personal transformation. In this paper, I will present two in-depth narrative portraits examining how they can be used in training sessions or read by individuals as part of self-improvement efforts. Narratives have a long history of helping people transform their minds and practice (Rosenwald, 1992).

The paper will be organized as follows: First, I present the literature that supports the need to reconceptualize leadership and suggests why pluralistic leadership cultures are a promising avenue. Second, I present the theoretical framework that supports the use of narratives for eliciting the personal transformation required to achieve pluralistic leadership cultures. Third, I present two case studies as an example of the types of stories that could be used toward personal transformation. Fourth, I will present the implications of this paper including the ability of in-depth case studies to elicit stories that can help to address complicated issues that higher education institutions face and the transformative impact of having people reflect on their experience and being touched by others words. Lastly, in the appendix, I have provided an overview the assumptions, interpretive framework, and research design that guided the study used to develop the cases presented.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The assumption that traditional leadership models are inclusive and represent different leaders' understanding of leadership has been challenged due to mounting evidence that leadership models do not reflect the leadership of some women (Calas & Smirich, 1992; Cantor & Bernay, 1993; Ferguson, 1984; Helgesen, 1990; Rosener, 1990; Statham, 1987).[2] For example, women's leadership is associated with a more participatory, relational, and interpersonal style as well as different types of power and influence strategies that emphasize reciprocity and collectivity. Moreover, women leaders tends to conceptualize leadership as collective rather than individualistic; emphasizes responsibility toward others and empowering others to act within the organization; and de-emphasize hierarchical relationships (Astin & Leland, 1991; Blackmore, 1989; Cantor & Bernay, 1993; Ferguson, 1984; Helgesen, 1990; Rosener, 1990; Statham, 1987).[3] Traditional models or representations of leadership in higher education tend to be exclusive and represent an orientation to leadership derived from those traditionally in positions of power, i. e., a mostly white, male, upper-middle class, heterosexual orientation to leadership (Amey & Twombley, 1992; Bensimon, 1989; Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; Calas & Smirich, 1992; Cross & Ravekes, 1990; Lyons, 1992).

Moreover, the assumption that positional leaders' interpretation of leadership is inclusive of how different organizational participants understand leadership has been challenged (Martin, 1992; Tierney, 1988c; 1989a). Evidence to support different organizational realities has been derived from research that has examined different perspectives within organizations (Martin, 1992). There is evidence that traditional "hierarchical" models of leadership have excluded the understandings of people who do not hold formal leadership positions (Birnbaum, 1993). In higher education, this would include people such as faculty, students, or alumni. Past leadership research in higher education has mostly focused on

[2]Note that gender is exclusively mentioned because these studies focused only on how gender was related to leadership. However, I do not believe that differences are based on gender but on positionality or difference in experience (Alcoff, 1988).

[3]Women's leadership is conceived in the plural and is meant to include women of different race, ethnicities, sexual orientations, etc. No one experience for women is implied or hypothesized.

positional leaders, specifically college presidents (but sometimes deans or department chairs), and assumed that leadership can be best understood from their stories and descriptions (Bensimon, Neumann & Birnbaum, 1989; Cohen & March, 1986; Fisher, 1984; Kerr & Gade, 1986). Although perspectives have been illustrated to differ depending on one's role within an organization, leadership researchers have been exclusive in selecting subjects in order to develop representations of leadership. (Bensimon, 1990; Birnbaum, 1992; Chemers, 1984; Chemers & Ayman, 1993; Martin, 1992; Peterson & White, 1992). In a few studies, leadership has been explored through the perspective of a variety of participants in the institution (faculty, trustees, or alumni); however, the focus has remained mostly on positional leaders as an embodiment of leadership (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989).[4]

Building on the literature that suggests different groups interpret and understand leadership differently, a recent study identified multiple philosophies of leadership and descriptions of campus leadership (Kezar, 1996). These multiple constructions of leadership were related to positionality (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, role within the institution -- as a faculty or administrator, field of study, administrative level, and paradigm) and result from different experiences and power conditions in individuals' lives (Kezar, 1996).[5] The relationship of positionality and multiple constructions of leadership complicates the notion of models, representations, or images of leadership. Since positionality implies fundamental differences in perspective (as long as people have different experiences and are impacted by power conditions differentially), the relationship between positionality and constructions of leadership necessitates a change in the way we have defined or understood leadership (Kezar, 1996).

One way to address the lack of inclusiveness of current models is the development of alternative models of leadership. For example, feminist, androgynous, interactive and

[4]Faculty, trustees, and alumni were, for the most part, asked to describe the leadership of the president (Bensimon, 1991; Birnbaum, 1992).

[5]Positionality refers to a strand of standpoint theory that encompasses the following concepts: (1) an emphasis on perspective or position specifically focusing on how power or social hierarchies/relationships shape these perspectives; (2) the use of particular standpoints for illustrating how the "dominant" perspective is not inclusive; and, (3) the emphasis on multiple, fluid standpoints within positionality which resists essentializing notions of women, people of color, or of any subject (Alcoff, 1988; Haraway, 1993).

collaborative models of leadership have been developed from the studies of women leaders (Astin and Leland, 1991; Kanter, 1983; Rosener, 1990). However, alternative models of leadership (e.g., a feminist model) suffer from several problems. They can serve to categorize and stereotype people as well as exaggerate differences among people. Moreover, alternative models can lead one particular or positioned perspective of leadership to be viewed as universal. Finally, they can lead to the alternative model becoming another dominant model. For example, within the general leadership research, "women's ways of leading" is becoming the dominant approach to leading.

A second approach to reconceptualizing leadership is to move toward participatory models, hoping that an inclusive model will encompass the diversity of leadership beliefs. Many campus' are currently struggling to develop these more inclusive leadership environment by adopting more participatory models such as Total Quality Management or Leading on the Edge of Chaos derived from Chaos theories. But these participatory models can result in a monistic leadership system, defining a certain set of collaborative and interactive principles for the leadership process that define many individuals out of leadership (Kezar, 1996). The primary problem among both alternative and participatory models is a continued assumption of a mostly singular construction of leadership and a continued denial of perspective (Kezar, 1996).

I have explored several directions for re-conceptualizing leadership including dismantling the notion of leadership entirely, realizing that this concept was developed to privilege certain individuals and disempower others or maintaining contingent leadership scripts that are constantly re-evaluated. I think leadership is so strongly embedded into our cultural beliefs that redefining this notion might prove more productive than discarding it. The belief in the existence of this concept could be used to introduce new ideas, rather than seeing this concept as a barrier to social change and the construction of new concepts. Developing more inclusive and complex images, as suggested by contingent models, may not be enough to avoid the problem of monism that seems inherent in the notion of models as exemplified in the

dilemma of alternative models. Instead of alternative, participatory, or contingent models, I have proposed the creation of pluralistic leadership cultures for modifying leadership practice (Kezar, 1996).[6] In referring to pluralistic leadership cultures, I am invoking a post-modern interpretation of pluralism that scholars such as McLennan (1995) have begun to use to refer to a wide-range of cultural values based on a plethora of differences and endorsement of different ways of knowing.[7] The goal of developing pluralistic leadership cultures would be to work toward eliminating exclusive, simplistic, and partial representations of leadership that result in fit or alignment concerns, group think, and organizational miscommunication, as described in the introduction. Three principles can be used to achieve and epitomize pluralistic leadership cultures: (1) awareness of identity, positionality, and power conditions; (2) acknowledgment of multiple descriptions of campus leadership and personal philosophies of leadership; and, (3) negotiation among multiple descriptions of campus leadership and personal philosophies of leadership (perhaps transcending partial perspectives).[8] I will describe each of these qualities in greater detail to illustrate how they contribute to the development of a pluralistic environment.

First, being self-aware of bias due to group affiliation, e.g., Liberal Studies faculty or administrator, is critical for the development of pluralistic leadership cultures. Lack of self-awareness prevents people from being aware that they hold a "particular" perspective or that others may have a different perspective. Also not having an awareness of the relationship of power to the way people construct meaning impacts individuals ability to understand why others might hold another perspective. For example, in a case study by Kezar (1996), those in positions of authority believed that the problems in initiating a new campus culture were the

---

[6]I developed the term pluralistic leadership cultures. This concept emerged from my reading of political scientists, such as McLennan (1995), who explores ways to encompass diverse ideas within a democratic political system.

[7]However, I should note that traditionally "plural" organizations are described by scholars working in the area of multiculturalism in organizations as an assimilation model; people within organizations ignore or tolerate diversity, institutional cultural bias is prevalent and intergroup conflict is significant (Cox, 1993). I chose not to refer to these new leadership cultures as multicultural because that term has become synonymous, in many ways, with race/ethnicity. I was afraid the multicultural framework would not be broad enough to encompass the kinds of positionalities I explored. I have re-invoked the term pluralistic since it refers to a multitude of differences.

[8]See Kezar 1996, for a detailed description of institutional practices that can be adopted to achieve pluralistic leadership cultures. In this paper, I focus on the three principles that characterize these cultures.

result of habits from the old culture. They did not conceptualize power conditions existing on the campus, for the most part, and they certainly did not see different perspectives related to conditions of power. This lack of awareness related to power conditions and relationships exacerbated misunderstandings and miscommunication. Awareness of power might have resulted in certain groups and individuals being able to understand each other's perspectives.

Moreover, awareness that each individual holds a particular and positioned construction of campus leadership and personal definition will most likely lead to an acknowledgment and exploration of multiple constructions of leadership. If multiple descriptions of campus leadership and personal definitions are acknowledged and legitimized, organizational participants can begin to compare, negotiate, and perhaps even appreciate the different perspectives and models. Multiple perspectives need to be examined from the position within which they were developed. Different group and individual perspectives of leadership are "justified" or "make sense" when they are related to the conditions of the groups'/individuals' lives within the institution. One approach for resolving organizational miscommunication is to develop an awareness of how different perspectives are formed and to be willing to try to empathize with or take on this perspective (Cox, 1993). Different personal definitions and descriptions of campus leadership could be used toward resolving issues on campus, rather than conceptualizing multiple perspectives as problematic.

Finally, we can begin to transcend partial perspectives by negotiating these perspectives. The transformation to a pluralistic leadership culture does not necessarily mean valuing all leadership models or perspectives equally. In practice, we have to distinguish between what should or will be valued. One way to distinguish between sets of values on campus is to exclude values associated with oppression, that negatively impact others. In my research, I have tried to illustrate how using a critical lens is one technique for facilitating some of the judgments that need to be made in practice (Kezar, 1996). Further, this lens can facilitate making these judgments while still remaining open to multiple constructions of leadership. I have proposed a critical lens that involves being self-aware, reflective, empathetic, and open to

multiple perspectives (Kezar, 1996). This technique has been found to be successful by feminist teachers in negotiating students' diverse knowledge (Maher & Tetrault, 1994). Instead of valuing one type of knowledge more than another, different forms of knowledge are presented and then compared leading to growth among all participants. Knowledge is constructed from these multiple perspectives.

The benefits of reconceptualizing leadership this way are many and impact individuals, institutions, and communities. For example, pluralistic leadership cultures should contribute to a more diverse group of people being identified, hired, and advanced into leadership positions (Bass, 1990; Chemers, 1984; Chemers & Ayman, 1993; Millman & Kanter, 1986). Also people who are a part of the leadership process but were not identified previously, e.g., people with different approaches to leadership, might be recognized and valued. Furthermore, the creation of pluralistic leadership cultures is a move toward eliminating organizational fit problems that result from exclusive images of leadership. Colleges and universities that are committed to creating a diverse or multicultural environment can use these principles to develop a more inclusive leadership environment. The development of pluralistic leadership cultures will lead to the expansion of the curriculum within leadership training programs to include a broader range of traits, behaviors, power/influence processes, cognitive processes, and situational or contextual issues that are more appropriate for a diverse group of leaders. This will hopefully curb suggestions that people model characteristics that are incompatible with their identities in order to be leaders. Decision-makers can become aware of a wealth of untapped or underutilized leadership throughout their institutions, which can be used to address complex problems that the institution faces (Lee, 1993). Finally, being aware of the multiple ways that leadership is defined can facilitate sounder organizational communication; organizational participants will realize the necessity of explaining their assumptions about leadership.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Narrative analysis as a form of inquiry has gained in popularity over the past twenty years especially in fields such as psychology, history, clinical studies, and social work where human understanding and meaning are paramount in addressing the research questions asked (Mischler, 1986; Riessman, 1993; Rosenwald & Ochenberg, 1992). Narrative analysis has recently begun to be used by educational researchers especially in studying teaching and the role of educational professionals (Cooper & Heck, 1995) Although there is renewed interest in narrative analysis the human sciences, it has a long tradition that stems back to the middle ages in Europe. For example, narrative -- as part of the hermeneutic tradition - was the prevalent systematic form of inquiry during this era (Rosenwald & Ochenberg, 1992). Narrative has always played a key role in the Christian religion since the bible is composed of parables or stories (Dallymer & McCarthy, 1977). Monastic scholars spent lifetimes interpreting these stories and presenting them to people in ways that would help them undergo personal transform. This association of narrative analysis with Christianity made it an unpopular method as empirical methods became popular in the 19th Century. Empiricist were suspect of a system of knowledge developed under the authority of the Christian church. In addition, it was seen as a weak method toward the understanding of scientific truth, since it focused on intentions, human motivations, psyche, and other non-observable phenomena. Over the past thirty years, empirical methods have been critiqued for their ability to illuminate human experience (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). These critiques have allowed for new methods or old methods such as narrative to re-emerge. Narrative has re-emerged because of its ability to illustrate and illuminate the complexity, ambiguities, and contradictions of human existence that is often not captured in other methods (Cooper & Heck, 1995).

Narrative analysis has been defined in many different ways and there is no one method. In this paper, I use Riessman's definition that "storytelling is what we do with our research materials and what informants do with us. The story metaphor emphasizes that we create order, construct texts in particular contexts. Narrative analysis takes as its object of

investigation the story itself" as a way to understand ideas, beliefs, and other complex processes that might not be best understood through statistics (1993, p. 1).[9] Interpretation is conceived of as inevitable; the speaker and context are paramount for understanding. The distinction between narrative and ethnographic or other textual accounts is that narrative emphasizes an interpretive thrust rather than the realist orientation of many ethnographic accounts or narrative methods such as semiotics or conversational or discourse analysis (Rabinow & Sullivan, Riessman, 1993).[10]

The role of narrative in modern disciplines as been described as twofold: 1) a method chosen to reconstruct an experience; 2) an independent variable active in shaping experience (Hart, 1992). In this paper, I endeavor to use narrative to shape experience by having people reflect on stories in a critical and reflexive way.[11] I hope to illustrate the valuable role of narratives in addressing higher education problems such as the development of pluralistic leadership cultures. I developed this idea as a result of the interviews I conducted. At the end of the interviews, several individuals mentioned how reflecting on their own experience in a structured and systematic way helped them develop new understandings and to grow. One of the problems this analysis attempts to overcome is a mismatch between method and research question. Methods, forms of inquiry, or strategies to address problems need to match the questions asked or the problems posed. Understanding how an individual comes to terms with his/her sense of identity, positionality, and power related to leadership, move toward acknowledging multiple forms of leadership, and negotiating his/her understanding with others, are difficult issues to address through conventional scientific methods (e.g., statistical or survey) and typical strategies applied to educational problems (e.g. policy making, allocation of resources, decisionmaking). I am arguing that these type of complex, human problems might be better addressed by different methods, e.g., narrative analysis, and strategies, e.g., training

[9]Please see Mischler, 1986, Riessman, 1993, or Rosenwald, 1992 for detailed descriptions of narrative analysis as a form of inquiry.

[10]A realist orientation includes the belief in a single reality or truth that can be identified through scientific methods of verification.

[11] In my case study, narrative was also used as a method to develop an understanding of the many meanings of leadership within a particular campus community.

sessions with narrative case studies. I am not arguing this is the only method for addressing these types of issues, but is a valuable avenue to consider.

There are three reasons that narratives are particularly well suited to help create pluralistic leadership cultures. First, stories are particularly powerful for coming to an understanding about the way identities are fashioned since they examine formative influences and experiences (Rosenwald & Ochenberg, 1992). Second, using narrative allows for the complexity, ambiguities, and contradictions of human existence to be revealed that I argue is necessary for personal transformation. Thirdly, since most individuals do not live in isolation but are part of a social world, narratives tend to speak to a variety of people (Rosenwald & Ochenberg, 1992). Personal and social growth, as I noted earlier, has been one of the primary goals and outcomes of storytelling (Cooper & Heck, 1995)

Empiricist deemed narratives suspect because they believed these stories were used by the Catholic church to manipulate and persuade people to adhere to the churches authority (Hart, 1992, p. 637). But the power of stories can be used to introduce people to resistance narratives, which allow people to become familiar with ways of living or thinking that are not their own (Hart, 1992, p. 649).[12] Using a multi-narrative technology as used in my case study allowed for these resistance narratives to emerge rather than a totalizing narrative used to legitimize an ultimate authority (Hart, 1992, p. 662). Instead, they are used to develop awareness of the many different scripts, texts, or narratives that people hold as well as helping them to transcend the boundaries of their own script.

CASE STUDIES

In this section, I will present the dialogues between myself and individuals struggling to explain their understanding of leadership as a philosophy and their experience of this phenomena on their campus. These conversations illuminate the type of dialogue and self-reflection necessary to transform notions about leadership. This section is organized in the

[12]Resistance narratives move behind one grand narrative to multiple, competing narratives, often resulting in the rejection of the dominant or grand narrative.

following way: I will provide a brief overview of the campus to place individuals comments in context. Next, the cases are presented; they contain three parts: 1) a dialogue between myself and another individual who describes their understanding of leadership -- my comments are in italic; 2) questions for reflections; and, 3) an analysis of the dialogue for further reflection. I will briefly describe what each section entails as well as the goals of these particular sections. The exercise would be accompanied by instructions that would describe how it allows participants to reflect on their own beliefs about leadership, leadership on their campus., and past experiences of leadership. Rather than being read, the dialogues could be presented as a play or dramatic reading. One interviewer might ask the same question to three different people who read the dialogues, more vividly presenting the different notions about leadership.

The goal of the dialogues is to make difficult concepts concrete and to facilitate an ideological voyage. The dialogues entail individuals' explanations and interpretations of their experience; I provide another level of interpretation as I ask questions and comment. When used in a training setting, the cases might be as long as 10-15 pages in order for the individuals reviewing them to feel connected to those they are reading about. The dialogues presented are abbreviated, but are illustrative of the strategy I am suggesting. Second, the set of questions helps the reader ponder and analyze their own experiences. Again only a sample of possible questions is presented. Examples from the cases are used to elaborate on and clarify the questions. Moreover, these examples provide concrete examples for reflection. The last step is to read a "sample" analysis and to think back over your responses and to try to critique and analyze your own perceptions.[13]

[13]I had some reservations about using the analysis in the exercise since it might be too directive and not allow people the chance to conduct their own interpretation. I placed the questions before the analysis in an attempt to avoid this problem. During the interviews I conducted, people noted that their beliefs changed more when there was some interpretation offered in order to make sense or explain their experience. Although the analysis could stifle some people from developing their own interpretation of the stories, I think the benefit -- of providing people a framework for interpreting the stories -- outweigh the potential pitfalls.

Developing the Context: Equivocal Community College

Ginger and Scott are both employed at ECC, a community college in the Midwest with approximately 20,000 students. For twenty years, ECC had a President with an authoritative, hierarchical style. Under this president, the campus culture was based on entrepreneurialism, individualism, and competition. It had a highly decentralized structure but strict chain and command management. Eight years ago a minority president came to the campus charged by the board to encourage participatory governance and diversity initiatives, to re-assess the mission, and examine finances. Racial tensions were high at the time the former president left since a board member -- who was a close colleague of the President -- made a derogatory racial comment that was not repudiated by the President. The new president initiated several changes such as a new organizational structure, culture, leadership model (called servant leadership), and mission. A values statement was adopted that focused on diversity, respect, collaboration, honesty, risk-taking, and openness to mistakes, and equality. The new leadership model is aligned with these new values; the new president described servant leadership as a philosophy where " people feel comfortable, an open environment, everyone has voice and works collaboratively and collectively using skills such as truthtelling, dialoging, and mapping processes -- essentially an inclusive type of leadership."

The changes within the organizational structure included: (1) the introduction of a team-oriented management approach was adopted; (2) academic divisions developed faculty chairs rather than administrative chairs [an effort to blur faculty and administrative roles]; (3) many faculty and administrators were assigned to more than one division [an effort to break down divisional barriers]; (4) decision-making was pushed down to the lowest levels and the middle management was reduced by over 30% [the organization is flat rather than hierarchical]; and, (5) many of the full-time faculty roles were re-defined [they are called lead faculty and have administrative responsibilities]. For the majority of the colleges existence the careers/vocational division received a greater share of the resources and prestige. With the new President resources seem to have leveled off between the two divisions. Opinions vary about

the success of the new culture, structure, and mission; some believe it works well, others believe the campus is still in transition, while others believe the campus is an open, bleeding artery – in trouble. Some who are concerned with the campus leadership believe that it has been defined in a singular way. One woman noted that "people don't fit if they don't conform to their narrow definition of how things should be done on this campus. There is this woman who gets all the work done, knows all the answers, is smarter than most people you can imagine, she can problem solve, she knows everything and works harder than anyone you could ever hope to meet. However, she is not personable; she is abrasive so she is going nowhere."

Ginger is a new administrator on the campus. She was compelled to work on the campus because she finds the vision and philosophy of the president were aligned with her own. She is mid to late in her career and has thought about leadership fairly extensively. Scott is a long-standing faculty member on the campus. He has only recently begun to think about leadership. In fact, until a few years ago he never thought about leadership at all. However, both their views are equally helpful in understanding leadership.

Ginger - Administrator of color

You are new to this campus, why don't you tell us about your experience with the servant leadership model. I guess this is not a new model for you. That is the philosophy that brought me to this campus. I am coming from a counseling background and from a campus where it was the president's natural leadership style to work with teams. For the five years, I worked at (Sterling Community College with President Diana Duncan); I got to watch somebody do it right. This is the style I am used to, not only from my professional values and from my last job, but I have had this style for as long as I can remember. *It is your professional identity as a counselor and the past president you worked with that influenced your beliefs about leadership. Why do you think you have always been inclined toward team, collaborative, shared leadership, even prior to those experiences?* This is who I am naturally, I am a very participatory leader. First, I grew up in a small, poor town, I would say by 10-11 years, I already had leadership roles in the church and community

organizations; I was lucky to have excellent role models. These role models always talked about a collective, community-based, vision oriented leadership. So, I was most influenced by these experiences with my church. Second, I mean I have always been empowered and not everywhere I have been has had a team approach, but my parents raised me to have such a good self concept that I can always speak up, that influences who I am as a leader. *You can identify several different influences on the way you think about leadership, role models within the community you grew up in and the church you attended emphasized a collective and collaborative leadership style and your family empowered you to believe that you could be a part of leadership.*

Have you ever had to work places where this wasn't the style? Yes, and I have left jobs. I have been places where there was a hierarchical, male style. I was trying to work within this other philosophy; at some point I said this isn't worth it, because I am so true to who I am, I don't like to walk around being incongruent. So I have always been lucky, when it wasn't working – I was in an incongruent environment – I could leave. *Fit concerns are especially important among women administrators in a field that tends to be defined in "male" terms. Your experiences reflect the agency to leave environments where you have not felt congruent.*

Tell me your perceptions about leadership on this campus? Well, we are utilizing a team approach, open communication, open environment where decisions are made at the lowest level. That is it in a nutshell. I can tell you about it in my division. I provide a lot of opportunities for open communication. I have open office hours every week. I spend a lot of time in every staff meeting, in all areas, (providing opportunities for people to talk about issues). Every semester I either do a walk through or ask them to tell me, show me how this feels to students (to come through their service area). So I spend a lot of time sharing with people what I see. I have started a newsletter, they seem to really like it. So I think you need to have all kinds of writing, talking, and opportunities for people to question. One of the things you might want to see is my belief statements, I write this down for people. I passed this out to when I got here and said

this is who I am, hold me accountable to this. I am human and I will make mistakes, but when you see me screwing up, hold me accountable.

That is the leadership you fostered, but what did you encounter when you came here? When I first came here they told me they were fearful to tell me what they really thought because in the other administration you didn't tell a dean, things. So we spent a lot of time getting them to feel comfortable to speak up. So the lack of empowerment has to do with who they are, inferiority complexes they have, and the things that they carry from the old system. In addition, I am trying to let them know I don't like "yes" men. I try not to stifle ideas as they are coming up. I try to create and maintain an open environment while at the same time being able to hold my own opinions. One person came in to my office hours and felt comfortable to say, I am offended when you say, all the time, in (Kansas) this is the way we did X, Y, Z. This ain't (Kansas) we ain't there and you need to know that offends me. I said, I didn't realize I was offending you, I was just speaking from my experience. I wrote her a thank you note, saying thank you for feeling good enough about our communication that you could say that to me and hold me accountable. I am going to try to not to do that anymore.

Can you tell me more about yourself as a leader. Much. I have thought about this a lot. There is this book the "art of leadership" that mirrors my philosophy. I think leadership is different from management, it is a person who can motivate the masses to move toward accomplishment of a common goal -- a vision. It is a person that has the ability to see the vision, to motivate, to influence, and to convince. Leadership in its best form is about motivating people and helping them move toward a common goal. I also think I am really a situational leader, I think because I have a counseling background it makes it easier for me to adjust to different people and situations. I think that I can modify myself while still staying true to my style. One thing I did when I came here was have brown bags, just meet with people, introduce myself, tell them who I am and I asked them what they wanted me to do for them. I haven't done a section with

faculty yet because I need to think about what we are going to talk about, and this gets at situational leadership Faculty don't want to go somewhere with me and ask them what they need, they want me to come up with a topic that is intellectually stimulating and say lets talk about achievement in the classroom. My counseling background is very helpful for me as a leader, being able to read different backgrounds. *I can see how your counseling background is related to the way you think about leadership.*

I have a related question, who do you think are the important leaders on this campus and why do you consider them to be important leaders? That is a tough question. Idealistically I would say everybody. But that is not true yet. I think the Provost and President, just by position if nothing else. I think (Deborah) is very effective at what she does, she is very powerful. Also (some of the other administrators), their styles are very compatible with mine. I would say the woman over at the library, strong, inspirational. (Jan,) who has a key role, (Carolyn, Diane), powerful support staff persons, another support staff, (Gina). *It doesn't have to be a person with position because you mentioned some support staff. I am not sure I understand yet. What do you mean by powerful and position?* Well the President and Provost as symbolic figures, I think they act as symbols of leadership. By powerful, I mean these people all tend to work well in this team environment and are respected – they tend to be part of the new movement. Also, they have the skills to work in this new team environment; the top thing in this team environment is the communication skills. I think they all tend to have the same vision. They are also people, people. *Hum, this is shaping up a little different from how I thought. In this team environment people who emerge as leaders are those who adopt the new leadership philosophy and fit in with a new set of associated people and communication skills.*

Some people have described the new campus environment as oppressive which is quite different from your description, what do you think is going on? Others don't see the servant leadership model operating on campus or feel aspects of the model are inappropriate? I realize that this is a difficult

change, to a new leadership culture. The college operated completely opposite of that prior to the re-organization because there was a president here for many years and his style was opposite that. So you have a number of people who have been here twenty plus years and that is the only leadership style they have ever seen. Many of them, have never worked anywhere else. So that means we are in transition. People are learning new techniques of communication, we have provided training for people in all sorts of areas. Teams are set up with opportunities for people to practice those skills. We have, at the dean's level, people who understand the new approach and so we are modeling the behavior in order to get others to model that behavior. Also regional values influence what is happening on campus. People like to work on their own. This state is very inward looking. They don't know what is happening on other campuses around the country. In (Kansas) we were always looking at models around the country. They don't do that here. *The resistance to the new leadership is due to people who tend to conceptualize the campus within the old culture. This again illustrates the influence of the history of leadership. People are in transition learning the new skills. That might explain why many people don't really feel empowerment since the model is not happening in practice yet among many parts of the campus. It does not explain the monistic nature of the script that some people on campus described. You also mention that the regional values are related to people's acceptance (or in this case resistance) of the servant leadership model since this model is, in many ways, in conflict with the regional values of autonomy and individuality.*

You know with any movement, there is always going to be resistance and what you do is that you move with the people who are motivated to go and eventually the largest percentage of the people will come with you. The President has said, we are in transition to give people time to understand and adjust to who they are, to align. The next step is that some promotion will be based on having gone through the training and modeling the behavior – and those who move the masses, help them move forward will be rewarded. *You conceptualize this change as a social movement. But shouldn't people want to move in the direction they are going. Do you see a problem*

with imposing the leadership script? Why do you have to coerce people? Because at some point after people have had time to adjust -- and this is coming soon, since people have completed training and they have seen the behavior modeled -- they will have to be held accountable. People have to take responsibility to act within the new way of operating. I see it as taking responsibility.

Very few people have talked about racial or ethnic issues on this campus or related to leadership. Do you have any ideas about that since you are new to this campus? When I was at (Newhaven), people used to come over and say, Ginger, help me with this, do Black people like to be called Negro, Black, or African American. I am comfortable saying here is the deal, (older people) don't like that Black stuff, (younger people prefer Black if they are) from the Black Power Movement. So now this generation likes African Americans. I often work with Hispanic students, and I just ask them, I grew up with the term Hispanic, tell me how that feels to you? In this area they tend to say Latino. But my point is I am comfortable asking you or telling you. That is the person I am. I think it is very empowering to have an open environment; we don't have that here. People don't talk about or acknowledge race and certainly don't relate it to aspects of their experience like leadership.

Scott - White, male liberal studies faculty member

How did you perceive the past campus leadership? When I first came here I perceived things as top-down. You are in a reactionary mode, you just react to what the administrator or leadership people thought we should be doing. One of the nicest thing that has happened in my years here, is going from a really top-down approach to one where the faculty have a little bit more of a say-so in how the campus should be run. People would argue with me about that because there are still some lingering top-down things happening. But overall the faculty now has some respect from the administrators, the leadership. And they look to us much more often than they did in the past for direction. *In addition to not being aligned with the past institutional values, you*

felt that faculty were disempowered. I am confused, you used administrators and leadership interchangeably. Have you assimilated the past definition where the administration and leadership are synonymous?

From my perspective, the real leaders on campus are the faculty, even though we do not call the shots. I think a lot of the initiative comes from there. It is very difficult sometimes to get things done, so you have to sell ideas to the administration. But many of the ideas and direction come from the faculty. But I think people still think of the administration as the leadership. But once allowed, I think we are becoming the leaders. For instance, we are (changing classes all across campus); that really came from the faculty. Another one is pushing the leadership to have more faculty representation on committees so that the faculty perspective can be presented. *Leadership to you is not position or power-based, it is those who shape the campus. You see that faculty have played a leadership role within both the current and the past leadership cultures, but that it is often not acknowledged. I thought that would have changed in this new leadership culture, it sounds as if this has only changed minimally.*

Can you describe your experiences in the new leadership culture? There are some aspects of the new leadership stuff that doesn't work. Faculty have taken on a lot more administrative responsibilities, as a part of this flattening. For example, some people have been chosen to be lead faculty; this position involves a lot of administrative work. I don't really see what we are doing as leadership, but that is what it is called. We don't have that much more influence in the organization or ability to shape the campus, just more responsibility. In many instances, we just get told to do things like these student outcomes assessment.

Before, we could just focus in on teaching and our classes. And now, we do student complaints, scheduling, curriculum development, tons of stuff that is loaded on. You can barely keep your head above water when you go into the classroom because of all the other

administrative stuff that you have to deal with. And if that is what flattening means, it has made it very difficult for faculty, their role is really problematic, it is not efficient. We are so fragmented. We did not get to choose how these positions were defined; they were defined for us. In some way, I would prefer absolute job descriptions because our job keeps changing, growing, more and more administrative work. *Administrative work is being delegated to the faculty; you feel fragmented with too many different and conflicting responsibilities. The new role for faculty was imposed, you had no ability to influence how your job was being constructed. You don't think you have more ability to shape the campus just more responsibility. This passage also seemed to reflect your positioning as a faculty member, the administrators have defined your role and the faculty did not have the ability to voice their concerns about the way their role was being redefined.*

You seem very oriented toward your teaching; faculty who possess a similar perspective of campus leadership to you also have strong identification with their role as a faculty member. These administrative tasks have severed you from what you define as your central role? Yes, I never wanted to do this leadership role, I never asked to do these things. I still think of myself as a teacher, that's what I do, that is who I am, that is my real contribution to the college. I love teaching, I love my students. That leadership stuff has just fallen into my lap and it has become very heavy. If I could reorganize again, I would make sure the jobs of administrators were clearly defined. This is what you have to do and allow the teachers to be leaders in the classroom, let us do that part and we will look to the administration for support. Because that is what this institution is about, education. And we are pulling people away from that. *The way leadership is defined as administrative work has put a new burden on you that you do not see as appropriate. You would like to be a leader in the classroom with students.*

Why do you think this has happened? Well, part of it, I know, is that they kept talking about saving money. But also, I think the faculty don't speak a common language with the administrators; I think this leads to inappropriate decisions being made because of

misunderstandings. I always felt that the best leaders and administrators never stop being teachers. This is an educational institution; you have to have this perspective, otherwise there is this big gap between the leadership, I mean administration, and the faculty. And they have their ideas that becomes very different from the faculty, and then there is a lot of tension there. *Your language indicates that you have assimilated the definition of administrators as leaders from the past leadership culture. Although you are trying to resist this definition of leadership, this remains an influence from the past on the way you presently construct leadership. You feel as a faculty member you have a different perspective and language than administrators.*

What are some of the aspects of the new leadership culture that you do like? I understand your reservations about the way it was defined top-down as mostly administrative work. I like working in this more collaborative manner. Everybody respects everybody's opinion. Things are conducted with great courtesy, civility. It is a much more team approach, with shared responsibilities. We take turns on doing the agenda, taking notes, and working on various problems of defining goals or budget. But I think that some feel this is all a waste of time. The time, dialogue, discussions, meetings. *Similar to other Liberal Studies faculty you tend to like the new leadership style's emphasis on collaboration, team-work, collegialness. This is quite different than the way the campus used to operate in the individualistic, entrepreneurial, competitive approach. Who do you think feels this is a waste of time?*

Mostly, faculty who are part of the old culture. Also, they don't believe in the new system, they think we are spinning our wheels and that all the decisions are being made at the top. At times, I even fall in this category. For example, we have submitted people to be hired to the Provost, and she has not liked who has been in the selection, and they have been sent back. So they are making decisions autonomously against the committees that they set up. That creates tremendous friction. Also, many of Careers faculty are having a difficult time, I don't know why. *Perhaps your positioning as a faculty member makes you suspicious, at times, of the motives of*

the administration. You are different from Liberal Studies faculty who don't identify strongly with their role as faculty; those faculty tend to have no reservations about the servant leadership model or the leadership practices on campus. Careers faculty in areas such as criminal justice, allied health, fire prevention, and law seem to struggle with the new model since it differs from the values of their areas, e.g., authority and expertise.

The official campus newsletter noted that people in Careers think that the President favors a transfer mission over a Careers or terminal orientation. Perhaps they are having difficulty because the values, structure, and mission that they were successful within has changed? I think the President has been even handed, but they might perceive it like that. But I do think that the Liberal Studies division is the leader division on this campus in the new leadership system. I think it is the nature of our disciplines. This comes naturally to us, when it comes to comparing course portfolios, we are cooperative and collaborative. *The servant leadership model comes to you more naturally because of your disciplinary background. Your disciplinary values tend to be aligned with the institutional values.*

However, there are some things that are difficult for me to adjust to in the new model. For instance, I am not big on meetings, I prefer to be given a task alone and just let me do it, complete it. But that is not the way things are going any more, so I had to make an adjustment in myself. That is my own personal style. I know you are also interested in personal style. I have great difficulty, delegating tasks, although I don't like working top-down with people. *In some ways you feel like the new model fits the way you think about leadership, but not in other ways. You noted how the approach fits with your disciplinary background, perhaps your positioning as a white male is related to your sense of individuality and non-delegation.*

Perhaps you could describe other influences on your perceptions or understanding about leadership? I am very influenced by Eastern philosophy. I think I take a very Taoist approach to leadership.

The least amount of structure is best, a laissez-faire role. We are competent individuals, we can do our jobs, just tell us what the expectations are. I act this way when I work with other people. I give them a task and say I have confidence you can do this. I hate pushing people though, I would rather sit back and wait for them to come forward. I treat my students that way. I give my students their reading assignments, I say do it at your own pace, I don't structure for them. I give them the overall picture, parameters and let them work out and be responsible for that. Relationships are important because everything is connected. I think about the whole and not just the parts, that is particularly important in the servant leadership model. *So there are aspects of the servant leadership model that directly overlap with your personal beliefs from Taoism. You tend to define leadership in terms of your classroom or working with students. I noticed throughout our discussion you often refer to students or the classroom in the way you construct meaning. This again reflects your identification with your role as a faculty member.*

How do you define leadership? I have some very specific ideas about what leadership means and I think the first thing that comes to my mind is leadership by example. The ability to appoint competent and loyal people to assist you in doing a task. I think that as a leader you have to have real good rapport with the people that you work with. I think that rapport comes out of a sense of compassion for the people involved. I think that is VERY IMPORTANT in leadership. I think you have to be creative and innovative, but what is missing a lot of times is compassion and understanding. It is kind of paternalistic. Maybe that is not the right word, but you need to look after the well-being of the people who work with you -- like a father would for a family. I feel that way about my faculty, (with whom I work). I honestly do, I do my best for them. When it comes to scheduling and so forth, these are difficult leadership decisions. Who gets what among the part-timers. They have families, and these decisions influence them in many ways.

The way you define leadership seems like it is related to many different factors. Your role as a faculty member seemed to be related to your personal definition in the way you think about leadership in relation to your class. In some ways, you seem to have assimilated the definition of leadership as administrative work, even though you claim to have resisted it. Your emphasis on scheduling, delegation, task-orientation, hiring, which are aspects of administrative work with which you are currently engaged, reflect this assimilation. This definition also seems to reflect your positioning as a white male in terms of the emphasis on paternalism, playing the role of the father as leader, yet at the same time, your definition resists the traditional definition of leadership associated with white men through its emphasis on compassion and understanding. The importance of working with people, the more relational orientation to leadership might reflect the influence of your disciplinary background with its emphasis on collaboration or the campus leadership script. Your definition appears to represent the influence of several overlapping positional conditions, professional identities, and leadership scripts. I wonder whether this personal definition reflects your personal beliefs or whether it is really a reflection of what is required within this new leadership culture. Many people who appeared to be dramatically influenced by the context had ambiguous or contradictory definitions of leadership that seem to reflect several competing scripts that they were trying to accommodate.

Questions & Reflections

1) Think about your own views of leadership. How do you define leadership? Ginger defined it as a process if setting and implementing a vision and motivating people to follow the vision, as a social movement. Scott described it as certain skill and abilities. How does this relate to the ways you have thought about leadership?

2). What impacts the way you define leadership? How might this be a reflection of different aspects of your identity? Ginger described the church, her community, her professional background as a counselor, past work experiences, and her gender as influences on the way she

thinks about leadership. Scott described his religious beliefs and role as a faculty member as influences on the way he thinks about leadership.

3) How might your positionality and power conditions in your life or work context impact your understanding of leadership -- both your personal understanding as well as the type of leadership you see occurring on your campus? For example, Ginger and Scott appear to be influenced by their roles as administrator or faculty in the ways they understand leadership. Can you think of a similar analogy in your own experience?

4) Have you ever been concerned that your idea of leadership did not match or fit with others you worked with as Ginger described? How did it make you feel? What did you do?

5) When comparing your understanding of leadership to Ginger's and Scott's what differences and what similarities can you identify? Compare your beliefs about leadership to your co-workers and to others on campus.

6) Have you ever been a situation where the leadership changed as it did at ECC. How did this impact you and others you worked with? Were you comfortable with the previous leadership/the new leadership? Why do you think you were aligned with this form of leadership?

7) Who do you consider to be important leaders on your campus and why? Try to be specific as possible, describing individuals or processes that embody your beliefs.

8) How has your current job influenced the way you think about leadership? Examine several different levels of influence including department or unit, school or college, and institution? Ginger was greatly influenced by her work experience as a previous campus while Scott was

greatly influenced by the history of leadership at ECC since he had been at this campus his entire career. What about the region you live in. Does that influence your leadership beliefs?

Analysis

Leadership is a complex and ambiguous phenomenon. Analyzing people's beliefs about leadership is equally complex and results in multiple interpretations of influences, definitions, philosophies, and practices. This following analysis is not offered as the "true" interpretation of the stories presented but is used as a vehicle for further reflection and discussion. The analyses focus on the relationship of identity, positionality, and power conditions, and the context on philosophies of leadership and experience of leadership. They also focus on comparisons and negotiation of leadership beliefs. Please use these passages to rethink your initial interpretations of the stories you read about Ginger and Scott.

Analysis of Ginger

Positionality appears to be related to Ginger's description of leadership in terms: (1) her role as an administrator, and, (2) her identity as a woman and as a racial minority. Ginger mentions how as a woman administrator she has felt a lack of fit with the values within several organizations. Like other women of color, Ginger mentions that leadership is not necessarily position-based. Her personal definition of leadership and description of herself as a leader maintain several aspects that are more characteristic of women's leadership such as collaboration, openness, two-way communication, facilitation, listening, empowerment, teams, delegation, and participation. Additionally, Ginger mentions having always felt like a participatory leader, her whole life. Almost all women and people of color I interviewed mentioned that the servant leadership model was close to the way they had always thought about leadership. Moreover, women and people of color tended to mention what was "right" as influencing the way they construct leadership. Ginger also mentions in the very first part of the dialogue, how she was influenced by Diana Duncan's leadership that was "right," and

emphasized social change. Thus, it would appear that her identity as a woman of color might be influencing the way she constructs leadership.

Yet, at the same time, she is an administrator in a position of power within this institution; this positional aspect of her identity also appears to be related to the way she constructs leadership. An example of this positioning is Ginger's description of leaders on campus. She discusses people who have adopted the servant leadership model as the leaders rather than describing people who meet the criteria she describes for leadership. In her role as an administrator, she is trying to convince people to be part of the "movement" and she violates her own definition in order to meet the institutional objectives. However, she seems unaware of the contradiction in her views of leadership. Moreover, her role as administrator provides her the privilege to leave the institution if she feels incongruent with the environment; this same privilege is not available to faculty whose careers are tied to tenure). Therefore, Ginger's description of leadership appears to be related to two positional conditions where she may have felt disempowered in parts of her life, as a woman and person of color, while the other positional condition, role as administrator, has positioned her in a place of privilege most of her professional career.

Professional identity as an administrator is related to the way she constructed leadership. Like other administrators, her personal definition of leadership was long, vivid and clear with many examples illustrating that administrators tend to construct themselves or are able to construct themselves more into the experience of leadership. I believe her personal definition is related to her privileged status as an administrator, where she has quite a bit of agency and involvement in campus leadership.

Ginger identifies several influences on the way she constructs leadership: (1) professional identity as a counselor; (2) previous context and president she worked with; and, (3) her family, community, and church having a collaborative and participatory understanding of leadership. Ginger's personal definition of leadership and description of campus leadership are both related to her professional identity as a counselor. She mentions how she is a

situational leader, responsive to differences among people, and is able to read other people. Another example is her attempts to listen to people and her emphasis on two way communication; no other person in the context emphasized communication and listening as much as Ginger. Much of Ginger's description of leadership differed from other individuals in this respect; I believe that this unique representation is the result of her counseling background. Therefore, professional identity does appear to have a strong relationship to the way Ginger constructs leadership.

Ginger's previous position within another community college also appears to be associated with the way she constructs leadership. When I asked her for an example of her personal philosophy of leadership she referred back to that previous campus as the "epitome" of her understanding of leadership. Ginger refers to this previous context again as she describes some of the problems with the leadership process on this campus she is currently situated. Aspects of the past context that appear to be influencing her personal definition of leadership are the way she discusses motivation, social change, and decision-making by facts that were all a part of her description of this past campus. This past context appear to operate as a script or model for Ginger. Lastly, Ginger describes her early life experiences with her family, church, and community as important influences on the way she constructs leadership as collaborative and participatory. Her early life seems to operate as yet another overlapping script. This script from her early life may also be related to her positionality as a woman of color. Ginger noted how her ethnicity was related to the way she thinks about things, but that the campus itself is not an open environment related to race/ethnicity issues.

Power was discussed minimally by Ginger either as related to the way she constructs leadership, her life in general, or as an impact on others. This is another trend that I identified among administrators. Ginger mentioned how many of her staff members had been disempowered under the past leadership culture; therefore, she illustrates an awareness of power conditions influencing the leadership process. She describes her successful efforts to empower individuals within the organization. When Ginger does bring up power related to her

own positioning, she discusses empowerment rather than oppression. Ginger notes how her family empowered her as a youth and that she has rarely felt powerless in her life experiences. She notes how inferiority complexes, as well as the context, have influenced people to make them feel powerless; she sees both the individual and the context implicated for lack of empowerment. The way she constructs power appears to be associated with the empowerment she felt from her family. For instance, even though she has felt a lack of fit within contexts where she was an administrator, she never allowed the context to disempower her. Also, she had the privilege to be able to leave any time she did not feel a fit within an institution. Thus, she has personal experiences of herself as an individual overcoming the power conditions of the context. Yet, she was able to overcome these power conditions due to her role as an administrator because this position is constructed so it is relatively easy to leave a situation of oppression.

The immediate context tends to have a stronger relationship to the way faculty construct leadership than administrators who change campuses more often. Equivocal Community College did not appear to have much of an influence on the way she constructed leadership. Ginger had developed an understanding of leadership that was comprehensive and this context appears to have had little influence. But it must be noted she has only been in this context for a year and a half. Even though the context appeared to have a minimal relationship to the way she constructed leadership, she noted how it appeared to be related to the way other campus participants were making meaning. Ginger discussed the past president, the habits of competition and values of entrepreneurialism, regional values, structural divisions that remain on campus, and the longevity of employees as associated with the way people within the context were constructing leadership.

Ginger does not conceptualize the campus script or alignment process as coercive. She also does not have any concerns about imposing the servant leadership model. Ginger has had experiences with social change movements and believes that in order to make changes, sometimes you cannot get the community to agree or come to consensus. She believes that if

people are doing the "right" thing, it is okay to impose a change on a community. Resistance from people is the result of people learning to practice the new leadership.

Analysis of Scott

Scott's story illustrates the relationship between his positioning as a faculty member, within a Liberal Studies field, and as a white male, on the way he constructs leadership. Scott mentioned his role as faculty as a positional aspect that might be influencing the way he constructs leadership. First, Scott keeps referring to the administration as leadership, his language reflects the way that positioning as faculty member, a disempowered status under both leadership cultures, are related to the way he understands leadership. Scott notes that the administration now has some respect for faculty, thus, they are more empowered than in previous years. Scott illustrates his resistance to being positioned as a faculty member within this context as he describes his frustration with the way leadership has been defined as administrative work. Scott's role as faculty appears to be associated with the way that he understands leadership.

Scott describes many aspects of the current leadership culture favorably, such as the collaboration, courtesy, collegialness, and participation. It is hard to decipher whether Scott's acceptance (for the most part) of the servant leadership model is the result of the model being similar to the values of his field of study or because of some privilege that he is experiencing as a result of this model, perhaps both. There is a relationship between Scott's personal definition of leadership and his position as a white male. Similar to other white men, Scott discusses a paternalistic approach toward leadership, his desire to working individually, and not liking to delegate. However, Scott's definition of leadership also emphasizes compassion, understanding, and a relational approach to leadership that are not characteristic of the leadership associated with white men. Scott's personal definition of leadership was associated with several different positional conditions; gender and race appeared to have a minimal relationship compared to others.

For the most part, Scott does not see the way he constructs leadership as related to positioning, but instead by his professional identity as a faculty member within a liberal studies field. Both of these professional identities are associated with a set of values, priorities, and approaches that Scott sees as central to the way he constructs leadership. This is not surprising since Scott comes from a traditional academic background. He noted throughout the dialogue his investment in the classroom, with student and the curriculum. Scott notes that the faculty and administrators tend to speak a different language and have different priorities. Scott has a minimal awareness of power relations and accepts some level of disempowerment. He expresses disappointment with the past leadership culture, but not the open anger that other faculty on campus described. Scott acknowledges that there is still top-down decision-making, but communicates complacency or perhaps hopelessness.

When asked to specifically identify what influenced the way he constructs leadership, Scott indicated his religious beliefs. His personal definition of leadership and the way he constructs campus leadership tend to minimally reflect this belief in Taoism, for example, his discussion of a laissez-faire approach to leadership. Scott's personal definition was fragmented, it appeared to reflect several conditions; his definition is very "typical" of faculty on this campus. Because faculty have been influenced by several interpretations of various leadership scripts and values, e.g., two different leadership cultures, disciplinary and field values, faculty values, other campuses they have been on, other jobs, the result is fragmented philosophies or understandings of leadership. Some individuals fragmented definitions might also be the result of their new split role as both faculty and administrators. Scott held some administrative responsibilities.

In contrast to Ginger, Scott does not describe alignment or fit issues at any great length. He does suggest that many aspects of the servant leadership model are aligned with his personal philosophy of leadership. He noted how he liked to work individually and was sometimes uncomfortable with delegation, which are parts of the servant leadership model, yet, he emphasized how he had easily changed these aspects of his working style. The only element

of the model where Scott felt a strong lack of fit was administrative work being defined as leadership. He does not resist the campus script, for the most part he has assimilated it. He does not define himself out of campus leadership as others have who resist the campus script. Instead, he tends to define himself as part of the campus script. I am still confused why Scott chose to define himself this way given his strong objection to the way faculty's roles had been redefined and his strong affiliation to his role as a faculty member. It may be his acceptance of a disempowered status or lack of awareness of power conditions that led him to maintain this perspective.

IMPLICATIONS

There are three major implications from this study that I wanted to briefly summarize. First, the type of values/cultural change involved in developing pluralistic leadership cultures requires personal transformation and, as noted earlier, are not readily addressed with conventional strategies. Many of the major challenges facing higher education require similar cultural or values changes, for example, beliefs about multiculturalism or affirmative action; resistance to technology initiatives; reactions to organizational restructuring such as re-engineering, total quality management, or BPR; resistance to curricular changes focused on collaborative learning; or cultural conflicts in the move toward multi or interdisciplinarity. One of the reasons that these challenges remain prevalent and are so difficult to address is because we are not aware of or do not utilize adequate strategies for addressing these issues.[14] This paper has argued that narratives can be used as a strategy for addressing these issues of issues.

Second, this paper suggests the transformative impact of having people reflect on their experience and others. These cases were specifically developed from the interviews where people described their beliefs about leadership being changed through such a dialogue and analysis. The analysis section is much more elaborate than what was offered during the interviews. I think this additional analysis probably enhances the potential for meaningful

[14] I realize another major reason that these issues remain challenges to higher education is that cultural changes often take a long time.

reflection. One critique of this method is that only people who are already self-reflect can benefit or will take part in the process. However, many of the people I initially contacted about the interviews were hesitant to speak about leadership, to be involved with the interview, and certainly did not imagine the type of change in their beliefs that would occurred. Therefore, many people were not self-reflective and had no initial desire to change. But very honestly, the success of the training process depends partly on the ability of the trainers to bring people into the process.

Lastly, the focus of this paper was on narrative as a tool or technique for initiating change, however, narrative was also used as a method of inquiry to further our understanding of leadership. I want to also suggest the power of narrative inquiry for addressing issues which are embedded in the ambiguities, complexities, and contradictions of human experience. The dialogues and in-depth individual level understanding presented here could not have been obtained without the use of this method. I encourage you to review the appendix for further detail about the method and references drawn upon.

APPENDIX

RESEARCH ASSUMPTIONS/PARADIGM

My study challenged the ontological and epistemological assumptions maintained within traditional research that perspective is unrelated or not important to our understanding of leadership. Traditional positivist or post-positivist leadership research assumes a mostly shared or singular reality. The result of believing in a singular "reality" was that researchers tended not to explore differing viewpoints (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994a, b).[15] Leadership research over the last decade has begun to illustrate the influence of perspective and perception (Ayman, 1993, Bolman & Deal, 1984; Chemers, 1984). Cognitive and cultural research traditions have provided support for the view that leadership is socially constructed between people; thus, its meaning is negotiated among individuals or groups (Calas & Smirich, 1982). Increasing support for different perceptions and for leadership as socially constructed, suggests that a belief in a single ontology is a problematic assumption (Bolman & Deal, 1984). Although there is increasing support for multiple ontologies, few researchers have explored the possibility of how peoples' social experiences are related to their understandings of leadership.

As a result of the gaps in the leadership literature, a critical-constructivist paradigm was applied to this study rather than a positivist or post-positivist paradigm. A constructivist approach suggests that the researcher maintain multiple ontologies, encourages the exploration of perspectives and leadership as socially constructed, and emphasizes the role of the context and local meaning of leadership (Astin & Leland, 1991; Bensimon, 1991a; Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1991; Birnbaum, 1992; Calas & Smirch, 1982; Smirich, 1983). Researchers have noted how it is difficult to separate meaning and power because they are seen as inextricably tied (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). I found it necessary to combine a critical paradigm with a

[15]Six major research traditions have been identified for studying or understanding leadership: 1) trait theories; 2) behavioral theories; 3) power/influence theories; 4) situational/contingency theories; 5) cognitive theories; and 6) cultural or symbolic theories; (Bass, 1990; Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989; Hollander, 1985; House & Baetz, 1979; Yukl, 1989). Most studies within these research traditions have been conducted within a positivist framework. For example, researchers utilizing these trait theories viewed traits as identical for all leaders, transcending all contexts (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989; Fincher, 1987). Further, it was assumed that all people perceive traits of leaders similarly. The emphasis on universal traits and universal perception of traits reflects the positivist assumptions of these research tradition.

constructivist paradigm because the constructivist paradigm, for the most part, does not challenge existing power relations and does not critically examine how power operates (Clifford & Marcus, 1986; Lather, 1991). The different "positions" or perspectives that I will be focusing on within this study are assumed to be related to power dynamics (Alcoff, 1988; Haraway, 1991; Harstock, 1986).[16] Further, a specific focus on power, especially for a study of leadership within organizations, is important (Putnam, et al., 1992).

INTERPRETIVE FRAMEWORK

In addition to adopting a critical-constructivist paradigm, two theoretical traditions were used to frame this study: standpoint theories (specifically the concept of positionality) and cultural theories (Alcoff, 1988; Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Tierney, 1993). Positionality suggest that the way people come to know is shaped by experience; lived experience cannot be separated from the ways that people make sense (Harstock, 1986; Hennessey, 1993). These theories emphasize how social categories and concepts express the nature of social relations or how people are positioned. Leadership cannot be understood separate from an individual's lived experience and the power relations associated with these experiences (Smith, 1987). Positionality suggests that subjectivity is, for instance, gendered, yet fluid and dynamic; it is affected by historical and social changes. This concept resists a fixed, static, essentialistic view of standpoints that is associated with many strands of standpoint theory (Alcoff, 1988; Collins, 1990). Moreover, multiple standpoints or standpoint pluralism are central to the concept of positionality (Haraway, 1991; Longino, 1993). Thus, people make meaning from various aspects of their identity including race/ethnicity, gender, social class, professional identity, etc.

Since power conditions are central to the concept of positionality, I will briefly describe the definition or understanding of power used within this study. The critical perspective

[16]Positionality is a concept within standpoint theory that suggests that people's different social experiences and associated conditions of power are related to the ways that they make sense or come to know (Alcoff, 1988).

applied to this study is based on the notion that power is a force pervading all contexts, historical situations, and interpersonal relationships (Bourdieu, 1994; Foucault, 1994; McLaren & Guitierrez, in press). It is not conceptualized as always repressive or oppressive (Kondo, 1990). I possess a post-modern perspective on power (Dirks, Eley, & Ortner, 1994). First, human agency is conceptualized as important to understand *power relations*, power conditions do not simply shape people, people shape power conditions and the resultant relations (Kondo, 1990). Thus, power conditions are negotiated, socially constructed, and can be transformed; it is not a static force (McLaren & Guitierrez, in press). Third, power is defined, understood, and manifested locally (Kondo, 1990). Fourth, understandings of power are based on experience, in other words, through one's position. My understanding of power mirrors the critical-constructivist assumptions adopted for this study.

Cultural theories are compatible with positionality theory and critical-constructivist assumptions. For example, these theories tend to emphasize in-depth study of social actors throughout an organization and several cultural theories emphasize subgroups. People of color and women (by virtue of their position in society) and faculty, staff, and students (by virtue of their roles within the institution) can all be characterized as subgroups. Cultural theories place specific emphasis on context that has been illustrated to be related to leadership (Calas & Smirich, 1983; Martin, 1992; Tierney, 1988a, b; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Cultural approaches specifically focus on the importance of studying and understanding these groups and their perspectives for understanding leadership.

I combined theoretical insights from a critical-constructivist paradigm and positionality and cultural theories in order to develop the overarching framework for this study. I have labeled it a ***positioned cultural framework***. A positioned cultural approach suggests the following interpretive framework for understanding leadership:

> *Positioned individuals* (assuming that individuals co-construct their location culturally, organizationally, and historically while interacting with others) ***possessing multi-faceted identities*** (assuming that individuals are shaped by

formative conditions such as family, culture, community, religion, etc.) ***within a particular context*** (assuming most contexts are fairly unique and particular) ***influenced by conditions of power*** (assuming power relationships and dynamics pervade culture, social structures, and history) ***construct*** (develop understandings based on their situatedness or positionality and particular context and negotiate this understanding with other individuals' understandings) ***leadership in unique (individual level) and collective (group level) ways simultaneously*** (assuming interdependent webs of situated individuals connected by their changing positions on a variety of issues).

RESEARCH DESIGN

I studied a case through critical-constructivist inquiry. Utilizing a case allowed me to study various individual's (people of different gender, race/ethnicity, and roles) constructions of leadership in-depth within a single context. Critical-constructivist inquiry allowed the people I interviewed to present their understanding of leadership without imposing "traditional" models or definitions of leadership because it utilized open-ended, semi-structured interviews rather than a survey or structured interview. This approach maintains similar techniques to ethnography but it emphasizes critical constructivist-interpretive assumptions (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).[17] The study addressed three primary foci:

How does an individual's positionality (i.e. gender, race/ethnicity, role as faculty) relate to her/his constructions of leadership? What positional conditions do people indicate relate to their constructions of leadership? What positional conditions appear to influence people's constructions of leadership?

Do people indicate that conditions of power influence their constructions of leadership? In what ways? How do conditions of power appear to influence people's construction of leadership?

What do people indicate within their context influences their construction of leadership? What contextual factors appear to influence people's constructions of leadership?

[17]Critical constructivist research assumptions include a belief in multiple ontologies, reality as socially constructed, interactive and multiple epistemologies or ways of knowing, naturalistic inquiry, and an emphasis on power relations or conditions.

Multi-Case Selection

This study examined multi-level cases: institutional, group, and individual level.[18] I chose to study one institution in-depth. First, the context and power relations within a context are critical to understand positionality. An in-depth case-study helped me to explore the context and power in greater depth and to move closer to an ethnographic study (Stake, 1994). Second, another goal of this study was to explore leadership more broadly throughout the institution than has been done in previous studies. Since I had several positional conditions that I wanted to explore, this single case study approach allowed me to focus on the intersection of the individual, group, and institution and to maximize within case variation. After conducting site visits and document analysis, I chose an institution that corresponded to the criteria outlined below.

First, since I was interested in understanding leadership instrumentally or not just in unique contexts, sampling typical cases was a more appropriate criteria than, for instance, sampling extreme or deviant cases (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). If a unique case was chosen for this study the results might be discounted because it was thought to be deviant or special. Although I believe that all institutions are unique, the cultural framework that I am utilizing emphasizes how a "case" should not be seen as completely "unique" but as part of a nexus of multiple levels of culture which all share, to some degree, certain aspects (Martin, 1992). The campus I chose had been through a re-organization, at first, I thought this made it atypical. But after site visits with many different community colleges, I realized this was typical among these institutions - most are currently going through some type of re-organization. Second, in order to explore power conditions related to gender and race/ethnicity, it was important to find an institution with structural diversity. Structural diversity refers to the numerical representation of various groups (women, racial/ethnic groups) in an institution (Hurtado, 1994). Since leadership has been related to institutional type, I focused on one type: a community college. I chose to conduct the study at a community college for several reasons: (1) these institutions tend to have

[18]When I refer to case, I am including all of these different levels of analysis.

a typically diverse faculty, administration and students; (2) community colleges are conducive to case study because they tend have a more centralized organizational structure;[19] (3) faculty, as a subcultural, are more likely to be influenced by conditions of power in community colleges than at four year privates, research universities, and comprehensive institutions (Austin, 1983); and, (4) I had access to several community colleges.

Two approaches were utilized for selecting people to interview within the institution (group and individual level cases): a positioned informant approach and sequential sampling (Conrad, Hayworth, & Millar, 1993).[20] Based on the leadership literature, I had chosen to sample based on gender, race/ethnicity and role within the institution. I extend the research that explored gender exclusively by exploring the relationship of gender and/or race/ethnicity with representations of leadership (Dill, 1986; Haraway, 1991). The research on faculty, administrative, and student subcultures suggests different roles affect the way that people understand organizational phenomena (Martin, 1992). This study focused on faculty because this group's perspective on leadership is mostly unexplored (Birnbaum, 1992). The research on faculty subcultures suggests disciplinary or field culture, tenured and non-tenured status, part-time or full-time employment status, highest degree earned, and rank might all influence the way faculty construct leadership (Clark, 1980). All of these conditions, with the exception of part-time status were examined in this study.[21] Sequential sampling strategy was also utilized in order to explore positional factors important at the particular campus. Campus participants noted that field of study and role as administrator or faculty were important positional conditions. Field relates to a larger category of study such as careers/vocational education or liberal studies/transfer education. Informants noted a difference in perspective between

---

[19] Decentralized campuses often make access to the institution difficult. The researcher has trouble identifying a point of access and has trouble moving from one point of entree to the next.

[20] People, as positioned subjects (where subjects refers to people with particular needs, perceptions, and capabilities for action and position refers to the environment in which they are located), actively interpret and make sense of their everyday world (Conrad, Haworth, & Millar, 1993). Sequential sampling involves emergent sampling criteria based on conditions that informants deem important within the specific context (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

[21] There are several reasons I chose not to interview this group: 1) part-time faculty are, in general, so removed from the institution that it would be extremely difficult for them to discuss campus leadership; 2) my informants did not mention part-time status as a more important condition than role or field; and, 3) it was difficult to get full-time faculty to discuss leadership – interviewees mentioned that as part-time faculty they would not have been able to answer my questions.

central/executive administration and non-central/divisional/department level administration. Based on informant's comments, I added field of study, role as administrator, and central and non-central level as positional conditions to specifically sample. Table 1 & 2 list the individuals by positional conditions that were interviewed as part of the study.

Table 1 - Faculty Interview Sample

	Careers Person of color	Careers Caucasian	Liberal Studies, Person of color	Liberal Studies Caucasian	Total
Male	3	3	3	3	12
Female	3	3	3	3	12
Total	6	6	6	6	24

Interviewed only full-time faculty within various ranks: 9 instructors, 8 assistant and associate professors and 7 full professors; 9 tenured and 15 non-tenured faculty; and 5 Doctorates, 15 Masters; 4 Bachelor's.

Table 2 - Administrator Interview Sample

	Central Person of color	Central Caucasian	Non-central Person of color	Non-central Caucasian	Total
Male	1	2	2	1	6
Female	2	1	1	2	6
Total	3	3	3	3	12

6 Masters, 4 Doctorates, and 2 Bachelors; 6 of the administrators had been faculty members

Data Collection

Multiple sources of evidence have been identified as helpful in understanding complex phenomena like leadership (Yukl, 1989). Thus, I utilized several field methods to understand leadership, including interviews, document analysis, observations, and an analysis of the physical environment. I rely mostly on interviews since my interest was in understanding how different individuals and groups within the institution construct leadership.

Observation and analysis of the physical environment were used mostly to assist me in developing a tacit knowledge of the context, to facilitate my interpretation of the interviews, and to explore power relations.[22] In general, my observations focused on attending meetings

[22] Tacit knowledge refers to an understanding that one develops in relationship to the context. It is often referred to as "taken for granted knowledge" that facilitates meaning (Altheide & Johnson, 1994). Tacit knowledge is socially

that I thought might relate to leadership such as board of trustees meetings, faculty union meetings, and divisional leadership team meetings. Since the interviews were one-on-one experiences, observation allowed me to understand more about the social environment that people are reflecting on and engaging with to construct leadership. In addition, these same meetings allowed me to explore power differences that I suspected existed between the administration and board, the faculty and administration, and between careers and liberal studies faculty. I focused on collecting documents in three areas: (1) past and current leadership process; (2) current leadership culture; and (3) general campus information.

The interview protocol was arranged so that typical interviews lasted approximately an hour. In general, the interview protocol focused on perceptions of leadership on campus, participants personal philosophy of leadership, and influences on both their ontology and epistemology of leadership. During my initial analysis of the context, I identified critical incidences or changes on campus and used this information to formulate a few additional questions for my protocol. The interview protocol was sent to faculty members prior to the interview. This allowed the participants time for reflection on the questions and the opportunity to clarify unclear questions prior to the interview. This interview protocol was also "pilot tested" and modified several times.

Analysis

Although I didn't have any pre-determined categories that I had planned to verify with the interview responses, I did explore the logic of the interpretive framework with the stories I had collected. I was also interested in themes that might emerge. Therefore, I conducted the analysis with an emphasis on looking for new patterns not specifically identified in the interpretive framework. Categorical analysis was undertaken to understand shared trends among people of different positionality. I utilized narrative analysis for understanding faculty

---

constructed and related to positionality. I realize the importance of tacit knowledge both from my reading of ethnography and from my own work in the field. I conducted a participant observation study last year, in which I would have interpreted interviewees responses differently if I did not have a context-based understanding of these people and their environment.

members' particular or unique stories about leadership (Riessman, 1993). I followed the narrative analysis offered by Riessman rather than other approaches which strictly define the form that a narrative must take, i.e., orientation, complicating activity, resolution and coda (Labov, 1972; Mischler, 1986). I emphasized how the respondent's story should be used to develop the interpretive frame applied to make sense of it. Narrative analysis gives prominence to human agency and subjectivity, the individual is not lost or dismissed (Bruner, 1990).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alcoff, L. (1987). Cultural feminism versus post-structuralism: The identity crisis in feminist theory. Signs, 13(3), 405-436.

Altheide, D., & Johnson, J. (1994). Criteria for assessing interpretive validity in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 485-499). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Amey, M., & Tombley, M. (1992). Re-visioning leadership in community colleges. The Review of Higher Education, 15(2), 125-150.

Astin, H., & Leland, C. (1991). Women of influence, women of vision. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, H. (1994, Spring). Social change model of leadership. NASPA Newsletter.

Austin, A. (1990). Faculty cultures, faculty values. In W. Tierney (Ed.), Assessing Academic Climates and Cultures (pp. 61-75). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Ayman, R. (1993). Leadership perception: The role of gender and culture. In M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and Directions (pp. 137-166). San Diego: Academic Press.

Baldridge, J. V., Curtis, D., Ecker, G., & Riley, G. (1991). Leadership in an organized anarchy. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader on organization and governance in higher education (pp. 30-45). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn.

Bass, B. (1990). Bass and Stodgill's handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press.

Bensimon, E. (1989). A feminist reinterpretation of president's definitions of leadership. Peabody Journal of Education, 66(3), 143-156.

Bensimon, E., & Neumann, A. (1993). Redesigning collegiate leadership. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

Bensimon, E., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). Making sense of administrative leadership: The "L" word in higher education. Washington DC: George Washington University Press.

Bensimon, E., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1991). Higher education and leadership theory. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader on organization and governance in higher education (pp. 389-398). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn.

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1967). The social construction of reality. New York; Doubleday.

Birnbaum, R.. (1992). How academic leadership works. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1984). Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bourdieu, P. (1994). Structures, habitus, power: Basis for a theory of symbolic. In N. Dirks, G. Eley, and S. Ortner (Ed's.), Culture/power/history (pp. 155-200). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Bruner, J. (1990). Acts of meaning. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Calas, M., & Smirich, L. (1992). Re-writing gender into organizational theorizing: Directions from feminist perspectives. In M. Reed & M. Hughes (Eds.), Rethinking organizations: New directions in organizational theory and analysis (pp. 97-117). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Calder, B. (1993). An attribution theory of leadership. In B. M. Staw & G. Salancik (Eds.), New directions for organizational behavior (pp. 63-85). Chicago: St. Clair.

Cantor, D., & Bernay, T. (1992). Women in power. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Chaffee, E., & Tierney, W. (1988). Collegiate culture and leadership strategies. New York: Macmillan.

Chemers, M., & Ayman, R. (1993). Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and Directions. San Diego: Academic Press.

Clark, B. (1980). Academic culture. Yale Higher Education Research Report No. 42., New Haven, Conn: Yale University.

Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. (1986). Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography. Berkeley: University of Berkeley Press.

Cohen, M., & March, J. (1986). Leadership and ambiguity. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Cohen, M., & March, J. (1991). Leadership in an organized anarchy. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader on organization and governance in higher education (pp. 399-420). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn.

Conrad, C., Haworth, J., & Millar, S. (1993). A positioned subject approach to inquiry. In C. Conrad, A. Neumann & P. Scott (Eds.). Qualitative research in higher education: Experiencing alternative perspectives and approaches (pp. 267-277). Needham, MA: Ginn.

Copper. J & Heck, R. (1995). Using narrative in the study of school administration. Qualitative studies in education, (8)2, pp. 195-210.

Cox, Taylor, jr. (1993). Cultural diversity in organizations. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Cross, C., & Ravekes, J. (1990). Leadership in a different voice. AAWCJC Journal, 7-14.

Cronin, T. (1993). Reflections of leadership. In N. Rosenbach & R. Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary issues in leadership (pp. 1-20). Boulder: Westview Press.

Dallymer & McCarthy (Eds.), 1977. Understanding and social inquiry, South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln. Y. (Eds.). (1994). Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Desjardens, C. (1989). The meaning of Gilligan's concept of "different" voice for the learning environment. In C. Pearson (Ed.), Educating the majority (pp. 134-146). New York: Collier Macmillan.

Dill, B. T. (1986). The dialectics of black womanhood. In Harding, S. (Ed.), Feminism and methodology (pp. 97-108). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Dill, D. (1991). The nature of administrative behavior in higher education. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader on organization and governance in higher education (pp. 369-386). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn.

Dirks, N., Eley, G., & Ortner, S. (1994). Culture/power/history: A reader of contemporary social theory. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Estler, S. (1987). Gender differences in the perception of administrative role demands. Paper presented at AERA in Washington DC.

Ferguson, K. (1984). The feminist case against bureaucracy. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fisher, J. (1984). Power of the presidency. New York: American Council on Education.

Fisher, J., & Tack, M. (Eds.) (1988). Leaders on leadership: The college presidency. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fisher, J., Tack, M., & Wheeler, K. (1988). The effective college president. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan Publishing.

Foucault, M. (1994). Two lectures. In N. Dirks, G. Eley, and S. Ortner (Ed's.), Culture/power/history (pp. 200-222). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Haraway, D. (1991). Simians, cyborgs, and women. New York: Routledge.

Harding, S. (1986). Introduction: Is there a feminist method?. In Harding, S. (Ed.), Feminism and methodology (pp. 1-15). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Harstock, N. (1986). The feminist standpoint: Developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism. In S. Harding (Ed.), Feminism and methodology (pp. 157-180). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hart, J. (1992). Cracking the code: Narrative and political mobilization in the Greek resistance. Social Science History, (16)4, pp. 633-667.

Helgesen, S. (1990). Women's way of leading. New York: Doubleday.

Hennessey, R. (1993). Women's lives/feminist knowledge: Feminist standpoint as ideology critique. Hypatia, 8(1), 14-33.

Hollander, E. (1985). What is the crisis of leadership? In W. Rosenbach & R. Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary issues in leadership (pp. 31-41). Boulder: Westview.

House, R. J., & Baetz, M. L. (1974). Leadership: Some empirical generalizations and new research. In B. M. Staw (Ed.), Research in organizational behavior (pp. 341-423). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Kerr, C. (1984). Presidents make a difference: Strengthening leadership in colleges and universities. Washington DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Kerr., C., & Gade, M. (1986). The many lives of academic presidents. Washington DC: Association of Governing Boards and Universities and Colleges.

Kezar. A. (1996) Reconstructing exclusive images: An examination of higher education leadership models. Unpublished Dissertation.

Kezar. A. (1996) Reconstructing exclusive images: An examination of higher education leadership models. Presented at AERA in New York.

Kitch, S. (1980). The women or the system. In C. Conek, S. Kitch & G. Hammond (Eds.), Design for equity: Women and leadership in higher education (pp. 71-75). MA: Education Development Center/Women's Education Equity Pay Act Program.

Kondo, D. (1990). Crafting selves. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Labov, W. (1972). Language in the inner city: Studies in black vernacular. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lather, P. (1991). Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern. New York: Routledge.

Lee, C. (1993). Followership: The essence of leadership. In N. Rosenbach & R. Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary issues in leadership (pp. 113-122). Boulder: Westview Press.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Longino, H. (1993). Feminist standpoint theory and the problems of knowledge. Signs, 19(11), 201-212.

Lunnonborg, P. (1990). Women changing work. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Lyons, N. (1990). Visions and competencies. In J. Antler & S. K. Biklen (Eds.), Changing education: Women as radicals and conservators (pp. 277-294). Albany: State University of New York.

Martin, J. (1992). Cultures in organizations: Three perspectives. New York: Oxford University Press.

Maher, F. & Tetreault, M. (1994). The Feminist Classroom. New York: Basic Books.

McElroy, J. C., & Shrader, C. (1986). Attribution theories of leadership and network analysis. Journal of Management, 12(3), 351-362.

McLaren, P. & Guitierrez, K. (in press). Global politics and local antagonisms: Pedagogy of dissent and possibilities. In D. Carlson & M. Apple (Ed's), Critical educational theory in unsettling times.

McLennan, G. (1995). Pluralism. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Millman, M., & Kanter, R. M. (1986). Introduction to another voice: Feminist perspectives on social life and social science. In Harding, S. (Ed.), Feminism and methodology (pp. 29-37). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Mischler, E. (1986). Research interviewing: Context and narrative. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Morrison, A. (Ed.) (1991). The new leaders: Guidelines on leadership diversity in America. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: Warner.

Peterson, M., & White, T. (1992). Faculty and administrator perceptions of their environments: different views or different models of organization?. Research in higher education, 33(2), 177-204.

Putnam, L., Bantz, C., Deetz, S., Mumby, D., & Van Maneen, J. (1993). Ethnography versus critical theory. Journal of management inquiry, 2(3), 221-235.

Quinn, R. (1988). Beyond rational management: Mastering the paradoxes and competing demands of high performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rabinow, P., & Sullivan, R. (1988). Interpretive social science: A second look. Berkeley: University of California.

Riessman, C. (1993). Narrative analysis. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Rosener, J. (1990, November/December). Ways women lead. Harvard Business Review, 119-125.

Rosenwald, G & Ochenberg, R. (1992). Storied Lives. New Haven: Yale University.

Shakeshaft, C. (1987). Women in educational administration. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Statham, A. (1987). The gender model revisited: Differences in the management styles of men and women. Sex Roles, 16(7/8), 409-428.

Stodgill, R. (1974). Stodgill's handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press.

Tierney, W. (1988a). Interpretive approaches to understanding organizations: Implications for researchers. Paper presented at AERA in New Orleans, LA..

Tierney, W. (1988b). Organizational culture in higher education. The Journal of Higher Education , 59(1), 2-21.

Tierney, W. (1988c). The web of leadership: The presidency in higher education. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Tierney, W. (1989a). Advancing democracy: A critical interpretation of leadership. Peabody Journal of Education, 66(3), 157-174.

Tierney, W. (1989b). Symbolism and presidential leadership. The Review of Higher Education, 12(2), 153-166.

Tierney, W. (1990). Assessing academic climates and cultures. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tierney, W. (1992). Cultural leadership and the search for community. Liberal Education, 78(5), 16-21.

Tierney, W. (1993). Building communities of difference: Higher education in the 21st Century. Granby, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Touchton, J., Shavlik, D., & Davis, L. (1993). Women in presidencies. Washington DC: American Council on Education.

Weick, C. (1995). Sense-making in Organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of the theory and research. Journal of Management, 15(2), 251-289.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").