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ABSTRACT

Context in Leadership: A Comparative Case Analysis of Female Public and Private Sector Leaders

by

Angela Koclanes Hernquist

Dr. Mimi Wolverton, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Educational Leadership
University of Nevada Las Vegas

Public higher education institutions today are fiercely competitive social, economic, and technologic powerhouses with complex missions, structures, and issues. They help fuel business and economic development through their direct impact on growth and spending and through the creation of new jobs and businesses, and have become critical sources of scientific talent, research data, and technological innovations for both the public and the private sector.

In comparison, private sector enterprises today function in an environment where knowledge is economic capital and success is driven by highly skilled professional employees working in innovative organizational units to find, use, create, and transform knowledge and information; all in the face of a greater public expectation of increased fairness, responsiveness, and accountability.

The purpose of this study was to explore the impact of context on individual leader perspectives of the leadership experience. The issues identified and delineated by the participants of the American Council on Education's Fourth
Women Presidents' Summit provided the rationale for the study. Through purposeful sampling, three private enterprise business sector and three public research university leaders, meeting the criteria of this exploratory comparative case study, were identified. The data were evaluated using the theories of Person-organization fit, Schneider's (1987) Attraction-Selection-Attrition, and Mintzberg's (1981) five organization configurations as analytical frameworks.

The data and analytical frameworks confirmed and validated the themes of engagement, productivity, and accountability and the personal, positional, and public domains that emerged. The findings of this research indicate that the environment in which these leaders operate did affect their perception of the leadership experience. As well, the lack of consensus among the leaders by sector and the spectrum of the leaders' perceptions of their experiences provide further evidence that the specific context of their influence and control is significant.

The findings of this study also suggest that there are particular indicators associated with the themes and domains of leadership that can be applied to assess the impact of context. The researcher developed a model and presents evidence rooted in an unanticipated finding of the study that advances a hypothesis about contextual accord, or lack thereof, between leader and environment.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Early higher education institutions in the United States were simple organizations that focused on shaping the minds of young men through the study of classical languages and literature, liberal arts, and religious teachings. Lacking academic departments and rigor, they stood more as symbols of local pride and testaments to civilized communities with "educated" public servants. Higher education in the United States has changed significantly over the last 160 years. Today, public higher education institutions are fiercely competitive social, economic, and technologic powerhouses with complex missions, structures, and issues. They help fuel business and economic development through their direct impact on growth and spending and through the creation of new jobs and businesses, and have become critical sources of scientific talent, research data, and technological innovations for both the public and private sectors (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 1999; Cohen, 1998; Rosenzweig, 2001). At this same time, the very underpinnings of public higher education are shifting. Relationships between public institutions and government funding sources are being redefined with increased emphases on autonomy, accountability, and revenue policies that are characteristic of a highly market-driven environment (American Council on Education, 2005 (a)(b)(c)(d)).
In contrast, private sector companies began as entrepreneurial organizations that historically operated in a highly market-driven, manufacturing-based economic system with little attention given to individual workers, public versus private good, civic responsibility, and/or civic engagement. The postmodern enterprises of today however, function in an environment where knowledge is economic capital and success is driven by highly skilled professional employees working in innovative organizational units to find, use, create, and transform knowledge and information. Boundaries are open and permeable between the organization and its environment and leaders are challenged to develop compelling strategic visions, engage employees, assure a sound organizational conscience and ethical standards, and build change capacity; all in the face of a greater public expectation of increased fairness, responsiveness, and accountability.

The dynamic environment of the twenty first century requires leaders who are able to meet the challenging demands posed by the combination of internal, external, and market forces and incorporate the best practices of both the public and private sector contexts of leadership. Specifically, private enterprise and CEO experience are not prerequisites for successful leadership in higher education. However, in view of the complex public/private nature of higher education institutions today it is important for those who seek to lead in higher education to learn about the leadership processes appropriate to both the public and private sectors from others who have been successful leaders in those arenas (Martin, Samels, 2004; McDade, 1987). Similarly, the changing
environment of business today suggests unique opportunities for private sector leaders to learn about the leadership of knowledge based organizations from presidents and chancellors of our nation’s large public research-driven universities.

Background and Context

The American Council on Education’s (ACE) 2001 survey of 2,594 college and university leaders reports that the majority of presidents in higher education have never held a prior CEO position (75%), have not been employed outside of higher education for more than one year (39.8%), and come from backgrounds in either education or higher education as their major field of study (43.2%). Eighty-five percent of the presidents have held prior positions in higher education; and of the 14.7% of presidents whose immediate prior position was outside of higher education, only 2% come from the private business sector. The ACE survey also reports that “between one-quarter and one-third of the presidents at most types of institutions were hired between January 1999 and 2001” and only 19% of these new hires have served as presidents in their previous positions (Corrigan, 2002).

In comparison, CEO Facts compiled by Burson-Marsteller, one of the country’s leading public relations and public affairs firms, indicates that of the Fortune 700 CEOs in 2001, 34% had MBAs (approximately 8% from Harvard University) and approximately 60% had worked in finance (27%), operations (14%), marketing (12%), or sales (11%) at some point during their careers.
Interestingly, 23% of the Fortune 100 CEOs in 2001 had a degree in some type of engineering field. In addition, among CEOs of the Fortune 700 companies in 2001, 21% were below the age of 50 years old, their median tenure in the position was 14 years, 32% became CEO within three years of their arrival at the organization, and 26% had been CEO for one year or less (CEOGO).

Research on Leadership

An extensive array of literature identifies four major approaches or perspectives on leadership; trait theories (Kouzes & Posner, Goleman, and various gender studies), behavioral theories (Michigan model, Ohio State model, and Blake & Mouton), contingency theories (Fiedler, House, and Hersey & Banchard), and emerging theories (transactional, transformation, laissez faire). Unfortunately, no one model adequately captures the individuality of the leadership role and addresses the environment-specific nature of leadership.

Recent leadership research has found that gender is not the primary determinant of differences in leadership style, traits, and effectiveness. Eagly & Johnson’s (1990) meta-analysis of 136 studies on gender and leadership found that research in organizational settings eliminated arguments for gender-stereotypic leadership styles. And Bass (1990) reports that gender studies have “failed to establish any consistent differences” and “the preponderance of research suggests that women actually do not behave differently from men in the same kind of positions” (p.725).
Context as a variable, however, has increasingly received attention as a critical factor in leadership (House & Aditya, 1997; Johns, 2001; Klenke, 1996; Lowe, 2000; Lowe & Galen Kroeck, 1996; Zaccaro & Klimoski, 2001). In a study of 3,368 same-gender leader-followers by Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam (2003), the researchers found that the nine-factor full-range leadership model (which uses transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire leadership factors) did not vary within homogeneous contexts, leading them to conclude that "leaders may operationalize or enact their behaviors differently depending on context" (p.20). Bass (1990) takes a comprehensive review of approximately 7,500 leadership studies and offers his conclusions in the chapter, "Leadership Issues for the Twenty-first Century." In it, he states that in contrast to the majority of research done on the micro-level, involving the leader in relation to his/her subordinates and superiors, "mesolevel research" looks at the relationship of the leader to the organizational and environmental contexts of leadership. He adds that "more such mesolevel research is needed (House, 1988a)" (p.909).

This mesolevel perspective is central to the complex public/private sector higher education leadership issue. The ACE Office of Women in Higher Education report from the Fourth Women Presidents' Summit states that "the separation of town from gown is no longer a viable or desirable state." The integration of both public and private perspectives and arenas has become an integral component of both higher education and its leadership. The core message emanating from the summit report is that leaders in higher education
must "forge enduring links with other... leaders in civic, corporate, and political arenas" (Phillips & Van Ummersen, 2003).

**Conceptual Framework**

*The Widening Gyre, Lessons from the Fourth Women Presidents' Summit: Living the Present, Shaping the Future* presents the results of roundtable discussions from the June 2002 summit sponsored by the American Council on Education (ACE) through its Office of Women in Higher Education (OWHE). Sixty female higher education presidents and chancellors participated in the summit along with female leaders from OWHE and various political sectors. "The metaphor of the widening gyre suggests the increasing breadth and depth of the sphere of influence, action, and responsibility that accrues to the individual holding an academic presidency or its equivalent" (Phillips & Van Ummersen, p.3). At the center of this gyre is the person herself, and emanating from her and this point are the larger concentric spheres of the office, the institution, the university community, the surrounding community, the greater community, and finally, the global community (see Figures 1.1).

The fundamental component of the "gyre" is the complex personal, positional, and public nature of higher education leadership. Through roundtable discussions, the leaders "examined the scope of influence attached to a president and her presidency" within each of the seven comprehensive and conjoined domains (See Figure 1.2). The participants further identified and detailed their perceptions of the greater public and private issues and challenges
associated with each sphere of influence, based on their personal experiences and presidential positions in higher education (Phillips & Van Ummersen, p.5).

Figure 1.1 Researcher's Conceptualization of Spheres of Presidential Influence
Figure 1.2 Seven spheres of influence, action, and responsibilities.

- **THE PERSON:**
  The woman as leader "resides in the realm of the personal," as an individual and family member, whose values are the basis for her leadership

- **THE OFFICE:**
  "Ex officio and de facto an authority and an expert," infusing her values into her vision for the institution

- **THE INSTITUTION:**
  "Site of the president and the presidency...responsible for the institution’s management and care”

- **THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY:**
  "Microcosm of broader university as community” and a demographic and ideographic exemplar of a democratic society

- **THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITY:**
  "University as a citizen of the area," responsive to the workforce needs, social, economic, & technological progress

- **THE GREATER COMMUNITY:**
  The university “connecting” to issues in the educational and national community

- **THE GLOBAL COMMUNITY:**
  "The scope of the president spirals from the heart and spirit of a single person to the evolution and welfare of a global population”
The concerns and dilemmas articulated by these women are both significant and valid, and provide a strong rationale and basis for further study. Since this summit no further research has been undertaken by ACE to determine the extent and/or magnitude of the problems identified or to determine whether these problems are unique to public versus private sector presidents.

To date, there is little research or literature regarding the influence of public versus private sector on leadership behavior, yet leaders in each of these contexts seems to exhibit a critical component and significant measure of success: leadership appropriate to the forum.

Women in Leadership

In 1833, almost 200 years after the founding of Harvard in 1636, women in the United States were first admitted into coeducational higher education institutions. In 1920 they gained the right to vote, and in the 1940s, women forever changed the demographics of the labor market by entering the workforce in unprecedented numbers. This expansion of influence and participation in society has continued. Women's enrollment in higher education has surpassed men's since 1980, the number of female voters have exceeded male voters in every presidential election since 1964, and their incomes have accounted for “almost all of the 100% of growth in family incomes from 1970 to 2003” (Center for American Women and Politics, 2004; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Gogoi, 2005).

Despite these changes in the last half century, women remain relative newcomers to the top leadership positions in both the private and public sectors.
In the private business sector today, there are eight females among the *Fortune 500* presidents and sixteen among the *Fortune 1000*, while the presence of women in the lower and mid-level ranks of management is at 45.9 percent (Catalyst, 2004; Fortune, 2004). In the public sector, 29 women (approximately 5%) have held a cabinet or cabinet-level appointment in the executive branch of the federal government, the majority of them (22) since 1983 (Center for American Women and Politics, 2003). And although the proportion of women among statewide elective officials has increased in the last three decades to 25.4%, only 26 women have served as state governors, the first elected in her own right (i.e., without following her husband) in 1975 and eight currently serving in office (Carroll, 2004).

In higher education, 21% of the institution presidents in the 2001 ACE survey were female, up from 9.5% in 1986. The majority of these women lead at two-year institutions and it was not until 1994 that a woman was appointed to lead an Ivy League institution on a permanent basis (Corrigan, 2002).

Gender is not the focus of this research however, as women have only recently ascended to the ranks of leadership positions once held almost exclusively by men, they offer unique contemporary perspectives on the challenges and opportunities of their positions and provide a means by which to investigate the impact of context on leadership.
The Purpose

Using a case study design, this exploratory study sought to describe and analyze the perspectives of three female private enterprise business sector and three female public research university leaders. The *Widening Gyre* conceptual framework developed by Phillips and Van Ummersen and the issues and challenges cited by the participants of the Fourth Women Presidents' Summit formed the basis for the interview questions and initial design. Specifically, the study sought to determine whether the experiences and perceptions of female private enterprise business sector leaders differ from those of female public research university leaders.

Terminology

For the purposes of this research, the following definitions were assumed:

- **Context:** The internal and external conditions, circumstances, and setting in which an individual leader operates and performs her job; environment.
- **Private enterprise business:** Profit-motivated organization/entity with ownership interests held and controlled by its shareholders and/or partners.
- **Public research university:** Institution of higher education that is supported with public funds, is a political subdivision of the state, and emphasizes research in the provision of educational services to the general public.
Additional terminology and definitions used throughout the study can be found in Appendix III.

Research Question

This study sought to answer the following question:

Does the context in which leaders operate affect their perceptions of the leadership experience?

Forging new insight and understanding into the issues and challenges faced by leaders can both expand the knowledge base on leadership and provide a framework for the professional development of individuals seeking leadership roles in complex public/private organizations. In addition, it is intended that the insights gained from this research will be the first step in the development of a survey instrument for use in a future quantitative research study that will examine a larger population sample of both male and female leaders from both the public and private sectors.

Limitations

It is recognized that this study may have several limitations. First, this study is purposefully limited in scope. Previous research and existing literature indicate that there are many factors that define leadership effectiveness, and efficiency. This study did not seek to compare or evaluate the individual leaders' effectiveness or efficiency. Longevity in the position, size of the organization, and
substantial annual organizational revenues were the determinants for both inclusion in the study and evidence of leadership effectiveness.

Secondly, only public higher education institution leaders were included in the research. It is recognized that private institution presidents participated in the ACE Fourth Women Presidents’ Summit and also in the identification of the issues and challenges that provided the basis for this research. Although their insights are valuable, they were not included in this initial study in order to maximize the potential differences between sector leaders.

Third, this research does not address age, race, ethnicity, or sexual preference differences. These variables may be important components of future research studies and may potentially impact the generalizability of the findings from this study. However, as the central focus of this study is leadership in the public versus the private sector, hence context, these factors were not the basis for either inclusion or exclusion.

Fourth, as only women were included in this study, gender could be perceived as a limitation of this research. The findings of this research may not be reflective of men in similar leadership roles. In addition, it is also recognized that the participants in this study may not provide a representative sample of the population of women in leadership.

Finally, face-to-face interviews were conducted with participants in this study. In addition, the research relied on the extensive use of secondary data, such as speeches, resumes, and publications. Due to the time constraints and organizational demands of the leaders in the study, observations were not
possible. This is consistent with case study design, which is not dependent on the same data collection techniques required with ethnographic or participant-observer methods (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003).

Significance

The results of this exploratory study are significant at three levels. Theoretically, this research contributes to the existing body of knowledge on leadership in general, public higher education and private enterprise business leadership in particular, and on women in top leadership roles specifically. Substantively, the results provide insights into the perceptions and experiences of women in both public and private sector leadership positions. Practically, this study helps to identify the personal, positional, and public components of women in leadership positions and to derive analytical generalizations about the influence of context on leadership behavior.

One outcome of this study is a conceptual model that can be used for the education and professional development of women seeking leadership roles in both the public and private sectors. In addition, the results of this study offer the precursor to a future research agenda that would address age, gender, race, ethnicity, and context as variables that influence leadership behavior.

Overview

The chapter that follows provides a review of the literature pertaining to traditional perspectives on leadership, public versus private sector leadership
characteristics, the shifting demands of leadership today, the entrepreneurial
environment of higher education today, and literature on women in leadership.
Chapter three describes the methodology of the study and chapter four details
the analytical frameworks that guided the research. Chapters five through twelve
incorporate descriptions of the individual cases and within sector analyses.
Chapter thirteen is a cross sector analysis of all six cases. In chapter fourteen,
the researcher presents an interpretation of the data within the analytical
frameworks and a discussion of the findings. The final chapter includes a
summary and conclusion and offers lessons for women in private enterprise
business sector and public research university leadership, as well as,
recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The study of leadership has commanded the attention of researchers and practitioners alike for the better part of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first century and produced minimal consensus. Bennis and Nanus (1985) explain:

Decades of academic analysis have given us more than 350 definitions of leadership. Literally thousands of empirical investigations of leaders have been conducted in the last 75 years alone, but no clear and unequivocal understanding exists as to what distinguishes effective leaders from ineffective leaders and effective from ineffective organizations (p. 4).

Antonakis, Cianciolo, and Sternberg (2004) assert, “Given the complex nature of leadership, a specific and widely accepted definition of leadership does not exist and might never be found” (p. 5). And Burns (1978) adds, “Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth (p. 1).” As evidence of this, a search for books on “leadership” produced over 13,000 results on the http://amazon.com website in April, 2006.
This lack of accord is attributable in part, to several factors. First, leadership resides within the individual and as such remains an elusive phenomenon that defies a singular conceptualization. Second, the evolution of leadership theories is a testament to the persistent difference of premises regarding leadership as a trait versus a behavior. Third, many studies have not made critical distinctions between leadership and management. Fourth, leadership does not take place within a vacuum; however the majority of research has treated it that way. And finally, the defining characteristics and analyses of leadership change over time in response to shifting economic, social, political, and technological forces (Bass, 1990; Bennis, 2003; Burns, 1978; Chliwniak, 1977; Cronin, 1984; Gardner, 1990; Wren, 1995).

Despite these challenges, research and theory in this area have advanced our knowledge and understanding on the practical phenomenon of leadership and offer a foundational framework for analyzing and evaluating the positions, practices, and predicaments of leaders today. As such, the following definition provided by Northouse (2004) will be assumed throughout this research; “Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (p. 3).

The purpose of this research was to explore how context impacts leadership in the public research university and private enterprise business sectors. As such, this chapter provides a review of the traditional perspectives on leadership, compares public and private sector leadership characteristics, explains the shifting demands of leadership in a knowledge economy within
postmodern organizations, and examines the entrepreneurial environment of higher education today. Finally, although gender is not the focus of this research, current literature related to women in leadership in general, and women in higher education and in business leadership specifically, are discussed and insights on strategic roles for 21st century leaders presented.

Traditional Perspectives on Leadership

Four major approaches to the study of leadership provide the foundation for the development of leadership as a domain of knowledge: trait theories, behavioral theories, contingency theories, and emerging theories. The four orientations, as presented, integrate both the historical and the increasingly comprehensive perspectives attributable to this complex, and often ambiguous, field.

In the early twentieth century, leadership studies focused on the qualities of distinguished political, social, and military leaders; resulting in what is collectively referred to as the “Great-man theories” (Bass, 1990). This narrow approach was underscored by the presumption that ‘great leaders are born not made’ and was the precursor to a large body of research that investigates the individual characteristics of leadership known as trait theories. Numerous reviews and meta-analyses examine the results of decades of these studies (Bass, 1990; Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986; Stodgill, 1974; Yukl, 1998).

The findings overall are inconsistent due to differences in terminology, methodologies, and contextual factors as the trait perspective has evolved and
broadened over time both in the breadth and depth of the leadership attributes it seeks to explain. However, specific skills, abilities, physical characteristics, social aptitudes, and personality traits continue to be studied in varying combinations, substantiating the relationship of identifiable traits to the emergence of leaders in a variety of situations (Antonakis et al., 2004; Bennis, 2003; Goleman, 1995; Judge et al., 2002a; Judge et al., 2002b; Kouzes & Posner, 1993).

By the mid-twentieth century, leadership studies changed in approach to focus on the leader's behavior and interactions with subordinates; specifically task orientation versus people orientation. Three models exemplify this body of research. The Michigan Model, developed through studies at the University of Michigan led by Likert (1961), identifies two patterns of leadership behavior on job performance: job-centered and employee-centered. The Ohio State Leadership Model, developed by a team at Ohio State University, analyzed hundreds of dimensions of leadership resulting in the construction of a questionnaire known as the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Hemphill & Coons (1957) in Bass, 1990; Stogdill, 1974). This instrument measures the leader's behavior on initiating structure and consideration for employees. Finally, Blake & Mouton's Managerial/Leadership Grid,® devised at the University of Texas, delineates concern for production and concern for people as the two variables that correlate to leadership behavior. Individual measurements of the two variables are identified on the Leadership Grid, resulting in a graphic indicator of the prevalence of five principal management
styles that are expressed by leaders (Blake & Mouton, 1964, 1978; Blake & McCanse, 1991).

Behavioral approach theories fail to establish the presence of a consistent set of behaviors that predict effective and efficient leadership or optimal outcomes on either dimension of task and relationship. Ambiguities also exist with regard to cultural differences not explained by these models. Overall, the value of the behavioral perspective is most readily applicable to professional development and management training purposes (Antonakis et al, 2004; Bass, 1990; Northouse, 2004; Wren, 1995).

A third orientation to leadership studies combines aspects of trait and behavior theories with an additional component, or contingency, that factors in the changing demands of leadership relevant to the situation. Three models typify the characteristics of this effective leadership perspective. Fiedler's (1966) contingency model, based on 80 studies over a 30 year time frame, uses the Least Preferred Coworker scale and three evaluative dimensions to match leadership style with demands of the situation. House's (1971) path-goal model is based on the assumption that leadership style directly influences the motivation of subordinates and the "paths" to achieving goals. And Hersey and Blanchard's (1974) situational model predicates leadership style by cross-referencing the degree of readiness of the followers within the organization with one of four leadership styles.

The strengths of contingency theories are the flexibility of effective leadership styles, emphasis on subordinates, and interaction of behavior and
context. This integration of components is a significant factor in contingency theory models and allows for the application of this theory across a broad range of organizations. The weaknesses of this approach, however, include the use of unreliable self-assessment instruments, ambiguous conceptualizations of subordinates, and incongruity among leader-follower contexts (Antonakis et al, 2004; Bass, 1990; Northouse, 2004; Wren, 1995).

Finally, emerging theories of effective leadership in the latter part of the twentieth century have built on the core concept of exchanges between leaders and subordinates and converge on transactional and transformational conceptualizations. Transactional leadership theory concentrates on influencing changes in subordinate behavior through either contingent rewards or corrective action in the interpersonal 'transactions' between leader and subordinate (Bass, 1960; Hollander, 1978). The premise of this theory led to the development of an alternative construct by Burns (1978) posited as transforming leadership theory. Burns' (1978) transforming theory focuses on the leader’s ability to 'transform' the individual motivation and commitment of subordinates toward collective rewards and higher order goals.

Using quantitative and qualitative methods, Bass advanced both theories of transformational and transactional leadership as complementary constructs and developed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), which measures two transactional and three transformational dimensions (Bass, 1990; Lowe & Galen Kroeck, 1996). The original version of the MLQ has been revised and expanded over the years, and today Bass and Avolio's (1997) MLQ (Form 5X),
configured with constructs measuring three leadership typologies (transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire) represented by nine factors, is one of the most extensively researched leadership instruments. Findings by Antonakis et al (2003) in a study of 3,368 same-gender leader-followers and in Lowe & Galen Kroeck’s (1996) meta-analysis of MLQ studies continue to substantiate the validity and reliability of the instrument and the theories.

Transactional and transformational (emerging) theories of leadership have several common characteristics. First, they attempt to explain how the actions of the leader prescribe the actions and accomplishments of subordinates. Second, these theories examine the levels of motivation, commitment, and dedication of subordinates as a result of leaders. Third, they are not limited to top leadership levels within an organization. And finally, leader behavior and its effect on the affective state of followers are examined as a collective variable, in addition to leader effectiveness and follower satisfaction variables (Antonakis et al., 2004; Bass, 1990; Burns, 1978; House & Aditya, 1997; Lowe & Galen Kroeck, 1996; Wren, 1995).

In a discussion of the limitations of emerging leadership theories, House & Aditya (1997) report that “the organizational and environmental context in which leadership is enacted has been almost completely ignored ...[almost as if] ...leader-follower relationships exist in a vacuum” (p. 434). Despite the prevalence and popularity of emerging leadership theories, researchers agree that future investigations should focus on the impact of external constituencies
and organizational variables, hence context, of leadership (Dachler, 1988; House & Aditya, 1997; Lowe, 2000; Lowe & Galen Kroeck, 1996).

Pfeffer (1977) indicates that "many factors that may affect organizational performance are outside a leader's control, even if he or she were to have complete discretion over major areas of organizational decisions" (p. 107). His perspective challenges the belief that the focus of leadership is on individual characteristics, performance, and effectiveness with subordinates. While a large number of previous studies have focused on many of these leader dispositions, Pfeffer (1997) emphasizes situationalism and highlights the need to explore "the extent to which dispositions or situations vary in their explanatory power over time and place, ...[and] whether behavior is caused by relatively stable, individual dispositions or by situations, " (p. 41). In his book, *New Directions for Organization Theory*, Pfeffer (1997) reviews the research on organization studies and causes of behavior and offers a short discussion on the "person-situation debate" (p. 40). He concludes that the literature to date in this area "is almost totally decoupled from the profound changes" that have occurred in the social structure and context of today's organizational landscape.

This notion of context as a significant variable is rapidly becoming an important area of research in the study of leadership. Postulating that "current leadership research and theory is not invalid, but incomplete," Osborn, Hunt, and Jauch (2002) have developed the contextual theory of leadership (p. 831). This theory "conceptualizes the interplay of leadership with the four contexts of stability, crisis, dynamic equilibrium, and edge of chaos; the latter operationalized
through a complexity theory/dynamic systems perspective” (p. 797). The underlying logic of this theory builds on the four traditional perspectives presented above and incorporates context as a broader, interactive dimension that is adjusted to meet the changing conditions of radically different and diverse circumstances.

The concepts associated with the theory are complex, as Osborn et al. explain, “because the context of leadership has itself become more complex” (p. 798). And although the specifics associated with measuring and validating the four contexts remain elusive, the authors anticipate that researchers will be encouraged to “develop more robust models and leadership understanding” using the ideas “to supplement or enhance the meso/micro perspectives that are prevalent in current leadership research and theory” (p. 832).

Public versus Private Sector Leadership Characteristics

The research base for the systematic comparison of public versus private sector leadership is disjointed and fragmented and has relied heavily upon broad theoretical models, non-equivalent firms, and non-empirical research methods stemming from both the organization development and public administration disciplines. A major limitation of the existing research is its focus on managers and management within these sectors as opposed to leaders and leadership. As well, researchers have had difficulty clearly identifying the criteria that distinguish public versus private organizations.
Rainey, Backoff, and Levine (1976) offer the most comprehensive summary to date of the main points of consensus on the differences between public and private organizations. Since their major review, other researchers have proposed different designations and variations of organizations within the public and private categories. However, it is recognized that the public sector and private for-profit sector forms offer the most distinct or "pure" typologies, and for the purposes of this study, this focus most appropriately addresses the nature of the organizations in which the leaders interviewed lead.

The summary by Rainey, Backoff, and Levine (1976) is structured around three classifications: environmental factors, organization-environment transactions, and internal structures and processes. Within each of these classifications, additional topics are cited and their respective dimensions delineated as propositions.

Environmental factors are depicted through three topic areas. The degree of market exposure (reliance on appropriations) posits that less market exposure results in less incentive for cost reduction, operating efficiency, effective performance, allocational efficiency, and lower availability of market indicators and information. These concerns are centered on the fact that profit and the "bottom line" in the private sector generally guide decision making and drive goals and objectives, while ambiguity, a lack of consensus, and inefficient quantifiers associated with the "public good" hamper public sector operations (Denhardt, 1984; Hooijberg & Choi, 2001; Rocheleau & Wu, 2002; Spillane & Regnier, 1998).
Legal and formal constraints and political influences round out the environmental factors cited by Rainey, Backoff, and Levine (1976). The authors indicate that public sector organizations face increased formal constraints on procedures, specifications, and controls, a greater diversity and intensity of external influences on decision making (i.e., public opinion, and special interest groups), and a more demanding need for support of "constituencies." Although private sector firms, in general, must be responsive to their boards and stockholders, public sector entities face a very broad spectrum of constituents and operate at the discretion of democratic influences and controls (Allison, 1986; Denhardt, 1984; Hooijberg & Choi, 2001; Ring & Perry, 1985; Rocheleau & Wu, 2002; Spillane & Regnier, 1998).

Rainey, Backoff, and Levine's (1976) second classification is organization-environment transactions. The representative aspects are coerciveness (the unique sanctions and coercive powers of many governmental agencies), breadth of impact and scope of concern, public scrutiny of officials and their actions, and the greater public expectation that public officials will necessarily act with increased fairness, responsiveness, accountability, and honesty. Research indicates that government agencies and programs typically operate under a system of contradictory and often disparate forces of both interdependence and competition for resources with multiple decision centers (Allison, 1986; Denhardt, 1984; Hooijberg & Choi, 2001; Meier & Bohte, 2003; Nutt, 1999; Ring & Perry, 1985; Rocheleau & Wu, 2002).
The final classification that Rainey, Backoff, and Levine (1976) identify is internal structures and processes. Topic areas in this categorization are complexity of objectives, evaluation, and decision criteria, authority relations and the role of the administrator, organizational performance, and incentives and the incentive structures. Attributes of public organizations include greater multiplicity and diversity of objectives, vagueness and intangibility of criteria, less decision making autonomy and flexibility, fragmented authority over subordinates, greater cautiousness and less innovativeness in performance, and fewer and less pecuniary incentives for employees. These factors reflect the wide-ranging demand for accountability and the lack of discretionary power for public entity leaders (Boyne, 2002; Hooijberg & Choi, 2001; Kerr & Jermier, 1978; Meier & Bohle, 2003; Rainey, 1991).

Although significant differences exist between the public and private sectors, leaders in both face many of the same challenges in today's economic, technologic, social, and political environment.

The Shifting Demands of Leadership Today

In the past, information supported the production of goods and services. Today, however, knowledge and information are the strategic and transforming resources of postmodern organizations and the hallmarks of the "knowledge economy" (Foss, 2002; Hodgson, 2004; Powell & Snellman, 2004; Read, 1996). Powell and Snellman (2004) identify three strands of research that inform the rise
of this new economy, which Hodgson (2004) indicates "constitutes no less than a paradigm shift in the nature of 21\textsuperscript{st}-century organizations" (p. 81).

The first approach, dating back to the early 1960s, analyzes the growth of science-based industries that occurred as a result of governmental, private enterprise, and university-supported research. Among others, Machlup (1962), Bell (1973), Stanback (1979), and Noyelle (1990) focus on the use of theoretical knowledge as a source of innovation by firms and further analyze the resulting impact on social and economic change and growth.

The second approach investigates particular sectors and industries that are identified as "especially knowledge-intensive" and their contribution to growth in productivity (Brynjolfsson & Hitt, 2000; Gordon, 2000). There has been some debate in the popular literature as to the actual measures of impact due to the unusual macroeconomic and financial-market developments in the 1990s and the rapid and concentrated expansion of knowledge-intensive industries during this same period.

The third approach focuses on the role of learning and continuous innovation inside firms and is characterized by a much narrower and more applied managerial orientation. Drucker (1993), Nonaka & Takeuchi (1995), and Prusak (1997) have all conducted studies in this area that seek to identify effective knowledge production and transfer practices in organizations and to determine whether these practices can be successfully replicated with other groups.
A knowledge-based economy is characterized by components of each of these strands and includes an increased reliance on intellectual capabilities and knowledge inputs rather than on physical inputs or natural resources, high levels of education and technology, an emphasis on human and intellectual capital, a cumulative feedback loop between innovation and the use of innovation, and a shift from tangible goods to information and intangible goods (Benjamin, 2003; Foss, 2002; Kitagawa, 2003; Powell & Snellman, 2004; Rennstich, 2002; Seetharaman et. al 2004). Rennstich (2002) assesses this new economy stating, “Change is constant; rather than witnessing a discontinuity of former economic structures, the current changes represent an evolutionary development with strong roots in past evolutionary transformations” (p. 174).

New and evolving organizational forms have emerged as a result of the knowledge-based economy, and in response to changing social, political, technological, environmental, and globalization forces (Bergquist, 1993; Blackler, 1995; Child & Rodrigues, 2003; Drucker, 1989; Heckscher, 1994; Hodgson, 2004). Conventional bureaucratic forms of the past in a broad range of industries have given way to new entities, collectively known as post-modern or post-bureaucratic organizations. The underlying shift in these entities is away from a top-down hierarchy, which assumes that valuable information is controlled by top management, toward a “distributed network of minds” with an emphasis on treating employees as strategic resources (Gibson, 1997, p. 8). Behavior is guided and motivated by a shared vision and culture that, while articulated by top
management, is informed, discussed, and approved by members throughout the organization.

Typically, semi-autonomous units and teams consisting of knowledgeable, professional, or highly skilled employees are coordinated through a system of decentralized authority, power, responsibility, and resources in post-modern organizations. Boundaries are open and permeable between the organization and its environment; however, the efforts of all members are goal directed and contribute to the wider organization strategic mission (Bergquist, 1993; Blackler, 1995; Child & Rodrigues, 2003; Drucker, 1989; Heckscher, 1994; Hodgson, 2004). Table 2.1 presents Heckscher's (1994) summary of the characteristics of bureaucratic versus post-bureaucratic or post-modern organizations.

The postmodern form of capital is knowledge, and successful growth in this economy is, in part, dependent upon employees' knowledge, experience, and attitudes in helping the organization to find, use, create, and transform knowledge and information. As Bergquist (1993) indicates, knowledge and information is expandable (without limitation), compressible (as in computer chips and nanotechnology), transportable, patentable, and easily shared. Competitive advantage in a knowledge-based economy will result from continuous innovation and will involve investments in people and learning, as well as in physical assets (Bell, 1976; Bergquist, 1993; Drucker, 1989; Read, 1996).
### Table 2.1 Characteristics of Bureaucratic and Post-Bureaucratic Organizations (Heckscher, 1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureaucracy</th>
<th>Post-Bureaucracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consensus through acquiescence to authority</td>
<td>Consensus through institutionalized dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence based on formal position</td>
<td>Influence through persuasion/personal qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal trust immaterial</td>
<td>High need for internal trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on rules and regulations</td>
<td>Emphasis on organizational mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information monopolized at top of hierarchy</td>
<td>Strategic information shared in organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on rules for conduct</td>
<td>Focus on principles guiding action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed (and clear) decision making processes</td>
<td>Fluid/flexible decision making processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal spirit/friendship groupings</td>
<td>Network of specialized functional relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical appraisal</td>
<td>Open and visible peer review processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite and impermeable boundaries</td>
<td>Open and permeable boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective rules to ensure equity of treatment</td>
<td>Broad public standards of performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation of constancy</td>
<td>Expectation of change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The disintegration of forms and functions that typifies post-modern organizations facilitates the ability of these new entities to respond to turbulent environmental changes through the integration and "the reconnection of producer and consumer, and through an emphasis on relationships between people within [the organization] regardless of status or position" (Bergquist, 1993, p. 43).

Clarity and commitment to organizational mission and values are critical success factors. In addition, these organizations tend to be flatter, more networked, and flexible in order to encourage and engender increased collaboration among members (Bergquist, 1993; Child & Rodrigues, 2003; Drucker, 1989; Heckscher, 1994; Hodgson, 2004). Drucker (1989) suggests that these organizations will
increasingly resemble the more non-traditional organizational forms of hospitals, universities, and even symphony orchestras.

Leadership in post-modern organizations requires “a tolerance for ambiguity, a recognition of the need for one to learn from his or her mistakes, and a clear sense of personal and institutional mission and purpose” (Bergquist, 1993, p. 94). Bilimoria & Godwin (2005) cite the need for leaders to act “with enhanced inclusion and engagement of others, flexibility, responsiveness, openness, ethicality, and proactivity” (p. 261). Peters and Austin (1985) identify listening, facilitating, coaching, and most importantly, reinforcing values as essential leadership skills for these entities. Lipman-Blumen (1996) contends that an increased emphasis on employee well-being, environmental protection, equitable treatment for all workers, and concern for socially responsible business practices are key leadership concerns. And Goodman and Loveman (1991) suggest that changing public demands for accountability, due in part to permeable boundaries, require leadership that is cognizant of and responsive to the blending and overlap of public interest and private benefits. Caproni (2001) summarizes the changes that result from the move from bureaucratic to post-modern organization and details the consequences for leaders in Table 2.2.

The Entrepreneurial Environment of Higher Education Today

Colleges and universities have traditionally taught students, conferred degrees, generated new knowledge, and served society. Today however, many institutions have become critically important to the economy and increasingly
entrepreneurial in their nature, structure, and practice. Researchers, practitioners, and leaders offer several reasons for this transformation. First, institutions of higher education are recognized as one of the most vital “engines of the knowledge economy.” Colleges and universities not only produce the knowledge workers and raw material that drive this economy, but provide much of the backbone that supports growth and innovation through libraries, laboratories, computer networks, and more (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 1999; Bok, 2003; Gould, 2003; Guterman, 2005; Johnson, 2002; King, 2005; Kitagawa, 2003; Rhodes, 2001; Rosenzweig, 2001; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Steck, 2003; Wooldridge, 2005). These institutions also drive the local economies in many areas. As King (2005) reports,

Whether it’s for the current month, or averaged during the past twelve months, the metro areas with the lowest unemployment figures are almost all home to a major research university (p. 80).
Table 2.2 The Changing Face of Leadership (Caproni, 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old organization</th>
<th>New organization</th>
<th>Consequences for leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stable, predictable environment</td>
<td>Changing, unpredictable environment</td>
<td>From routinization to improvisation, adaptability, and flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable and homogenous workforce</td>
<td>Mobile and diverse workforce</td>
<td>From one-size-fits-all styles to multiple styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital and labor-intensive firms</td>
<td>Knowledge-intensive firms</td>
<td>From machine and industrial relations models to learning models of organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick-and-mortar organizations</td>
<td>Brick-and-click organizations and e-commerce</td>
<td>From managing relationships face-to-face to managing with technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and product stability</td>
<td>Knowledge and product obsolescence: mass customization</td>
<td>From routinization to improvisation, adaptability, and flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge in the hands of a few</td>
<td>Knowledge in the hands of many</td>
<td>From manager as expert to manager as a creator of context that enhances learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability of managerial knowledge and practices</td>
<td>Escalation of new managerial knowledge and practices</td>
<td>From a focus on learning to a focus on learning and unlearning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology as a tool for routine tasks</td>
<td>Escalating information and communication technologies</td>
<td>From using technology for tasks to using it as a key leadership resource for wide-scale changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local focus</td>
<td>Local and global focus</td>
<td>From one-size-fits-all styles to multiple styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>From command and control to relationship building and fluid organizational boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers as fixed cost</td>
<td>Managers as variable cost</td>
<td>From security to pay for performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictable, trajectory careers</td>
<td>Multiple careers</td>
<td>From employment to employability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-breadwinner families</td>
<td>Dual and triple career families</td>
<td>From emphasis on traditional family roles to an emphasis on fluid family roles, flexible work schedules, and work-life balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A second major factor is the “democratization” and “massification” of higher education (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 1999; Bok, 2003; Gould, 2003; Newman, Couturier, & Scurry, 2004; Rhodes, 2001; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Steck, 2003; Wooldridge, 2005). In 1950 there were approximately half a million degrees awarded in the United States. In 2004, over 2.3 million degrees were awarded (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac Issue 2004-5, p. 4). This phenomenon is attributed to both the large number of offspring of the Baby Boomer era and the fact that those without higher education training are at a severe economic disadvantage in the labor force. Carnevale and Fry (2003) estimate that by 2008, fourteen million of the twenty million “new jobs” that will be generated, will require some postsecondary education. In addition, the widening salary gap resulting from the knowledge economy has led to a trend of lifelong learning in higher education and a change in the student population. The Chronicle of Higher Education 2004-5 Almanac Issue reports that 38% of the undergraduate students enrolled in higher education in the fall of 2002 in the United States were 25 years and older and more than 25% were over the age of 30 (p. 14).

A third aspect of the changing landscape of higher education is globalization. Wooldridge (2005) reports, “The World Bank calculates that global spending on higher education amounts to $300 billion a year…and there are more than 80 million students worldwide” (p. 3). American institutions are increasingly welcoming and relying on the income of students from around the world, opening campuses and learning centers across the globe, offering more
international learning programs, engaging in shared faculty training and research, sending larger numbers of domestic students abroad, and continuously searching for new markets and "consumers" (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 1999; Arimoto, Huang, & Yokoyama, 2005; Bok, 2003; Johnson, 2002; Newman, Couturier, & Scurry, 2004; Rhodes, 2001; Rosenzweig, 2001; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Steck, 2003).

Competition for funding and resources is a fourth major factor in the development of entrepreneurialism in higher education. The American Council on Education (ACE) produced a four-part essay on "The Changing Relationship between States and Their Institutions" (2005). In the reports, reduced state appropriations and expenditures, a decreasing pool of state funds, competition with for-profit institutions, increasing pressure on higher education to augment state economies, and changing state priorities are all cited as reasons for higher education as a whole, becoming more entrepreneurial (Eckel, Couturier, & Luu, 2005a, b). The extent of funding deficiencies is discussed in the ACE report, *Bridging Troubled Waters: Competition, Cooperation, and the Public Good in Independent and Public Higher Education* (2005). It indicates that "if higher education had received constant funding [from 1977 to 2000], it would have gained an estimated $21 billion in additional revenues" (Eckel, Couturier, & Luu, 2005c, p. 5). This fact, combined with increases in instructional, technological, and facility costs and heightened demand and competition for talented faculty and high-quality amenities, has put tremendous pressure on colleges and universities to find new sources of funding (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 1999;
Bok, 2003; Eckel, Couturier, & Luu, 2005; Newman, Couturier, & Scurry, 2004; Rhodes, 2001; Rosenzweig, 2001; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Steck, 2003).

Institutions of higher education have responded to these challenges in a number of ways, including through new commercial activities that have produced near-record revenues. Blumenstyk (2005) reports that in the 2004 fiscal year, institutions created 425 start-up companies, collected more than $1-billion in revenues from licensing new products and technologies, filed more than 15,000 "invention disclosures" – findings with the potential for patenting and commercialization," and executed over 4,000 deals for licenses and options on licenses (p. A25). This is turn has created new layers of administrative offices and departments as well as new organizational structures that include partnerships, joint ventures, and organized research units.

The highly market-driven environment in which modern colleges and universities find themselves has blurred the boundaries between their once "pure" public versus private sector purposes, missions, and priorities. This new climate has some common elements and trends. Eckel, Couturier, & Luu (2005d) cite less reliance on government subsidy as a primary funding source, a shift toward allowing market forces more influence, increased tuition and enrollment flexibility, more procedural and operational autonomy, steady or decreased public funding, the introduction and increase of performance standards and accountability measures, and more emphasis on entrepreneurialism in generating new revenues. Kerr and Gade (1986) cite additional government controls, greater involvement with legal issues, more influence by students and
their parents, added university goals and greater ambiguity in their definition, further fund raising responsibilities, and increased governing board involvement in day-to-day operations as external pressures that presidents in particular, face in this higher education setting.

Higher education institutions have not abandoned their primary functions of teaching, research, and service, however, the manner in which they conduct business has gone through a fundamental change and "corporatization." Steck (2003) defines the corporatized university as

An institution that is characterized by processes, decisional criteria, expectations, organizational culture, and operating practices that are taken from, and have their origins in, the modern business corporation. It is characterized by the entry of the university into marketplace relationships and by the use of market strategies in university decision making (p. 74).

This has taken many forms and includes an emphasis on decentralized structures with incentives for growth and gain-share revenues, a redistribution of labor away from full-time tenured to part-time adjunct faculty, the development of ancillary products and services, the adoption of various quality management criteria and strategies, such as Total Quality Management (TQM) and Management by Objectives (MBO), major public relations and marketing campaigns, price discounting and variable pricing, and decision making that increasingly assesses contribution margins and cost effectiveness (Bok, 2003;

The current environment in higher education is both intensely competitive and collaborative and filled with new paradigms and new challenges. In order to be successful, leaders of these institutions must coordinate and confront a myriad of traditions and changes simultaneously.

Women in Leadership

For decades women were not included in leadership studies as it was culturally assumed that only men were leaders. The lack of women in leadership positions, outside of philanthropic organizations, reflected this thinking. The majority of gender research in leadership, therefore, has come about in the last 40 years and has been concentrated on quantitative studies of women’s leadership styles as compared to men’s and qualitative studies of women’s personal accounts of their backgrounds and rise to executive positions.

Early studies by Kanter (1976, 1977) as reported in Bass (1990), categorized women leaders as either “mothers, pets, sex objects, or iron maidens,” based on stereotypic references to those titles and female interactions with subordinates (pp. 24, 711). Recent leadership studies continue to address and reference leadership styles stereotypically delineating between masculine versus feminine styles, and often adding new terminology, such as Eagly et al.’s agentic and communal styles of leadership (Bass, 1990; Eagly et al., 2003).
Kanter (1977) argued that research fails to show a relationship between gender and either leadership aptitude or style, and in fact, theories to this effect “do not match the realities of adult life in organizations” (p. 199). In contrast, Rosener (1990) proposes that gender-related differences in leadership style do exist, adding however, that women actually succeed “because of – not in spite of – certain characteristics generally considered to be ‘feminine’ and inappropriate in leaders” (p. 120). Overall, comparative gender research has focused on three areas: gender differences in leader effectiveness, gendered leadership styles, and level of satisfaction of subordinates with gendered leaders.

Eagly et al (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of 45 studies on transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles to examine gender differences in leader effectiveness. In this study researchers found that female leaders were transformational and used more contingent reward behaviors, a component of transactional style, more often than male leaders. Male leaders alternatively, used two other components of transactional leadership and a laissez-faire leadership style more. The results of the meta-analysis indicate small, but significant, differences between male and female leaders. The implications are that the factors that female leaders rated higher on “relate positively to leaders’ effectiveness” and those dimensions on which men exceeded women “have negative or null relations to effectiveness” (p. 580).

Similarly, in a study of 425 high-level executives evaluated by approximately 25 performance evaluations each, female leaders ranked higher on 42 of the 52 skills that measured dimensions of motivating of others, fostering
communication, producing high-quality work, and listening to others (Sharpe, 2000). In analyzing the results of this study the researcher concludes that "the gender differences were often small, and men sometimes earned higher marks in some critical areas, such as strategic ability and technical analysis. But overall, female executives were judged more effective than their male counterparts" (p.74).

In research on gendered leadership styles, Eagly & Johnson (1995) conducted a meta-analysis of 162 studies done between 1961 and 1987 and found that women leaders exhibited more interpersonal and democratic styles of leadership while men tended to manifest more task-oriented and autocratic styles. The researchers further analyzed the settings of the studies included in the meta-analysis. They found that laboratory experiments with students and assessment studies of leaders and followers tended to result in findings that revealed stereotypical gender leadership styles. In organizational settings, their meta-analysis found differences between men and women leaders in their autocratic versus democratic style, but not in their use of interpersonal versus task orientations.

Studies on the level of satisfaction of subordinates and leader gender have not found any discernable significant differences between male and female leaders (Bass, 1990; Yammarino et. al., 1997). However, an analysis of 21 studies of subordinate evaluations and 380 leader-followers reports that leader rankings and subordinate satisfaction may not be a reflection of the leader's
gender, but rather, influenced by the leader's power and level within the organization (Ragins, 1991).

Limitations to the existing body of quantitative research on women's leadership in general can be attributed to several conditions. First, the majority of studies examine the skills, traits, and behaviors of a broad range of leadership positions in organizations. Second, methodologies vary among the studies with measurements done in organizational settings, through co-worker assessments, and using non-leader small groups in laboratory settings. Finally, although the studies of non-homogeneous organizations and non-equivalent leadership roles/positions have added to the general knowledge of leadership, generalizability across contexts and leaders is limited.

The inconsistencies resulting from the limitations of previous studies emphasize the need for more narrowly focused context-specific research and for the current research on public higher education versus private sector business presidents. Eagly et. al. (1995) provide additional rationale for this approach stating:

Behavior may be less stereotypic when women and men who occupy the same managerial role are compared because these organizational leadership roles, which typically are paid jobs, usually provide fairly clear guidelines about the conduct of behavior (p.49).

As evidence, a five-year longitudinal study on male and female college and university presidents "found no apparent relationships between
gender and leadership, either in terms of presidential background, the way presidents thought, constituent support, or institutional change" (Birnbaum, 1992, p. 44).

Qualitative studies and narratives on women in leadership provide rich insights into the personal backgrounds, as well as the social and organizational barriers and experiences of women in a variety of leadership positions and contexts. *Talking Leadership: Conversations with Powerful Women*, edited by Hartman (1999), is a collection of interviews with thirteen women who have “achieved recognition as 'positional' leaders in a variety of fields” (p. 13). The participants offer insights into their personal and professional backgrounds, experiences, approaches, and strategies as women in leadership. This narrative was the inaugural book of the Institute for Women's Leadership at Rutgers University.

*Women on Power*, edited by Freeman, Bourque, & Shelton (2001), presents the provocative essays of a group of women who have expertise in a broad range of disciplines. In this narrative, the editors combine theoretical discussions on gender with historical and contemporary case studies to explore the influence of women on leadership and power. Through the essays, the issues of access to and participation in leadership by women are examined across professions.

*Women of Influence, Women of Vision* (Astin & Leland, 1991) is one of the most highly recognized cross-generational qualitative studies of women leaders and social change. The individual case-studies of 77 female educators from three
generational cohorts are examined in an effort to discover developmental themes and generational issues associated with "leadership as experienced and performed by women ... in the period of the contemporary women's movement" (p. 13). The authors find three significant factors associated with women in leadership that emerge from their analysis of the 77 case studies: collective action, passionate commitment, and consistent performance.

The narratives on women in leadership all offer valuable and unique perspectives and many of them reflect the first-generation anecdotes of the women who were and are pioneers in both their fields and positions. However, a significant limitation of the majority of qualitative studies on women in leadership is the lack of generalizability. This is due to methodologies that often make use of non-equivalent leadership roles, organizational contexts, and/or research protocols.

Women in Private Sector Leadership

The Center for Women's Business Research indicates that in 2004, approximately 47.7% (10.6 million) of all privately-held businesses in the United States were owned by women who had an interest of 50% or more. These businesses generated $2.46 trillion in sales and employed 19.1 million people (Center for Women's Business Research, 2004). In addition, a census of female corporate officers and top earners found that women have increased their presence to 45.9% in the management ranks of American companies and their
representation within the senior ranks of the Fortune 500 companies has increased from 10% in 1996 to 15.7% in 2002 (Catalyst, 2004).

The 2005 Wall Street Journal Report: Women to Watch found that 1.4% of Fortune 500 CEOs are women and that virtually every one of these women, regardless of industry, gained their experience through the operations side of the business. This is despite the fact that 90% of all women managers are employed in staff positions. In addition, this report indicates that women business leaders are concentrated in the consumer products, financial services, retail, publishing, and media sectors (Hymowitz, 2005). These industries typically have large numbers of women customers.

In 2004, Catalyst, the leading research and advisory organization dedicated to advancing women in business, examined the connection between gender diversity in top management teams and organizational financial performance in the second half of the 1990s with a groundbreaking study of 353 Fortune 500 companies. Return on Equity (ROE) and Total Return to Shareholders (TRS) were used to measure organizational financial performance. Catalyst found that the group of companies with the highest representation of women on their top management teams experienced 35.1% higher ROE and 34% higher TRS than companies with the lowest women’s representation. They found similar results when comparing financial performance by industry. Although the results do not demonstrate causation, Catalyst makes the argument that “diversity and financial performance are related” (p. 2).
Research on women in private sector leadership has been limited by the same conditions as those found for women's leadership in general; that being the lack of focus exclusively on the president/CEO position, the lack of consistent methodologies, and the use of non-homogeneous organizations and non-equivalent leadership roles/positions affecting generalizability across contexts and leaders.

Women in Higher Education Leadership

Research on women in higher education leadership is overwhelmingly focused on a broad range of roles within institutions due to the dearth of women in presidential/chancellor positions. Although the skills, styles, and practices for various administrative roles have some commonality, their relevance to the position of president is limited.

Chlawniak (1997), Eggins (1997), Madden (2002), and McDade (1987) have researched and written extensively about women in higher education leadership. Similar findings among the studies indicate common career paths to administration through faculty experience, various senior administrative staff positions, and the role of provost. The academic deanship and department chair are cited as the least common previous positions of institutional presidents. A variety of skills and competencies for higher education leadership are also cited by the authors, the majority of which are common across organizational contexts.

Nidiffer & Bashaw's (2001) findings on women administrators in higher education and their review of the relevant literature indicate that “old-style, top-
down leadership has little relevance in a contemporary university community. On a daily basis, presidents must deal with a variety of constituencies - across class, age, gender, and race" (p. 275). In a review of studies on the twenty most frequent development needs of leaders in business, secondary education, government, and higher education, McDade (1987) reports that four of the top five needs identified by higher education administrators were speaking publicly, working with boards, acquiring resources, and working with governments – all of which entail significant private sector interaction (p.18). Nidiffer (2001) adds that "the precise mixture of competencies depends, of course, on the individual and the context of the institution; there is no single, ideal type of leader" (p. 112).

This finding is echoed by Walton (1996) in her study of twenty female higher education leaders in the United States and Great Britain. Through autobiographical essays written by the presidents on issues including personal background, educational background, career path, assistance (such as mentors) and hindrances encountered, recruitment for her present position, scholarly activities, public activities, acquiring and developing leadership style and skills, personal strengths, conflict management, stress, job satisfaction, and encouraging other women to pursue careers in higher education administration, Walton found that there were no consistent career paths or competencies expressed by all of the women. However, in further analyzing the ten American presidents specifically, this researcher found that the issues of mentoring/networks and the public/private nature of higher education leadership emerged in each of the ten essays.
The most comprehensive quantitative study on women presidents in higher education is Corrigan's (2002) *The American College President*. The findings of this report indicate that 87% of the female presidents are white, 57.3% are between 51 and 60 years old, 83.1% are married, 85.7% have children, and 57.4% are Protestant. The majority of the women are employed at two-year institutions (26.8%) and Master’s institutions (20.3%), with the least number employed at doctorate-granting institutions (13.3%). Almost 75% of the presidents surveyed report to governing boards and the majority of the women (31.4%) have been in their positions for 6-10 years.

A significant number of the women presidents (76%) have no prior experience in a CEO position. Thirty-five percent held the previous position of Chief Academic Officer/Provost, at a different institution (62.3%), for a period of less than six years (49.6%). As well, the women report that they are not tenured in either their current (74.4%) or their prior position (62%).

More than 25% of the presidents indicate that they left the job market or worked part time in their career due to children (as compared to only 1.9% of the male presidents) and 58.9% of the women are married (as compared to 89.6% of the males). On average, the women have slightly more years in previous full-time faculty experience than males, the majority of women (55%) come from education or higher education as their field of study (as compared to 40.7% for males), and more women than men attended same sex colleges.

Two of the most interesting findings of the study are that male and female presidents report similar experiences as to their greatest challenges as president
(planning, fund-raising, and budgets) and the areas that occupy the most time (faculty, legislators, and governing boards/system offices). These results lend credence to the theory that there are no significant gender differences in leadership performance and support the public and private nature and importance of context to higher education leadership today. This is in contrast to a limitation of the majority of studies that focus extensively on female versus male leadership styles.

Finally, in a study of 713 college and university presidents by Fischer and Koch (2004), researchers found no statistically significant differences between women and men presidents on the majority of 60 items that assessed presidential attitudes, values, and behavior. They did, however, find that "a distinctive class of entrepreneurial leaders does exist" and that "effective presidents and women presidents are more entrepreneurial in character than representative presidents and minority presidents (p. 104-105). The study characterizes entrepreneurial presidents as being "innovative, flexible risk takers who are not afraid to violate the status quo, [who are] more successful than nonentrepreneurial leaders, at least as experts see their performance" (p. 107).

Fischer and Koch (2004) posit that "all things considered, women presidents are more entrepreneurial than men presidents, especially in their attitudes and values" (p. 107). They further suggest that, based on their research and their interview with a female president of a large public university,

Women must be more flexible and entrepreneurial in order to deal with the vicissitudes of academic life and leadership. They cannot count upon
some of the long-established connections that men presidents may have... and must find different ways to skin the cat (p. 107).

Insights on Strategic Roles for 21st Century Leaders

U.S. News & World Report, along with the Center for Public Leadership, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, commissioned a 2005 national study of confidence in leadership in the United States. The findings indicate that Americans most often look for honesty and integrity in leaders and have the highest confidence index for military (3.21) and medical (3.11) leaders, followed by educational (2.98), religious (2.94), nonprofit and charity (2.94), and business (2.78) leaders. Congressional (2.66), executive branch (2.64) and press (2.39) leaders rank lowest. As well, 73% of Americans believe that their leaders are out of touch with the average person, 64% think their leaders have been corrupted by power, and 58% view their leaders as people who cannot be trusted (Yankelovich, 2005).

Quatro (2005) discusses the fact that leaders in private, public, and non-profit organizations all face tremendous challenges. He offers five critical areas of focus that are important for contemporary organizational leaders across sectors. The first is to develop a compelling strategic vision through a process of dialogue and articulation that is prudent from both a competitive advantage standpoint and from a human motivation standpoint. The second is to design jobs "that holistically engage" increasingly sophisticated employees who seek greater work-life balance. The third is to instill "a sound organizational conscience" to ensure
conduct in primary business activities that are seen as morally and ethically reputable by its employees and stakeholders. The fourth is to leverage organizational knowledge and "build an organizational infrastructure to harness and grow that asset." And the fifth is to build change capacity and proactively view change as a "legitimate source of competitive advantage" (pp. 280-281).

Mitchell (2006) offers a poignant finding in a long-term tracking study of CEO effectiveness. Research was conducted through questionnaires and in-depth interviews with leaders of companies for which stocks had grown the fastest in North America from 1992-2002. He finds that

The only statistically significant, continuing factor that distinguished those CEOs and companies that made the list from others who did not was their frequent success with developing and installing new business models that expanded both profits and profitability in serving customers in a sustained way... In every case we examined, CEO leadership was a key ingredient (p. 244).

Overview

The study of leaders is challenging due to the individual nature, variety of competencies, non-equivalent roles, and different environments in which leaders operate. Although previous research has attempted to address several of these issues, to date there has been little or no attention to convergences and divergences in leaders' perceptions of their experience in public higher education.
versus private sector business contexts. The following chapter provides a description of the methodology of this study.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The search for meaning necessarily assumes a methodology within which research is conducted on the nature and the characteristics of the phenomenon. The approach is informed by the purpose, processes, and role of the researcher and constitutes a shared paradigm and orientation to research (Babbie, 2001; Creswell, 2003; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Glesne, 1999; Kuhn, 1996; Merriam, 1998). Qualitative research has as its underlying philosophical assumption the notion that "reality is constructed by individuals interacting with their social world" (Merriam, 1998, pg.6). The central focus is on the meanings and patterns of the phenomenon being studied and the individuals' perspectives and interpretations of their environment (Darlington & Scott, 2002; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Several foundational characteristics naturally result from this strategy. First, qualitative research is characterized by the insider's or "emic" perspective. Second, the natural setting is most often the site for the research as a result of the aforementioned characteristic. Third, the primary instrument for the collection and analysis of data is the researcher. Fourth, qualitative research uses an inductive approach that builds toward theories as opposed to testing existing theories. Fifth, research is emergent in the qualitative process and often requires
modification and change as the study progresses. And finally, the majority of the resulting data is rich and descriptive rather than quantitative in nature (Babbie, 2001; Creswsell, 2003; Glesne, 1999; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

The goal of qualitative research is to produce detailed context-bound generalizations of the phenomenon of study (House, 1988; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001; Miles & Huberman, 1994). As the focus of this research specifically addresses the contextual nature of individuals in leadership roles, qualitative research is the appropriate methodology. Lincoln & Guba (1985) discuss naturalistic investigation and the need to “detail the many specifics that give the context its unique flavor” as one of the purposes of qualitative research (p. 201). This approach is supported by House (1988), Dachler (1988), and other researchers in the book, Emerging Leadership Vistas, which chronicles the findings of an international symposium on leadership and managerial research, held in July, 1985.

Although researchers House and Dachler offer divergent opinions and perspectives on the state of leadership research, they both agree that there is a need to incorporate rigorous qualitative methodology into future research that deliberately takes into account social, political, and contextual factors in order to enhance and expand the study of leadership. House (1988) advocates the need for qualitative methods because it “allows the environment to teach us because we do not have an adequate framework, we do not have hypotheses, we do not have a clear idea as to what the critical variables are, and we have little ability to
measure them" (pgs. 258-259). Dachler (1988) adds that "leadership and management as concepts are meaningless outside the context of a social system" (p.270).

Design of the Study

Case studies represent a specific mode of interactive qualitative inquiry that is characterized by a bounded system as a unit of analysis (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2003). This approach is differentiated from other designs by the focus on a single phenomenon or "case" and its interaction with the natural context or environment in which it operates. Yin (2003) observes that this design is best suited to phenomena that are difficult, if not impossible, to study independently from their context, or when the focus of the research is, in fact, the "contextual conditions" of the phenomena (p.13).

As Stake (2000) indicates, case studies "are of value in refining theory and suggesting complexities for further investigation, as well as helping to establish limits of generalizability" (p.448). Case study inquiry can be both holistic, incorporating an examination of individuals in leadership roles, and intrinsic, seeking to provide insight into and refine the theoretical frameworks and previous research on leadership theories with regards to context (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1998).

This research used a multiple-case study strategy, a variant of single-case design, explicitly due to the comparative intent of the study. The logic of this
approach lies in the anticipated contrasting results for a foreseeable reason - the two different organizational environments of the participants (public versus private sector). Miles & Huberman (1994) discuss multiple-case strategy as a means to examine how complex practices vary under different conditions. Yin (2003) identifies this as "theoretical replication" (p.47). The multiple-case study design allows the researcher to replicate the protocol across cases and contexts in order to substantiate and enhance the external validity and conceptual stability of the findings (Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2003). Yin (2003) describes this process as the "literal" and "theoretical" replication of multiple-case study design. Literal replication addresses similar results across individual cases while theoretical replication is based on contrasting results across cases for expected reasons (Yin, 2003).

The chief purpose of this interpretive multiple case study design was to provide data and develop conceptual categories that assisted in the analysis, interpretation, and development of working hypotheses regarding the perceived impact of environment on individuals in leadership roles (Creswell, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 2000; Yin, 2003). Miles & Huberman (1994) report that the contrasts observed allow the researcher to "distinguish between cases on dimensions that are conceptually meaningful" with effects that are "much more powerful than a series of individual case studies over several years" (pp. 31-33).

The perceptions of the participants in this study are central to understanding and analyzing the impact of context, or organizational climate, on
leadership in the public higher education and private enterprise business sectors (Field & Abelson, 1982). James, Joyce, and Slocum (1988) emphasize that:

Attributing meaning to environmental stimuli is a product of cognitive information processing, and it is individuals, not organizations, that cognize. The basic unit of theory for meaning is the individual (p. 130).

It follows, then, that the perceptions of the leaders are the appropriate unit of measure in this study on the context of leadership (Babbie, 2001; Yin, 2003). In addition, as these individuals have held various management positions within their given sectors, the knowledge and experiences they have garnered along the way to achieving the highest level of leadership within their organizations offer a competent and sophisticated view of the sector in which they operate.

Pilot Case Study

A pilot study was conducted in March, 2005 with a state public higher education system chancellor who is also a successful and respected private sector entrepreneur. This practice is consistent with Darlington & Scott (2002), Merriam (1998), and Yin’s (2003) indications that participants should be identified based on their potential to contribute to the understanding and insight into the phenomenon. The chancellor holds degrees in both accounting and law, as well as a Doctor of Laws (L.L.D.), and was a teaching fellow at the University of Illinois law school. Prior to taking on the chancellorship, this individual founded and served as the chief executive officer of a major communications company, which owns and operates NBC and FOX affiliate television stations throughout the
western United States. The chancellor also has extensive experience in the banking industry as a founder of several large banks and as a chairman and member of several boards of directors.

As an active participant and supporter of higher education, the chancellor has donated hundreds of millions of dollars to several universities in the country, has served as a member of various Dean’s Advisory Councils, and has assisted with and paid for the construction of buildings on several college and university campuses. When the position of system chancellor became available due to the resignation of the previous chancellor, this individual took on the challenge of managing a system with four community colleges, one state college, two universities, one research institute, and over 100,000 students for a token salary of approximately $8,000.

The pilot study consisted of interview questions regarding the perceived differences in public versus private sector leadership. Data were analyzed through a simplified analytic induction process to find patterns and relationships to the phenomenon of study (Babbie, 2001; Merriam, 1998; Ryan & Bernard, 2000). This process was simplified in that it used only the pilot study as the test case to determine that there was support for the tentative explanation of context as a variable in leadership.

The findings of the pilot study offered two specific insights. First, the findings supported the use of the research questions as identified by the participants of the Fourth Women Presidents Summit. Second, the findings highlighted the need to select participants who do not own the majority interest in
their organizations. These findings are consistent with the purpose of a pilot study, as identified by Yin (2003), in that the case helped to refine the participant selection process and justify the conceptual framework.

Participant Selection

Based on the findings from the pilot study and the literature in the field, purposeful sampling was undertaken to identify three public research university presidents and three private enterprise business sector leaders as participants for the study. This non-probability selection process seeks to identify individuals for the proposed study who will best represent and contribute to the understanding of the phenomenon (Babbie, 2001; Creswell, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003). In addition, criterion and comparable case selection sampling strategies were employed to ensure that participants met specific relevant characteristics with regards to positional and organizational criteria (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Stake, 2000). Miles & Huberman (1994) cite these sampling strategies as a means to "increase confidence in analytical findings on the grounds of representativeness" (p.29).

The sampling frame is critical to multiple-case study design and pivotal to reliable and valid cross-case comparison (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2003). Using a criterion selection strategy, it was determined that the participants should be; a) female; b) hold the title of president, chancellor, CEO, or chairman of the board of their organization; c) have at least three years experience in the executive role of the organization;
and in the case of private enterprise business sector participants, d) not own a majority interest in their organization.

In view of the contextual nature of the multiple-case study design, a comparable case selection strategy was also employed. This strategy focused attention on the participants’ organizations and the determination that they a) be comparable in the number of employees and/or annual revenues; b) have similar competitive market positions within their respective industries; and c) have similar regionally located headquarters in the United States.

As a result of the selection strategies used, a variety of participants from a range of public research universities and private enterprise businesses were represented in the study. Three public research university leaders were identified; two with institutions located in major metropolitan areas and the other, with an eight-campus institution located in a rural area of the state. In addition, three private enterprise business sector leaders were identified. All three businesses have central offices located in large metropolitan areas. Two of the organizations are publicly traded corporations; one a specialty retailer and one a consumer packaged goods retailer. The third organization is a limited liability partnership financial services company.

Gaining Access

Gaining access to participants is often a problematic issue for researchers (Babbie, 2001; Fontana & Frey, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Stake, 2000; Yin, 2003). This particular aspect presented a significant challenge in this research.
study due to the level of authority, responsibility, and accountability associated with the leadership position in these large, complex public and private organizations. As well, time constraints, political sensitivity, positional visibility, and issues of confidentiality and anonymity are all important factors in any study however; they were critical components to gaining access in this specific research project (Darlington & Scott, 2002; Fontana & Frey, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998).

Written agreements addressed these issues and were central to both the research protocol and the relationship between researcher and study participants (Babbie, 2001; Darlington & Scott, 2002; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Stake, 2000; Yin, 2003). A letter of introduction to all potential participants was provided at the outset to introduce the researcher and to delineate the methods of data collection, the time frame for the study, and the risks and benefits of participation. In addition, information was included that specifically addressed the issues of confidentiality, anonymity, access to sensitive materials, and consent to voluntary participation.

Several strategies were used to gain access to the public research university presidents in this study. First, public research university presidents who participated in the Fourth Women Presidents' Summit were contacted by mail and through telephone calls to acquaint them with the study. A second method consisted of gaining access to participants through various personal contacts and at conferences associated with higher education. Finally, a "snowball" strategy was employed. This strategy is used to identify or nominate
cases of interest through individuals who have knowledge of or associations with other people who would qualify as study participants (Babbie, 2001; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Two strategies were employed to gain access to private enterprise business sector presidents. First, “snowball” sampling was once again used as various personal and professional contacts were asked to help identify and nominate individuals and gain access to potential participants who fit the stated criteria delineated in the participant selection section. As the potential study participants were identified and the means to access them determined, they were contacted either by telephone, email, or letter depending on the method deemed most appropriate by the researcher and the contact individual. At the same time, potential participants that met the stated criteria were also identified through a review of a broad range of national business articles and publications. These potential candidates were also contacted by telephone, email, or letter to acquaint them with the study and enlist their participation.

Data Collection

Primary data collection took place between June, 2005 and February, 2006 and consisted of open-ended, in-depth interviews with participants as well as document and archival record collection. Due to the constraints previously articulated with regard to the participants’ professional roles, observations were not undertaken. Due to these same constraints, the major portions of the interviews were conducted face-to-face; however, telephone and email follow-up
interviews were also used as necessitated by the needs and schedules of the participants (Darlington & Scott, 2002; Fontana & Frey, 2003).

Open-ended interviewing as a data collection method has been described as being flexible, emergent, iterative, insightful, interactive, and continuous (Babbie, 2001; Darlington & Scott, 2002; Fontana & Frey, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Yin, 2003). This procedure specifically addresses the intention of the researcher to pose exploratory questions that when answered, elicit and evoke subsequent questions, as opposed to inhibiting further inquiry. Lincoln & Guba (1985) discuss this type of naturalistic inquiry and the “interdeterminacy” between the researcher and the context/participant that allows for the design of the interview to “unfold, cascade, roll, [and] emerge” (pgs. 208-209).

In-depth interviewing as a research procedure has been described as an active meaning-making process that allows for the negotiation and sharing of understanding between the researcher and the participant (Creswell, 2003; Darlington & Scott, 2002; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Fontana & Frey, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Yin, 2003). Darlington & Scott (2002) add that this method of data collection is well suited to phenomena that cannot be directly observed and measured. In addition, they highlight the retrospective quality of in-depth interviewing that enables the researcher to gain insight into both the participants’ past and the participants’ “subsequent organization and understanding of their experience” (Kleinman, 1988, p.50). They refer to this as the participants’ perspective “presented in the context of lives as they are being lived” (Langness & Frank, 1981, p.50).
An interview protocol consisting of twenty questions was developed based on the issues identified and delineated in each of the seven spheres of influence, action, and responsibilities, by the participants of the Fourth Women Presidents' Summit (See Appendix I). Through the use of one-to-one interviews, the researcher attempted to capture the participants' perceptions "from the inside" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2003). In addition, the task was to explain the ways in which the participants within their contexts "come to understand, account for, take action, and otherwise manage their day-to-day situations" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 7). As such, the researcher was the primary instrument for data collection.

The interviews began with questions that addressed general information regarding the participants' educational and professional background. This is consistent with qualitative research techniques that seek to establish rapport and gain the trust of participants (Babbie, 2001, Merriam, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994). The researcher took the role of active listener and avoided personal opinions and 'real' conversations on the issues being discussed as advocated by Babbie (2001), Denzin & Lincoln (2003), Fontana & Frey (2000), and Merriam (1998).

All interviews were tape recorded and transcribed, however many nonverbal aspects of interviews could not be captured by audio recordings (Babbie, 2001; Fontana & Frey, 2003). Therefore, the researcher took extensive notes during the interview and included indications relating to the four basic modes of nonverbal communication as reported by Fontana & Frey (2003): a)
proxemic, use of interpersonal space; b) chronemics, pacing and spacing of speech patterns; c) kinesic, posture and body movements; d) paralinguistic, variations in voice and volume (p. 87). In addition, the researcher took “descriptive notes” of the setting and activities, and “reflective notes” concerning the impressions and personal thoughts of the researcher throughout the interviews (Creswell, 2003).

It is recognized that telephone and electronic interviews have many limitations, including the lack of important nonverbal communications and the potential for responses by informants other than the participants in the case of email in particular (Fontana & Frey, 2003). As a result, these methods of data collection were kept to a minimum.

Documents

Pertinent documents and archival records relating to each of the participants were collected. This method of data collection allows for broad coverage over an extensive period of time, events, and settings and is an unobtrusive means with which to gather information. In addition, documents and archival records provide a technique to corroborate and/or contradict findings and a strategy with which to gain further insight into the phenomenon being studied (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003). Multiple sources of information help to provide a more comprehensive perspective of the individual cases and their context and enhance the process of understanding and meaning-making (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Fontana & Frey, 2003; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003).
Data Analysis

Data analysis of qualitative interviews focuses on words and how they are assembled, organized, contrasted, and compared as semiotic segments, themes, and patterns (Babbie, 2001; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman 1994; Stake, 2000; Yin, 2003). Stake (2000) writes that “qualitative case researchers orient to complexities connecting ordinary practice in natural habitats to the abstractions and concerns of diverse academic disciplines” (p. 440). To this end, the analysis of data in qualitative research must be competent, methodological, and thorough in the attempt to gain insight and understanding from both the individual cases and across multiple case studies.

Miles & Huberman (1994) view qualitative data analysis as “three concurrent flows of activity” comprised of “data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification” (p. 10). This process represents a continuous, interactive, and cyclical procedure, which in coordination with on-going data collection, is designed to provide a fluid and well-documented approach to linking relationships and social reality to explanatory patterns. Data reduction initiates structure in the analysis process as data are coded, summarized, clustered, and partitioned into emerging themes and patterns. From there, the researcher displays the data in meaningful and organized formats (i.e., charts, graphs, matrices) that foster and facilitate conclusion drawing and verification. As tentative conclusions are formed, they are verified with participants, documentation, and archival records for “their plausibility, their sturdiness, [and] their ‘confirmability’ – that is, their validity” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 11).
Qualitative data analysis incorporates a variety of schemes that range from simple “emic” and “etic” frames to more developed descriptive and interpretive analyses with expanded domains. Lofland & Lofland (1995) identify six frames of data analysis leading to the identification and presentation of patterns through the search for: frequencies, magnitudes, structures, processes, causes, and consequences. Researchers Bogdan & Biklen (1992) offer a ten-level scheme of categorization and segment coding that consists of: setting/context, definition of the situation, perspectives, ways of thinking about people and objects, process, activities, events, strategies, relationships and social structure, and methods.

As important as the coding scheme is the timing of the coding procedure in the study. Although the previously mentioned approaches of Lofland & Lofland and Bogdan & Biklen render structure throughout the preliminary and secondary phases of analysis, Lincoln & Guba (1985) identify a coding procedure specifically for use in the later stages of the analysis. The operations they delineate consist of: “filing in” with new codes and reconstructions, the “extension” of previously coded materials to new themes or constructs, the “bridging” of new configurations or new relationships, and the “surfacing” of new categories in the analysis. This process continues as knowledge is refined, deciphered, and organized into a conceptual structure (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

The multiple-case study design of this research necessarily assumed that multiple techniques of data analysis be performed and presented in order to fully
examine the issue of context as a variable in leadership. Creswell (1998) identifies a within-case and cross-case analysis strategy. At the forefront of the within-case approach are the detailed individual case descriptions, coding, and themes. As these are individually developed and defined, the analysis is expanded to thematic analyses across all of the cases in the research study resulting in a broad cross-case analysis that builds additional layers and levels of "confirmability" and validity to the analysis and the findings.

Researchers Lincoln & Guba (1985) and Merriam (1998) advocate the constant comparative method developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) as a data analysis strategy that is consistent with the concept-building nature of qualitative research. This approach, as the name suggests, is a process of comparing data within and among cases on a continual basis throughout the data collection and data analysis phases of the research. Lincoln & Guba (1985) highlight two important "caveats" related to the use of Glaser and Strauss's constant comparative method in naturalistic inquiry. First, this method was instigated "to enable prediction and explanation of behavior," hence theory generating. Second, the method is "not simply a means for processing data," but rather "a means for deriving (grounding) theory" (p. 339).

While Lincoln & Guba (1985) acknowledge the caveats to Glaser & Strauss's (1967) original strategy, they add their "enthusiastic endorsement of the notion of a 'continuously developing process' in which each stage provides guidance for the next throughout the inquiry" (p. 340). The constant comparative process consists of a) a comparison of incidents [coding] resulting in both
researcher-constructed and emergent categories; b) the integration of categories and their properties [into domains]; c) "delimiting the theory" [themes]; and d) writing/constructing the theory [emergent explanations] (pgs. 339-351). It is this strategy of simultaneous data collection and analysis that was used in this multiple-case design research study.

The seven spheres of influence delineated in *The Widening Gyre: Lessons from the American Council on Education's Fourth Women Presidents Summit* (Phillips & Van Ummersen, 2003) initially informed the interview questions with the participants in this study. However, as the interviews proceeded and data were analyzed, additional questions were added to the protocol consistent with the constant comparative method.

Documents and archival records were analyzed using content analysis strategy. In this approach, the researcher focuses on applying codes and reducing textual material into "units of meaning." The researcher then quantifies the "units of meaning" and analyzes the data for frequencies, patterns, and themes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Ryan & Bernard, 2000; Silverman, 2003). Content analysis assumes that the categorization scheme is sufficiently developed prior to analysis, therefore the collected documents and archival records were analyzed after the interviews and their associated data coding had taken place (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Ryan & Bernard, 2000; Silverman, 2003). Content analysis is an extremely useful analytic means of identifying both the socially organized and subtle meanings of communicated data (Ryan & Bernard, 2000; Silverman, 2003).
Case-oriented and variable-oriented approaches to data analysis were also used to code and analyze the findings of the study. Miles & Huberman (1994) explain that through these processes the researcher looks "for underlying similarities and constant associations" as well as "broad patterns found across a wide variety of cases" (p. 174). This on-going categorization and analysis resulted in overarching themes and domains that emerged to explain the leaders’ perceptions of the leadership experience within their organizational context.

Over the course of the data analysis and interpretation phase of this study, the researcher moved from a linear approach, in which the process was methodical, direct, and sequential using the analytical frameworks, to a more grounded theory approach in which emergent themes and domains were identified. This was due to the fact that data were left unexplained by the analytical frameworks. This method is consistent with those advocated by Glaser & Strauss (1967), Lincoln & Guba (1985), and Miles & Huberman (1994). Table 3.1 provides a summary of the design of this research study.

Data Display

The visual display of data assists and facilitates the data collection and data analysis procedures. Miles & Huberman (1994) present 27 different matrices and discuss their applications and effectiveness in helping to make "sense of things in an integrative way" (p. 237). They indicate that data displays are central to the processes of developing coherent descriptions, deriving good explanations, and better theories (p. 237). In their analysis of visual data
displays, Miles & Huberman highlight the need for both variable-oriented and process-oriented strategies as complimentary approaches to matrix building. The variable-oriented approach focuses on coding small segments of data, retrieving them, and assessing them for similarities and conceptual patterns, while the process-oriented approach centers on the setting, sequences, chronologies, and "connections to the big picture" (p. 147). The combination of the two orientations significantly increases the quality of the data display and the overall analysis.

The process of data display helps to guide both the researcher and the reader through the logic of the analysis and to substantiate several principles that underlie good quality social science research. Although various models and methods exist for the visual display and analysis of data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merrian, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2003), this researcher initially reduced and organized the findings into "content-analytic summary tables" (p. 183) of both the interview and the organizational data (Miles & Huberman, 1994).
Table 3.1 Research Study Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process of Analysis:</th>
<th>Informed By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question:</strong> Does the environment in which leaders operate affect their perceptions of the leadership experience?</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants:</strong> Presidents, CEOs, Chancellors, Chairmen of the Board</td>
<td>Criteria of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology:</strong> Multiple case studies across sectors</td>
<td>Exploratory nature of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Protocol:</strong> Questions derived from issues and concerns that were identified and articulated by female higher education leaders</td>
<td>ACE Fourth Women President’s Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Presentation Dimensions:</strong> At the Core: Individual Values, The Intersection of Individual and Organization, and The Intersection of Organization and Public Domain</td>
<td>Collapsed spheres of influence identified in The Widening Gyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation through the Analytical Frameworks:</strong></td>
<td>Process of categorization, interpretation, and analysis of data from participants, documents, and archival records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Person-Organization Fit Theories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Schneider’s A-S-A Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mintzberg’s Organizational Configurations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergent Themes and Domains:</strong></td>
<td>Grounded theory approach to analysis and interpretation as a result of data left unexplained by analytical frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engagement, Productivity, and Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal, Positional, and Public nature of leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This type of matrix allows the researcher to condense and standardize the data, while retaining direct quotations and summary phrases. In addition, this format assists in the identification of gaps in data and highlights both the range of variables and the similarities/differences across the individual cases. From this point, an additional analysis was instigated using the "cross-case construct table" (p. 184-186) as suggested by Miles & Huberman (1994). The use of this analytical format promotes the understanding and interpretation of the core concepts and the essential nature of the variables across cases.

The researcher interpreted the data within the analytical frameworks of the study and found that distinct patterns were inconsistent within sectors and across divides. As a result, through on-going analysis and categorization, the researcher developed an alternative framework and identified three overarching themes and three domains within each theme. The researcher coded three-by-three case-ordered matrices and charted componential analysis matrices for each of the participants in the study based on the themes and domains. The findings were then summarized individually and across all cases and plotted in both individual componential matrix profiles and in a mega-matrix componential profile for all of the participants. Miles & Huberman (1994) indicate that matrices use multiple tactics. The most frequent are "noting patterns, themes; making contrasts, comparisons; clustering; and counting" (p. 243). The componential matrix profiles were compared and contrasted and are discussed in Chapter Fourteen.
Trustworthiness

Due to the humanistic nature of qualitative research and the significance of the researcher as the primary instrument for data collection, it is important to address the issue of trustworthiness. In quantitative research designs, validity and reliability are the key indicators of the trustworthiness of the study. In contrast, qualitative researchers have proposed different and more appropriate measures of these same criteria. Janesick (2000), Lincoln & Guba (1985), and Miles & Huberman (1994) all advocate "credibility" as opposed to internal validity, "transferability" as opposed to external validity, and "dependability" as opposed to reliability.

Several techniques were operationalized specifically for the purpose of safeguarding the credibility (as opposed to the internal validity) of this study (Creswell, 2003; Janesick, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2003). First, the researcher used member checks with the participants to verify/correct/challenge both the data and the interpretations. As well, debriefings by peers, whereby the researcher systematically addresses the design, findings, and interpretations with professional peers was done. Finally, triangulation of the data was carried out to strengthen the study. This technique relies on the use of multiple sources of data collection and a variety of cross-checking measures to assess agreement of the interpretations and findings in the study. Although prolonged engagement and persistent observation provide an additional means to insure credibility, this strategy was not used due to the professional and positional roles of the study participants.
The transferability (as opposed to the external validity) of the findings in qualitative research is dependent upon the thick description of the study. In a multiple-case study design this includes descriptive data with precise quotations, detailed statements by the researcher and the participant, corroborating documents, and a wide range of supporting information and evidence. The researcher in this study made every attempt to see that this was done and attention was paid to the details in the individual cases and across the cases.

The dependability of the study (as opposed to the reliability) focuses on "whether the process of the study is consistent, reasonably stable over time, and across researcher and methods" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 278). In order to assess this many researchers, including Lincoln & Guba (1985), advocate the use of an inquiry audit (p. 317-318). This technique relies upon a professional peer ("auditor"), who through the research protocol first examines the process of the study to in order to confirm the acceptability and dependability of the study. The auditor then analyzes the "product – the data, findings, interpretations, and recommendations – and attests that it is supported by data and is internally coherent" (p. 318). The dissertation chair and committee members took the role of the auditor in this study and certified the dependability of the design, the findings, and the interpretations.

As previously indicated, the researcher in this study used both a linear approach to data analysis and interpretation and a more grounded theory approach. The consistency of the results of this study using both of the methods significantly reinforces the trustworthiness of the findings as well as the
processes and products of the research. In addition, the two approaches are supported by the foundational bases of qualitative research, which stress inductive reasoning that builds toward new theories, as opposed to testing existing theories, focus on detail-rich context-bound generalizations, and underscore the emergent processes and nature of qualitative methods (Babbie, 2001; Creswell, 2003; Glesne, 1999; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Ethics, Accuracy, and Confidentiality

Ethical issues and concerns are critical aspects of research involving human subjects (Creswell, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994). It is important that participation is voluntary and that the participants are made aware of the nature of the study, the procedures, risks and benefits, and informed that they have the right to withdraw at any time. As previously mentioned, this information was provided to the participants along with a project participation consent form which was signed by the researcher and the participant, with copies provided for both.

Accuracy in data analysis, interpretation, and reporting is an additional critical aspect of research (Creswell, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Lincoln & Guba, in Merriam (1998), caution that case studies "can oversimplify or exaggerate a situation, leading the reader to erroneous conclusions about the actual state of affairs" (p. 42). Several strategies addressed previously were used to insure accuracy in this research.
study and include member-checking, debriefing, and triangulation of the findings. In addition, the researcher sought permission to reproduce any material generated by authors not directly associated with this study.

Stake (2000) indicates that case studies “often deal with matters of public interest but for which there is neither public nor scholarly ‘right to know’” (p. 447). He adds that “‘scholarly intent’ does not constitute license to invade the privacy of others” (Stake, 2000, p. 447). As such, it is important to protect the privacy of the participants from “exposure and embarrassment, as well as loss of standing, employment, and self-esteem” (Stake, 2000, p.447).

Due to the prominent roles and positions of the participants in this study, several steps were taken to protect the privacy of the participants and the confidentiality of the information gathered throughout the study. First, participants were afforded the option of using pseudonyms in place of their real identities. Second, participants were allowed to require the use of disguised organizational identifications in place of the actual entity names. And finally, private information directly attributable to the organizational purposes and/or entities of the participants was not published without the expressed written consent of the participants.

Overview

The research design and methodology that guided this research were discussed in this chapter. In the following chapters, the results of the interviews with the private enterprise business sector and public research university leaders, as well as the cross case and cross sector analyses, are presented.
facilitate the interpretation of data, the analytical frameworks that informed the study are purposefully examined and discussed in Chapter Thirteen.
CHAPTER 4

JENNIFER HANLEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD/CEO, CALLIOPE KIDS

Introduction

Jennifer Hanley states that “creativity is a driving force” in her life and describes herself as “the most reluctant CEO you’ve ever met in your life,” in part because she never aspired to the position as a goal and nothing in her background prepared her for it. She holds a Bachelors degree in Art History and the majority of her career has been driven by her love of fashion design. She has spent more than 20 years working in the retail sector, which includes numerous senior design, merchandising, and operational roles with some of the more prominent retailers in the clothing industry.

Hanley exudes boundless energy and passion for her work. It is easy to get caught up in her enthusiasm as she speaks and operates at breakneck speed and broadly uses humor and witticism in her easy-going repartee. She boldly admits to being very “low-tech,” turning on her cell phone only when she needs to make a call, and goes so far as to label herself “technology-phobic.” She prefers not to dress “in dark suits and the whole CEO thing” and is more likely to be found wearing bold or bright colors and comfortable clothes. When she’s not working, Hanley puts her creative forces to use remodeling old houses.
Hanley initially joined Calliope Kids in the early 1990s as Director of Design and Merchandising and then left to take a position with another company. Several years and a year-long hiatus later, she came back to Calliope Kids in 1999 as the Vice President of Design. Hanley held progressively more challenging and responsible roles in the company including Senior Vice President of Merchandising and Design, General Merchandise Manager, and President before becoming the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the organization.

Calliope Kids is a publicly traded corporation that was first incorporated in 1979. After the organization narrowly avoided a bankruptcy filing in 2000, Hanley took on the position of CEO in 2001 and was made Chairman of the Board of Directors/CEO in 2002. When she began, Calliope Kids had one brand. Today, Calliope Kids is very profitable and growing. The company has four brands, more than 648 stores in the United States and Canada, and over 500 franchisee-operated centers. Their stores in the United Kingdom were recently closed due to poor financial performance. Calliope Kids has approximately 3,878 full-time equivalent employees and sales for the fifty-two weeks ending January 29, 2005 of $583.2 million.

Calliope Kids' corporate strategy focuses on the strong brand recognition they enjoy in their highly competitive sector, an emphasis on design and differentiation, and attention to their loyal customer base. In her keynote address at a major National Retail Federation conference, Hanley stated that the company's goal is to establish a strong operational foundation for multiple concepts with diverse selling channels ensuring a seamless customer experience.
experience. In addition, she indicated that Calliope Kids is committed to developing a lean and nimble structure as it grows its new brands. Both Hanley and the organization as a whole are very clear about strategy, consistent operational platforms across divisions, the "non-negotiables" in their business, and a design-driven approach to innovation. Calliope Kids is not afraid to retrench if change is necessary and has done so in several areas under Hanley’s leadership.

Hanley describes Calliope Kids as entrepreneurial at the core with a strong operating base that encourages “creative risk takers.” She sees a culture of innovation that is the result of the on-going attention to product design, a focus on the consumer as an individual, and a synergy between divisions that encourages an emotional connection to the brand. This translates into a business approach that optimizes a customer base that moves back and forth between brands and matches data-driven decisions to identified opportunities.

When speaking about leadership at this same conference, Hanley emphasized having a vision for Calliope Kids and “living it.” This includes having high standards, checking for understanding, and encouraging authenticity and creativity with everyone in the organization. She believes that it is important to “find great people and give them lots of responsibility” and “love them – they’re great.” Hanley believes that the success of Calliope Kids is due in large part to a corporate culture that facilitates their work as a team. Hanley is the first female president, CEO, and Chairman of the Board of Directors/CEO of Calliope Kids. She is currently not married, has no children, and is in her forties.
At the Core: Individual Values

Hanley identifies authenticity and "the ability to be [myself] in the work environment" as the important core value that she brings to her leadership. She adds that "with that comes respect and it comes with accountability – both sides of that." She also emphasized the importance of creativity in all aspects of both her personal and professional life and the fact that she sees "creativity; that ability in every single person." To illustrate the point and prove that in fact this is the case, she gives the example of handing the members of her management team big white sheets of paper at the beginning of a strategy meeting and saying "Okay, let's start with this!" She then sat back and watched them "become comfortable with that process," which is a core component of both Calliope Kids corporate culture and her leadership.

The "synergy of art and science" is one of the "most powerful" ideas with which Hanley works. When discussing this point she states, "I have a very scientific aspect to me and a very creative aspect, and I see that they work very well for me." She recognizes these same facets in other people and acknowledges that the balance of the two is different for each individual. Hanley, in fact, credits the President of Calliope Kids with a more analytical approach that compliments her often artistic approach to the business. The result is "a great working relationship."

Hanley asserts the importance of "not taking yourself too seriously," which translates into an atmosphere within Calliope Kids that says "check-your-ego-at-the-door" and "remember to laugh." She emphasizes that it is vital for everyone
to bring their true personality with them to their positions - that authenticity - but that there is no room for the "super ego aspects to be there." Her humor tempers her strong drive and probably her own ego. As well, she doesn't take herself too seriously and tries to keep a healthy perspective of her own role in the organization. She states,

It's great to run a business, it's great to be successful, you're going to have ups and you're going to have downs. And when you're down, you've got to rally yourself to get back up and when you're up, you have to be not too full of yourself to think you're a genius. And I think that kind of approach of, this is good; I'm enjoying this but it's not going to last forever and when it's bad, this is bad; and I'm not enjoying this and it's not going to last forever, [gives you] perspective.

Hanley readily admits that "she doesn't follow the crowd." She talks about a very critical learning moment when she first took the job of CEO and felt that she "was going to have to do it the CEO way;" "act like a CEO" and "speak like a CEO." She remembers thinking, "It'll kill me!" It was at this juncture, early on in her tenure as CEO, that she became determined to lead in a manner that reflected her own values and style. As a result, she has been "rewarded so much for that individualism."

Hanley sees herself as "very demanding" and "very fast-[paced]" at work, so she relies on the head of Human Resources as both "a great resource" and as someone "who can help get [the employees] grounded again" when they are
feeling "swept away" by her pace. She talks about her relationship with the head of Human Resources and states, "I couldn't do this without a few people in the company, and she's one of them."

There were no factors that motivated Hanley to seek the leadership position, and in fact she often feels that she is "a reluctant place holder." However, her intense passion for Calliope Kids, its employees, and their accomplishments is abundantly clear and at times, as she indicates, "I get all choked up when I talk about it." She credits the chairman emeritus of Calliope Kids with taking a "tremendous interest" in her work and her role in the organization, and with being a great mentor to her.

The Intersection of Individual and Organization

Hanley believes that "the most important thing is to be very clear what the vision of the company is and to check for understanding and compliance" in order to be successful in her particular leadership role. There are "certain people" and under certain conditions where "I make a conscious decision that ... I'm going to let a few things slide [for a while] and allow [them to] behave outside of that ... because the business need is such, that it is going to get me where I need to go" and achieve the projected results for the company. However, although she states that "you can't be a prima donna about your values ... and it's not one size fits all, all of the time," a clear vision, adherence to corporate strategy, and consistency are central to her leadership at Calliope Kids.
Hanley sees the greatest challenge to this leadership position as an understanding of self, which encompasses a realistic assessment of both personal strengths and weaknesses. With regards to leaders and leadership, she explains that

[Leaders] have to know themselves completely. They have to know what drives them, what they're afraid of, what they're great at, what they're terrible at, and to be completely honest with themselves. I think that is the hardest thing and I think the best leaders are those people who know themselves the best.

Hanley indicates that employees who allow their individual egos to take precedence and priority over the organizational goals, objectives, and accomplishments of Calliope Kids pose the most difficult internal constraint to her leadership. She explains this further stating,

The hardest thing is when I have these people who think they're very successful, and sometimes being successful does that because [they think to themselves] 'I have all this success and I'm obviously doing everything right, and I, I, I,' and then that rationalizes bad behavior because 'I'm so good.' The ego creeps back in.

From her perspective, the list of external constraints that impact the organization and her ability to lead Calliope Kids is long and highlighted by her belief that "there are very clear x's and o's and it's analysis, and that's all that matters. There's no innovation, there's no creativity, there's no vision; it's very cut
and dry." Hanley lists the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, lawyers, accountants, Wall Street, and shareholders among these constraints and believes that, in the financial community, the pervasive attitude is "What have you done for me lately?" She adds, "I try very hard not to let that completely impact me, but we're so constrained by external perspective. That's probably been harder than anything."

Hanley states that although the board is "very nice" to her and recognizes the value that she brings to Calliope Kids, her job performance is evaluated based on the company's earnings. When asked to identify one thing that she would change about her job she responded with, "I wouldn't work as much."

Hanley admits that the worst decision she made was in "hanging on to people who weren't on the [same] page too long." She adds,

You almost learn to just cut bait [and say] 'You're a good person, you're fabulous, it's just not a good match for you. There are lots of matches out there; this just isn't one of them.'

Her best decision was in "going back to being myself," but interestingly enough she states, "the biggest surprise about being a leader [was] that people want to be led ... they want to keep their head down and they just want to follow."

The environment in which Calliope Kids operates is highly competitive, requires a substantial commitment of resources, is sensitive to economic conditions that impact consumer spending and seasonal consumer spending patterns, and can be impacted by changes in national regulations, customs delays, and foreign trade. However, labor laws and ethical issues associated with those laws have the potential to dramatically and adversely impact both the
company's sales and their reputation in a very public way. Hanley addresses this issue with respect to Calliope Kids' suppliers,

We have a no exceptions policy when we go to factories, we check to make sure they have toilet paper in the bathrooms, we check ages ... I mean we have no exceptions and if they're missing, what we consider a no exception, they're out immediately. Pack everything and we're out. And we're very diligent about that.

Hanley adds that the “no exceptions” policy is one of the “non-negotiables” within the company and that any kind of creativity and/or innovation that is aimed at circumventing “non-negotiables” is not tolerated.

Her vision of the organization has at its core, customers and stakeholder value resulting from attention to quality, creativity, and innovation by every member of the company’s team. A focus on the customer truly drives Hanley’s vision and Calliope Kids as a whole, and is at the heart of its success. She explains, "Never forget who your customer is and never take your customer for granted." She stresses the importance of “protecting your brand at all costs” and strives for authenticity by keeping the company true to its identity and ideas, rather than by trying to mimic and match competitors. The emphasis on customers and authenticity is central to the corporate philosophy as Calliope Kids incorporates customer suggestions into the product designs in an effort to continually exceed the expectations of their customers. This customer input is at the nexus of the company’s vision to become “the most respected specialty
retailer in the world by embracing and encouraging innovation in all that [they] do.”

Hanley acknowledges that she is not good at dealing with conflict in the organization and hates business politics; “I shut down. I avoid it.” Instead she calls on her head of Human Resources for assistance stating, “[she’s] great at it and I’m not, and so…” But ask Hanley how she deals with a crisis, and she is quick to respond, “You get the players all together, you come up with a game plan, and you execute to it. It’s very cut and dry.”

On the subject of bringing her organization to change, Hanley emphasizes that there is no “point of change” and believes there is a misconception that “change is an event.” From her perspective, change is constant. She adds,

What I think is critical though, is communication. And, I think that it isn’t about communicating change, it’s communicating ‘here’s where we’re going.’ I’ll say ‘Here’s where we’re going, boom, boom, boom. Okay, this isn’t working very well so we’re going to slightly shift in this direction; we’re not going to throw it all away, we’re not going to turn 180 degrees’. I explain it to [the employees] in those terms and they’re like, ‘Okay, I get it’ and there’s a rational basis to it.

Hanley indicates that she is able to operate this way because she trusts her intuition, and in fact, one of the corporate values is to “honor the intuitive process.” This translates into: “If it doesn’t feel right, it’s not right; there’s something wrong with it, dig into it and figure out why it doesn’t feel right.”
From Hanley’s perspective, equity is more important than efficiency at Calliope Kids and when asked how this is encouraged/facilitated within the organization, Hanley answers, “You just live it.” As evidence she offers the following: “We [discern this in] a candidate who’s coming in for an interview, [by evaluating] how they treated the receptionist; simple things. I can tell you that it goes all the way down the ladder.”

The Intersection of Organization and the Public Domain

Equity and an emphasis on the individual employee and what he/she brings to the organization is also apparent in how Hanley tries to achieve balance between public and private good in the company. In this regard, Calliope Kids promotes a two-pronged approach. The first is a corporate-wide sponsorship of the March of Dimes. Every member of the organization is encouraged to take part in raising funds for this charity with the understanding, “if you don’t it fine; if you do it, fine.”

The creativity and innovation that is so entrenched in Calliope Kids’ culture is also evidenced in the breadth and depth of services and activities that the employees undertake to support the March of Dimes. Hanley gives the example, We have a guy who sets up a piano in the café and does lounge singing and his tips all go to March of Dimes. I buy raffle tickets, I buy [the] baby booties they knit and sell … departments try to outdo each other creatively.
Hanley encourages the endeavors and the camaraderie with the challenge that she will cook dinner for “whoever brings us the most money.” Calliope Kids is one of the largest corporate sponsors of the March of Dimes and Hanley comments on the enthusiasm of the company employees and states, “It’s just the most amazing thing I’ve ever seen, because it’s not forced.”

The second approach used to achieve balance between public and private good is that Calliope Kids will support any charity that any member of the company wishes to support. “If you want to do the AIDS Walk, we’ll support the AIDS Walk. If you want to do stuff for the library, we’ll support stuff for the library.” Hanley discusses how this same strategy is applied with regards to professional development for employees in the organization. Although the company does not do training courses per se, the attitude is “If you need a class, come tell us what class you need and we’ll get it for you.” Hanley indicates that this approach is a reflection of the broader corporate attitude that “you are in charge of your own destiny.” She believes that forcing people is not the best way to get things accomplished and gives this analogy,

You know you can lead horses to water, but you can’t make them drink. And unless they’re thirsty, they don’t want to drink. I let them get thirsty [and] go find the water.

Due to the location of Calliope Kids’ corporate office, balancing social and cultural issues in the organization “is not even in the conversation. It’s not that interesting … it’s you know, ‘de rigueur’ to be diverse and accepting and all [of] that. It just is.” Having corporate offices in this location, however, also results in a
great deal of state legislative mandates and judicial decisions that impact the organization "all the time; it's a lot."

Although Hanley believes that corporations in general should be more civically and socially involved, she thinks that "it is hard." This does not mean, however, that the public has no role/impact on the organization. To the contrary, the customer loyalty, dedication, and enthusiasm could almost qualify many members of their customer base as "fanatics." Their customers are extremely interactive with both the organization and with other customers who share their commitment to the brand. For example, there are more than 300 Yahoo groups dedicated to Calliope Kids; some of whom "take a vow that when they sell their outgrown [company] clothing on eBay - which they can do, because the clothes are indestructible - they'll spend all the money from the sale back at our stores."

Hanley believes that positive public relations associated with Calliope Kids in the press and in the media "is a good thing," but she is "very cautious about the amount of [publicity]." She personally receives a great number of requests to be profiled and/or interviewed, in part she believes, because she is a female in this high profile leadership position. Hanley limits the amount of exposure she receives and insists that "I really try hard for it not to happen." She also admits that she "is a terrible networker" and emphasizes the point by exclaiming, "I'm pathetic. I hate it."

Keeping a low profile also extends to Hanley taking a public stand on controversial national or international issues and policies. She states,
I don't think that it's a good idea to put my personal position as representative of the company. I think I can deal with the softer stuff; people, the art versus science, personal accountability, [and] authenticity. But in terms of labor unions or whether I think [the governor] should fill in the potholes, or that sort of thing, I don't think it's my place to be political.

Leading in Business versus Higher Education

Hanley supports and works with the Retail Management Institute at a private nationally-ranked university. When asked about her experience working with people in higher education versus the corporate business environment, she indicates that she has a great deal of respect for the people and the program, but adds,

I just don't understand how they think. I really, really, really don't. Like, what's your objective? What do you want the school to look like? What do you want your organization [to look like]? What do you want your students to feel when they enter? Like how to touch all the more brand issues, and then at the same time, what do you want your objective to be? How many students do you want? What kind of national recognition do you want? What is your goal? I can't get it out of them. It's very amazing to me. My experience is that it is just so logical. The [higher education people she works with] don't think the [students] are clients. They have a very different lifestyle there: publish or perish.
Advice to Others Seeking This Level of Leadership

Hanley gives this advice to others who aspire to her level of leadership:

My advice/recommendation would be to know yourself really well, to spend some time figuring that out - what's important to you - really check your ego, find the very best people you can possibly work with, and take it easy. Relax.

With regards to other women seeking leadership roles she adds, "You don't have to be power chick. You really don't. You don't have to act like a guy to be a powerful person."
CHAPTER 5

LINDSAY HARTWELL, PRESIDENT, CREIGHTON FOODS

Introduction

Lindsay Hartwell states, "I have never in my entire life done anything for the money." She is somewhat of a novelty in Corporate America today as she started her career in marketing and stayed with the same organization for 25 years before retiring at the age of fifty. She was also the company's first female president. Her secret as she explains it is:

Find yourself a field you can love. You're not going to love it all the time. You're going to have plenty of days when you just hate it. But if you find yourself something where, for those few transcendent moments, you can't believe two hours just went by, that means you'll love what you do. And when you love what you do, you are infinitely more powerful than if you merely like it, or if you're only doing it for the money.

It is readily apparent in speaking with Hartwell that she is very energetic and handles life with an even handed measure of wisdom and inspiration, often adding a large dose of insightful humor to the mix. She has a friendly, plain-speaking, and vibrant nature that is instantly captivating and disarming; like being with your best friend. However, this best friend has an intense business savvy, a wealth of experience as an S&P 500 division company president, and is a
recognized marketing genius. Interestingly, she never set out to achieve any of this.

After graduating with a Bachelor of Science degree in Economics, Hartwell landed a job as a Reinsurance Accounting Manager for a major insurance company. She began taking evening graduate courses at a prestigious local university while working, and after three years, she received a Masters Degree in Business Administration. Feeling that the insurance company did not provide a supportive environment for women, she left the organization and began a new career as a Marketing Assistant with Creighton Foods.

Creighton Corporation is a 105-year old publicly traded company. The organization was restructured in 1970 into four separate and distinct business units. Creighton Foods had offices in the corporate headquarters, as well as in six food plants. Hartwell successfully climbed the corporate ladder at Creighton Corporation and held various positions across several corporate divisions as Brand Manager, Marketing Director, and two different Vice Presidencies before becoming President of the $300 million Snack Foods division for two years, and then the first female President of the $1.8 billion, 4,500-employee Creighton Foods division for eight years. Among other things, she is credited with the invention of an extremely successful and lucrative pet food product, tripling sales in the Wholesome Variety division from $33 million to $99 million in just one year, expanding corporate production capacity, and delivering record operating income, sales, and market shares across several categories. Her reputation as
an innovator in the industry is well respected along with her proven abilities in creating new businesses and identifying opportunities for turnaround businesses.

Hartwell attributes her 25 year tenure with the organization to a unique corporate culture that encouraged collaboration, innovation, and a “family” atmosphere. She states,

Had I not worked at [Creighton Foods], I couldn’t have lasted in Fortune 500 America for twenty-five years. I would’ve been one of the hundreds of well-educated women who put up with it for about fifteen years, and then blow out and go start their own business.

At the pinnacle of Hartwell’s tenure as president of Creighton Foods, the Creighton Corporation was considered small within the industry with approximately $5 billion dollars in sales and 11,000 employees. It was a prime target for acquisition with successful divisions generating tremendous earnings growth and cash flow in a proven cross functional matrix organizational setting. Hence, in 2001 the organization was acquired by one of the world’s largest consumer packaged goods companies. Hartwell stayed on as President for three years before retiring and explains that, although the corporate culture was much different, she remained to “hold the door open until everybody from [Creighton] had walked through” and was either settled in their new roles or had left the corporation to seek employment elsewhere.

For Hartwell, the timing of her resignation was appropriate as she was turning 50 and happily married to an entrepreneur. In addition, she was celebrating 25 years with the same organization and was in a lucrative financial
position after the acquisition due to Creighton's employee stock option plan. With
the acquisition of Creighton Corporation, the new organization posted almost $30
billion in net sales revenue in 2004, had 130,000 employees, and maintained a
very hierarchical and "functional silo" approach to organization.

At the Core: Individual Values

Hartwell describes her identity by discussing the three things that mean
the most to her. Aligned with her father's version of duty, honor, and country, she
states,

Number one would be service to others; number two would be, from those
to whom much is given, much is expected; and number three is, it's all
about delight. It's all about enjoying your gifts and sharing them with other
people, and so it all kind of boils down to you got to love the people in your
life, you got to love your work, and you got to put that to use for the people
around you.

Although she gained much of this insight from her upbringing, many of the
same principles were perpetuated throughout the organization where one of the
defining words of leadership was "obligation." She emphasizes that phrases like
"passion for business," were pervasive when she was president and she
remembers talking "incessantly about leadership and service to others" in her
role. She believes that the relatively small size of Creighton Foods and the CEO
of Creighton Corporation, who was a fifth generation member of the founding
family, enabled this corporate culture. As such, Hartwell believes that it was "a
privilege" to have the position of president and be lucky enough to find a company that had similar values.

"Intellectual honesty, a sense of humor, and sheer determination" are the core values that Hartwell brings to her leadership. She expounds on this saying, "intellectual honesty is just size up the situation; don’t sugarcoat it." She explains that this is not about assigning blame, but rather about being realistic. She adds that a sense of humor is important "because there are plenty of things in business that will frighten you" and humor provides a coping mechanism for dealing with menacing issues that need to be cut "down to size" - like a drought that tripled the organization’s commodity costs and severely endangered one year’s business results. Finally, she believes that sheer determination and "doing something, always beats doing nothing." She emphasizes that "the dynamics of business are such that competitively, you’ll just get washed away" if you don’t take some action. She explains,

Sometimes you can look far down the road and you have a magnificent plan in your head and sometimes, you can’t see more than twenty feet in the fog but - it’s always, do the next right thing. If you can’t figure out the next ten right things, figure out the one next right thing and then go do it, and then do the one after that, and do the one after that. Because I’d much rather go down swinging than just get swept away.

Hartwell indicates that her desire to try new and different things motivated her to seek the leadership position. She reveals that she enjoyed the marketing courses she took in graduate school and appreciated both the creative and
analytical aspects that marketing entails. So upon graduation, Hartwell accepted a position in one of Creighton Corporation's divisions and found that she "loved everything about it." From that point, her rise through the Creighton hierarchy was driven completely by wanting to do more. In addition, as she moved up the corporate ladder, she had "a healthy enough ego" to realize,

I’m deriving good results. Not everything I do works; but a lot of it does.
And my leadership style from the very beginning was very much, ‘come-on-in-the-water’s-fine.’ I’ll get all psyched up about this idea and I’ll tell you about it and then you’ll be psyched up about it. And so it was very collaborative, very cross-functionally integrated, and you’d get this team of people psyched up ... and then you’d make it happen and that was such a rush. Oh, wow, it worked! Look, we have a twenty-million-dollar business now. Oh, boy! Okay, let’s go do that again.

Hartwell knows that she “had any number of very good bosses” and people with whom she worked for twenty years who were close friends and confidants. However, she credits her friends who started in the company around the same time and stayed, with being her network of advisors. This is due in large part to the brand management model that is typical in this industry for the selection and promotion of employees.

As Hartwell explains, this particular model is characterized by a clearly understood “up or out” mentality and “virtual leadership” concept; “It’s all about collaboration and persuasion, and if you’re not good at that, it’s not the field for you.” Promotions are typical and expected at specific points in your career as
your responsibilities and span of control increase. If for some reason you are not promoted, it is understood that you will either remain in your current position for a very long time or will look for employment with another company. Therefore, those who do stay over the long run become very close. Fortunately, having worked at Creighton "is every much a credential as Stanford Business School" on a resume and other businesses aggressively compete for those employees who do leave the organization.

Hartwell states that "the number one skill that you need to have is advocacy" in order to be successful in her particular leadership role. In her opinion, strategic ability and communication skills are also major components of this. Hartwell believes that "ideas are easy; execution is what's hard." She discusses this in terms of "persistence on behalf of an idea" and describes the process in this way;

If you can come up with the idea, communicate it clearly, and then stick with it enough, by that process you will persuade others to start to buy into it too, and then you can put the execution in gear and get things done.

Although Hartwell was involved with an extensive array of new products over the years, she uses the example of a product that she personally invented at 28 years old after having been with the company for only three years, to illustrate the importance of advocacy as a leadership skill. She explains how she came up with an idea and developed the product, and then fought for over a year to persuade her superior to "buy into it" and produce it on a large scale. The
product was introduced nationally nine months after test marketing and continues to be a $20 million-a-year product today.

The greatest challenge to individuals who seek a high level of leadership, as Hartwell sees it, is “to get over yourself.” She realizes the inherent difficulty of this concept for leaders in their roles; however, Hartwell states that if you don’t keep your ego in check, other people will know. She adds, “They might help you within the bounds of their job descriptions, but they won’t help you with their hearts.” She scrutinizes this further and characterizes it as the “balance between the love of the work, which is inherently selfless, and your own self-interest.”

Hartwell believes that women like herself, over forty, and probably some women over thirty years old as well, “were socialized not to unleash the creative juices …and not to be that overtly competitive,” so they focused instead on just getting things done. She indicates that, in the case of her own success, she was able to balance her strong competitive drive with her sharp creative skills for both personal and professional gain. This explains the aspect Hartwell loved most about her job, which was “selling more food and making more money.” As evidence of this, she is credited with taking a mature category product that had not increased in sales for over twenty years, and transforming it from a $430 million business to a $760 million business. She accounts for this stating,

I discovered early on, I’ve got a gift for right-brain creative stuff and … the whole notion of; if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. I will innovate my way out of just about every problem, because that’s
where I go. And I had other peers who would take a much more analytical approach, and guess what? This is all about the beauty of teamwork.

In Hartwell’s opinion, the “up or out” mentality of the organization and the industry mitigated the majority of usual internal constraints. However, in working with an executive coach during one of her early leadership roles, Hartwell found that her personal idiosyncrasies had the potential to impact her performance. She realized that she has a “very right-brained, creative, and intuitive” nature that enables her “to make leaps” in the thought process that leave other people wondering “where you went.” Learning to mediate and adapt her objectivity and enthusiasm to the rate of change and pace of others in the organization took time.

The most difficult external constraint that Hartwell recognizes, but did not have to deal with personally, was having children. She states that she did not miss having children as she worked all the time, loved her job, and was able to focus all of her time and energies on her work. Unfortunately, this was at the expense of a six-year marriage early in her career. Hartwell believes that for many women of her generation, “their love of their work precluded other forms of love in their life.”

In her opinion, the decision to marry her current husband of sixteen years is the best decision she made. At the time of their marriage, which was five years after her divorce, she was firmly established in her career and her husband fully supported her pace and passion for work. She describes it as a “marriage of all the intellectual-type skills [and] a deep intuitive, ‘this is the right thing to do’
Their meeting, courtship, and even being born on the same day and the same year are testament to this.

Hartwell has few regrets or incidents that she cites as bad decisions although she’s had “plenty of bad ideas…some real stinkers.” She insists that

The object of the game is never to avoid the bad ideas; it is to put time and energy into them on a small enough scale so that when you find out that it stinks, you haven't blown the ranch on it.

She cites a $100 million business problem that resulted from differences in organizational culture within the larger merged company as “not so much a business mistake, but if I think about the last ten years of my business life, to me that was the most painful episode.” In looking back, she realizes that she tried to solve the problem using a “Creighton” mentality that focused on results through collaboration and integrity in a hierarchical, “functional silo” situation that rewarded “numbers and not much else.”

Hartwell’s job performance was an annual review process that measured her performance against previously determined objectives that focused on Creighton Foods’ sales and income. A self-assessment as well as an evaluation by superiors was also included. In addition, Hartwell was responsible for showing that the organization was healthy and had a well developed succession plan. The process was the same at all levels throughout the organization.
The business environment in which Creighton Foods operates in is "extremely competitive by market segment" in a relatively "mature industry." So while the organization may enjoy a dominant position in some product lines, each of the divisions are "scrapping for growth" against competitors in the industry as a whole. Hartwell describes a dual vision for the company during much of her tenure. The first component revolves around continually trying to get mature product lines "to defy expectations" through new growth, and the second centers on achieving the organization's "planned profit commitment." After the company was acquired, Hartwell's vision for the company changed. Her new focus, as she defines it, was to educate the new organization about the acquired business and its markets in order to maintain both stability and profitability, and to facilitate informed decisions on the future of the business.

When asked how she deals with conflict in the organization, Hartwell summarizes her strategy for moving from problem to solution as, "find it, communicate it, engage everybody in it," and then, "we're all going to join ranks and do it." She indicates that the culture of Creighton facilitated and supported this approach. The size of the company, in relation to others in the industry, also made bringing change to the organization fairly easy; "All you had to do was point to ... all these big guys" that you were in competition with, and "that was enough of a burning platform."

Hartwell asserts that equity was more important than efficiency at Creighton and mentions that the company had "summer hours on Fridays 30
years before anybody did" and a profit sharing plan. The culture and corporate mentality centered on,

    We want our consumers to have great products, we want our customers to be pleased with us, and we want our employees to think this is a good place to work.

She emphasizes that institutional history and memory were important at Creighton and adds that the turnover rate at the Vice Presidential level of the company was approximately two or three percent a year, as opposed to 18 percent a year at the larger organization which acquired Creighton.

Hartwell indicates that achieving a balance between public and private good at Creighton was not a problem. She states, "The best example I can give you is that at [Creighton], over twenty five years, I never got within ten miles of a genuine ethical dilemma. Never." She is quick to point out that while the company was concerned about profits, ethics and the public good took precedence. Hartwell believes that the organization’s size and culture mitigated any problems with balancing social and cultural issues. However, Creighton was very much involved with "big pillar-of-the-community type" of activities and philanthropic endeavors due to the founding family member status of the company CEO and the business's long institutional history.

The Intersection of Organization and Public Domain

Civic engagement at Creighton took several forms. The first was company-wide participation with United Way. Although there was no required
contribution, the company did provide incentives to achieve 100% participation. For example, every employee was given the day after Christmas off from work when the company achieved 100% company-wide participation in its annual United Way drive. In addition, the corporation administered its own very large private foundation. This foundation provided three-to-one matching for employee donations to non-profit organizations and dispersed between four and five million dollars annually to philanthropic agencies. In addition, the corporate culture was such that senior executives understood that there were "very significant obligations" to be involved with philanthropic activities. Although the scope of this participation was never explicitly addressed or discussed, annual performance reviews included a section titled, "Outside Commitments."

As President, Hartwell also had to be aware of local and national politics as there were always legislative issues and policies with the potential to adversely impact the company and the industry as a whole. She gives the example of a specific sugar protection policy and her meeting with a then-state senator about the policy. She discusses this experience in terms of educating the senator and providing him with data that he could use "in subsequent debates." Hartwell adds, issues that could affect profits directly tended "to define [the] agenda" and scope of Creighton's involvement.

The press and the media were given limited access to the organization. Hartwell explains,

We had a deliberate strategy which was, we're a small company, we don't have big egos, and when you get press, the people who read it most
avidly are your competitors; so why would you help them? So we very deliberately avoided press coverage unless it would benefit the business. As evidence of this strategy, Hartwell gives the example of a drink product that receives a great deal of targeted media exposure because the publicity increases sales, which benefits the business. In contrast, Creighton’s corporate publicity is restricted and more focused on the organization as “a great investment” because it benefits the overall stock and shareholder value.

Hartwell acknowledges that she did not make connections and communicate with other leaders across sectors “as much as [she] probably should have, and that was more from personal preference.” She explains that there were “plenty of opportunities for high-profile schmoozing” and many people within the organization who took part in it, but she never did. She adds, “I loved what I did, and then once I was happily married, I wanted to be home.”

With regard to taking a public stand on controversial national or international issues and policies, Hartwell states, “We were never asked [and] I was never that visible.” She was, however, included in media and recognition pieces that highlighted successful young and/or female business executives, which she initially enjoyed but over time, she “became increasingly uncomfortable with it.” She attributes this discomfort to an incongruity between being “all about the business and the team” versus personal “arrogance.”
Leading in Business versus Higher Education

Hartwell works with and supports a very prestigious university's women's leadership program and offers the following opinion with regards to higher education programs;

I think they need a hell of a lot more focus on the good old-fashioned liberal arts education, and it's not just because I had one. It's because skills can be taught. Accounting can be taught. Statistics can be taught. Values take a lot longer to teach. Ethics take a lot longer to teach. In ... running my business, I don't need somebody who's a good mechanic; I need somebody with good judgment.

Advice to Others Seeking This Level of Leadership

Hartwell offers several pieces of advice for others seeking this level of leadership;

• Number one is this whole notion of having passion for what you do and don't stop looking until you have found it because that, by definition, [passion] will make you better at [your job].

• Number two: get over yourself as quickly as you can, recognizing it will take a long time and will be your struggle for the next ten years. But get in the habit of reflecting on your own behavior and giving yourself stirring little lectures, because by so doing, you will become a better leader.
• The third tenet: find your own way of making it fun; whether it’s making fun of the things that frighten you or whether it’s decreeing every Thursday is Beer Day or whatever it is.

Hartwell explains her “degree of difficulty theory of life” with regards to careers and advises, “You learn what you need in each decade of your life to enable you to meet the challenges of the following decade.” She posits:

Your twenties [are] all about skill acquisition,… in your thirties you are reaching unconscious competence: you can do it without thinking about it, … your forties [are] all about service to others, … and then in the fourth quarter of the big game, know that it ends … and get ready for that day.

So just plan ahead.
CHAPTER 6

ALLISON HAYDEN, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
CORBIN & CADE

Introduction

Allison Hayden never expected to one day become the first female Chairman of the Board of Corbin & Cade and the highest ranking woman in the firm's 105-year history but acknowledges, "You know there's one chairman and 2,700 partners in our firm. It's a real honor and I don't take that lightly."

Raised in a rural community of 2,600 people and the youngest in a family with four daughters, Hayden often wonders if her "naiveté contributed to [her] success because it never really bothered [her] that [she] was one of only a few women in the firm." Attractive, charming, and professionally attired, Hayden even today gets blank stares and inquisitive looks when people discover that she is Chairman of the Board of this professional services company and not someone's assistant. Being a woman in a largely male profession has its benefits however, as Hayden's record of hard work, proven abilities, and competence in a broad range of areas, combined with her friendly manner and calm voice, make her memorable.

Before joining this organization, Hayden attended the state's flagship university a few hours' drive away from her birthplace intending to major in
education. After some coaxing from her college roommate to take a class in accounting and finding that she enjoyed the logic of the math, she changed her major and graduated with a Bachelor's degree in Accounting. She married and began her career in the local office of Corbin & Cade, which had a number of large clients, and over time became managing partner. In 1997, she became managing partner of one of the firm's larger offices in another state, and in 1999 she assumed the role of regional managing partner and moved to the main office in the then, second-largest region in the country. As regional managing partner, Hayden had overall marketplace responsibility for several states and offices, increased the size and scope of the practice by moving into new industries, and oversaw the integration and recruitment of hundreds of professionals from other firms within the industry.

In her 30-plus years with Corbin & Cade, Hayden has worked with a variety of business, non-profit, and political leaders across the country and has served on the firm's Nominating Committee, Structure Committee, and Client Service Standards Task Force. She has served twice on the company's U.S. Board of Directors and was elected Chairman of the Board in 2003. Hayden also sits on the board of the global organization and is the U.S. representative on the organization's Governance Committee, chairs the Global Risk Management Committee, and oversees the firm's relationships with many major multinational and national clients. Hayden has been the recipient of numerous awards and has been recognized for her business acumen, leadership, and philanthropic efforts by many of the most influential organizations and media publications.
Corbin & Cade is one of the largest and highest ranked professional service companies in their sector with nearly $7 billion in revenue and more than 30,000 employees. The firm is a limited liability partnership (LLP) with 103 subsidiary offices in the United States. They have operations around the globe as well, and serve more than one-half of the world’s largest companies. The organization offers a broad range of integrated business services through four main divisions.

At the Core: Individual Values

Hayden asserts that trust and integrity are the most important core values that she brings to her role and to her leadership. Although she likes to be considered friendly, “at the end of the day it’s about trust,” and she credits being elected Chairman to the fact that, in her opinion, the partners trust her. Hayden emphasizes that she’s “not much for beating around the bush and people figure that out pretty quickly,” so therefore, integrity is also a factor. She explains that this entails “being yourself and focusing on your strengths and also recognizing the areas that you don’t really excel in.” She believes that these same values are important in all areas of life, regardless of your role or position.

Hayden indicates that she matured in the organization by continually taking on more prominent positions and increased duties. Her motivation to seek more senior leadership roles came with each level of authority and new post she accepted. Hayden felt,
A growing responsibility and appreciation for being able to be in a leadership role and having an impact on people's lives, hopefully generally positive, and being able to really impact what was going on around [her]. Ultimately, the position and visibility she attained within the firm enabled her to get elected to the chairmanship.

Hayden emphasizes that she has "always had the good fortune of having people who have been good advisors and mentors" and she is very aware of the importance of this concept. To this end, Corbin & Cade has put a great deal of time and effort into trying to formalize programs, training, and assignments that facilitate mentoring within the organization. However in her view, Real mentoring takes place on a one-on-one, almost on a more informal than formal basis, because two people have an affinity for the same kind of work or organization or good efforts, whatever it is, and a little bit of friendship and a little bit of looking out for one another, and that's what a mentor's about.

Organizational skills, the ability to think and work on multiple levels at the same time, and "a level of competency in some kind of specific and appropriate category in order to gain the respect and trust and so on of the people around you," are cited by Hayden as the key aptitudes for success in her leadership role. She is quick to point out that although a leader doesn't necessarily have to be "the best" in his/her profession, there is the need for proven technical proficiency in some aspect that is directly related to the leadership position. Hayden adds
that “an ability to interact, communicate, and lead a group in a particular direction” is also essential to what she does on both a daily and on-going basis.

There are unique circumstances within Corbin & Cade’s professional services industry that also impact leadership. As Hayden explains,

It requires, I think, an ability to have an understanding and appreciation of the importance of our partners and our partnership structure, as well as our clients and our kind of stakeholders, if you will, which is really the entire investing public. But it starts with the partners and our people, and then it kind of extends out to our clients, and therefore, to the stakeholders of our firm.

The greatest challenge that Hayden identifies for those who seek her leadership role is “having first, the visibility across our partnership and, [second], finding a way to appropriately demonstrate your capabilities in a broader context.” She indicates that “not everyone has the chance or opportunity to do that,” so it is incumbent upon the individual to bring his/her own accomplishments and abilities to light. And although the travel involved with her position is the one thing that Hayden would change about her job, she appreciates the diversity of situations and the opportunities for interaction with very high-powered individuals that the role offers her. The chance to exchange information and ideas and influence activities on behalf of the firm is a very attractive aspect associated with the Chairman’s title. Hayden gives this example:

If I have an opportunity, for instance, to give a speech somewhere, visit a client in the same city, go to the office, have a meeting with our partners
and directors, and maybe meet with our Women's Initiative group at the same time, you know, that's a trifecta for me ... and that's a great opportunity.

Hayden does indicate, however, that her energy level and "willingness to get on yet one more airplane" are the toughest internal constraints she faces. Her schedule is a testament to the grueling hours she keeps and she admits that, although the move to the regional office and election to Chairman are great opportunities, they have created challenges for her husband as a trailing spouse and with his business endeavors.

External constraints do not garner a great deal of Hayden's attention or focus. From her perspective, many circumstances that are initially considered to be limiting factors can actually be turned into positive advantages. She cites her own experience as a woman in this largely male-dominated industry and discusses the importance of "diversity of thought" and "different dimension" that she brings to this organization as examples of constructive benefits derived from potential "constraints."

Several times during the course of her career at Corbin & Cade, Hayden was offered opportunities outside of the firm "that were great, but they were at important times in [her] career and [she] decided to stay." She explains that her initial decision to join the firm, her move to the regional office, and the fact that she did not take any of the outside positions that were offered to her, were the most significant and the best decisions she made as they led her to the chairmanship.
Hayden's job performance has become more complex as her responsibilities have increased. She indicates that she currently has more people scrutinizing her goals and achievements against her goals than she ever did in all the time she was coming up through the firm, because it's a very visible position.

This situation is due, in part, to the need for an independent chairman since Hayden continues to be an active partner in the firm and ethically should not report to anyone over whom she provides oversight. She explains the job evaluation procedure and states,

The board, through a committee of the board, an evaluation committee of the board, and the board as a whole, actually approve my goals and approve my evaluation and my compensation, ultimately, so that it won't have to go, again, through any individual over whom I provide oversight.

The aim of the entire process is to make the person in the Chairman's position "very accountable" and "very clear" about goals and expectations.

The Intersection of Individual and Organization

Historically, the industry in which Corbin & Cade operates had been largely self-regulated and supervised. Today, however, the passage of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act in 2002 and the creation of oversight entities have "created a regulatory environment that has previously been unknown within the context of the professional services sector and have resulted in a very different business setting. Stringent compliance requirements, formalized ethics programs, reliable
reporting, and good governance are the new hallmarks of the profession. Hayden discusses the fact that there have been more changes that have taken place in the last five years than in the entire history of the profession or in her 30-plus years with the organization. She discusses the fact that one of Corbin & Cade's oldest and largest competitors is no longer in business; something that she "wouldn't have even thought [to be] possible" and adds, "I've almost given up predictions at this point because things have changed so dramatically and in all senses of business."

Hayden remembers the biggest challenge that she faced as the new regional partner in 1999 was whether Corbin & Cade was going to have "casual Friday on Fridays." She looks back now and thinks, "Oh, for the good old days" and realizes how "trivial" challenges were in the past as compared to "the context under which you think about things today and the impact of your decisions."

The issues that Hayden confronts today have a much broader scope and a more direct impact on the overall operations of the business. As Chairman, she is personally responsible and has oversight for the vision of the organization, or the "global strategy," which is "to be the standard of excellence." The intent of this standard, as Hayden explains, is to be at the pinnacle of performance in their industry such that

We [would be in a situation] where we could choose the clients that we'd like to serve, and that the best and the brightest would choose to work with us as we serve those clients.
Hayden emphasizes that this effort is "an evolutionary process" that involves a great deal of "self-analysis [within the company] and looking at the things that you do to assure that you really are setting the standards against which you’re judging others." She also recognizes that in this capacity, "you really feel like you’re making a difference to the future of an organization."

Although Hayden is no longer directly involved with the day-to-day conflicts in the office, the more critical and comprehensive issues within the partnership as a whole, and those concerning client relationships, do come under her purview. "Conflicts are real" Hayden states, and as Chairman, she is occasionally brought in to work through difficult problems, which are often "more a matter of communication, or lack thereof." She has found that resolution is "usually a matter of listening … acknowledging, and committing to a course of action." She realizes that having someone in her position take the time to go through this process with the parties in dispute typically presents the best resolution to the conflict.

Hayden discusses a similar approach that is used to bring the organization to change and cites the example of the organization’s initiative for the advancement and retention of women. Approximately ten years ago the firm was concerned with the fact, that although 50% of the new hires were women, very few were actually making it into the partnership. Instead of assuming that most of the females were leaving the profession to stay at home and raise children, Corbin & Cade actually commissioned a study to investigate the problem. The
results indicated that there were many reasons for this phenomenon, chief among them, leaving for more flexible workplaces and greater autonomy.

This initiative has become the standard by which Corbin & Cade facilitates change. In Hayden’s opinion, the success of the process was the result of documented need, commitment from the top, and a studied and focused approach to solving the problem. The firm is taking a comparable approach with their Diversity and Inclusion Initiative.

As a service profession, Corbin & Cade’s major resource is people, and Hayden indicates that equity, as opposed to efficiency, “will always win out.” She describes the environment as “very collegial and very collaborative” to the point that “sometimes that gets in the way of us being as efficient as we might be.” And although Hayden points out that the firm “could probably make more money in better margins against our services if we weren’t so collaborative,” she’s not willing to trade the cost.

The Intersection of Organization and Public Domain

Corbin & Cade’s business is contingent upon the public’s perception of the firm’s reputation, which in turn, is a direct reflection of the extent to which Corbin & Cade ethically and reliably represent the public investors of their client companies. As a result, Hayden believes that “within the context of [the firm’s] work…the public and private good should be the same.” She expounds on this stating,
At the end of the day we represent the public, and so while we have to worry about profitability and compensating our people and compensating our partners and doing all those kinds of things,... we have to be looking out for the public good.

Social and cultural issues impact Corbin & Cade's operations as well, and Hayden discusses the need to balance corporate social responsibility with the business profitability and compensation issues. She explains,

To find the line that kind of runs through all that is tough. It's tough, but important. ... Eventually you figure out it's not just the right thing to do, it also makes business sense.

Hayden cites Corbin & Cade's Impact Day as an example of attending to social and cultural issues while participating in civic engagement as an organization. This event, held one day a year across the nation, and in some of the global offices as well, puts the entire workforce of Corbin & Cade into the community to help designated non-profits with significant projects. Committees within each office select the philanthropic groups and projects and then work to coordinate and organize the effort. The size and scope of this endeavor is immense and is the equivalent of approximately 250,000 billable hours of company time. As evidence, one executive director enthusiastically related to Hayden, "You did a year's worth of work today [for our non-profit]!"

Hayden acknowledges that the company and the employees also benefit from this activity as it builds "a sense within people about the role that they play ... it connects the people ... [and] it's a team-building exercise." She admits that
the first time the topic was brought to the table there was some hesitation by the executives regarding the time and manpower commitment involved. However, Hayden emphasizes that management “creates [a] feeling of responsibility within the organization” and “an expectation of giving back to the community” that permeates the firm, so they promoted the concept and everyone’s participation. She reports that people in the company really enjoy Impact Day and seeing the difference that they make. They are encouraged to be involved in their communities in other ways as well. For example, Corbin & Cade rallies their employees to support the United Way and Hayden indicates that this results in “the firm having the largest group of De Tocqueville givers in the country.”

Much of the community work that Corbin & Cade does is not highly publicized. Hayden reveals, “We try not to get in the press as much as possible, to be honest, because it doesn’t tend to be very positive typically.” As a result, the firm works to “proactively manage press and public relations” and uses many of the speeches that are given by top executives within the corporation, including some by Hayden, to achieve specific objectives. Among these are the goals of reestablishing trust in the profession, increasing confidence in the public market system, and for Hayden especially, speaking on “women in business and diversity in the workplace and the boardroom.” Hayden recognizes that the press is very important to the firm and to the industry as a whole, however, the lack of care taken with reporting the facts and issues of accountability associated with this create a real need for Corbin & Cade to “manage the press appropriately.”
In addition to dealing with press-related issues, Hayden spends much of her time interacting and networking with leaders across sectors. In many cases, these individuals represent companies that are current clients or have the potential to become new clients. Hayden, individually and through the work of Corbin & Cade, is in a unique position. As she explains, “we have this wonderful look into organizations that many don’t have, and if we’re doing the job right, we’re always learning [best practices] from that - even for our own organization.” To emphasize the point, Hayden adds, “I never have a conversation with a business executive that I’m not at least mentally taking notes of things that I think they’re doing well and what I would hope I would never do.” It is an aspect of the job that she really enjoys.

Politics, however, are not Hayden’s “thing.” Although she now participates as a member of one of President Bush’s national economic councils, she is very careful about taking positions on controversial national or international issues. She indicates that even matters of real significance and importance to the profession present special challenges. For example, in Corbin & Cade’s work with other firms in the industry, there is a need to be absolutely certain that there is nothing that could be remotely considered inappropriate or collusion-like. Once again, she asserts “We have to always be careful to try to deal with the balance of public interest with our own self-interest.”
Leading in Business versus Higher Education

Hayden is very involved with programs and recruiting at numerous prominent universities around the country and serves on several advisory boards as well. When the conversation turns to the context of leadership associated with public universities, Hayden comments on the slow pace of change associated with higher education and points out,

It is what it is. ... In many ways, higher education and the professors and those who really participate there, are part of the reason that it’s different ... so you couldn’t possibly try to totally change that, because that’s part of the magic.

Having said that, Hayden adds,

I think that a lot of times the interaction between a university and the rest of the world, if you will, is too limited and I don’t mean just in the fundraising sense, although I think people could do a lot more reach-out in an effective way around fundraising. That’s getting to be more and more typical. But I think [interaction is important], in the context of understanding how research really impacts the world around [you] and doing research that [provides more] relevance. If there could be a better connection between the world around the universities and the research and the activities that they’re taking on, it would be very helpful, I think, for everybody. It would be useful for the business world to have a better-informed basis on which they’re doing business ... and it would be better
for the university system because I think it would help make them more relevant.

Hayden gives the example of a research study that was conducted by a group of high-level universities to document the benefits of diversity in business organizations as evidence of the kind of "relevant" research that she believes is important and useful. She qualifies her opinion though, and explains,

I thought, boy, this is great. Why isn't there more of this? But I think it's probably not unlike in our world; you have a competitive environment, so research dollars are always in demand, and so you know you're cooperating but you're really competing.

Advice of Others Seeking This Level of Leadership

As a prominent female leader in the business world, Hayden is regularly sought out as a speaker for influential organizations and events. As such, she has spent a great deal of time contemplating the advice she gives to others on the topic of leadership. She offers the following insights on the subject;

I always start with; be yourself. I mean that's something that I've always just felt very strongly about. You really have to know your own strengths and build on them and know the areas, as I mentioned before, that you need help in, or that are not so much your strengths, and find ways to refocus. So, I just think knowing yourself and being yourself is important. I also always talk about the importance of watching out for yourself, and I don’t mean that you have to be a braggart; you don’t have to always be
patting yourself on the back. But, I learned early in my career that even though you think people know all the great things you’re doing, they typically don’t. So finding a way, without being a braggart, to assure that people really know your accomplishments, [the people] who are evaluating you and thinking about you for the next promotion or opportunity, is really important. You have to look out for yourself. And, I think you also have to take responsibility for your own progress, your own success. As much as I give credit, and I owe a lot to the people around me, my mentors and the people who have been kind of my sponsors and so on over the years, they can’t do it for you. You have to say that it’s about you, and it’s about what decisions you make, and making things work for yourself... You really do have to focus on how you play against the rest of the environment around you.
CHAPTER 7

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SECTOR CROSS CASE COMPARISON

This chapter examines the similarities and differences between the private enterprise business sector leaders in this study and provides a summary of the information detailed in chapters four through six.

Organization and Environment

Of the three organizations in this study, two are publicly traded corporations and one, Corbin & Cade, is a limited liability partnership (LLP). Creighton Foods and Corbin & Cade are both 105 year old companies, while Calliope Kids has only been in business for 27 years. Corbin & Cade has both the largest revenue stream of $7 billion and the most employees (30,000). Creighton is the second largest of the three organizations in this study with $1.8 billion in revenues and 4,500 employees. Calliope Kids is the smallest with $583.2 million in revenues and approximately 3,800 full time equivalent employees. The large number of employees at Calliope is due to the 648 primary business locations and to the immense number of part time and seasonal sales employees that work at those locations. By comparison, Corbin & Cade has 103 offices in the United States and Creighton has six business locations in addition to their corporate office headquarters.
Calliope Kids has a lean and nimble structure that uses strong brand and operational platforms across divisions. The organization uses a highly cross functional matrix leadership approach that depends on synergy between divisions and strict adherence to “no exception” policies. Creighton, by comparison, employs a matrix design structure that gives direct authority in product/brand management and market research to the leader, but function/staff management (supply chain, finance, human resources) to the function head in coordination with considerable input from the business division leader. Promotion is formal and based on the brand management, “up or out” model. Corbin & Cade operates in a more collegial manner. There is a partnership structure within each office that has formalized training, programs, and promotions that are reflected and integrated across the organization as a whole. An individual must be voted into both the partnership and senior leadership positions by the other partners.

Calliope Kids is in the highly competitive specialty retail industry and emphasizes a focus on the consumer and their emotional connection to the brand. They enjoy a very interactive customer base that underlies both their culture of innovation and their data-driven decision making to identified opportunities. There is a substantial commitment of resources for new stores and brands, however, Calliope Kids is “entrepreneurial at the core” and encourages creative risk-taking in designs and differentiation.

Creighton Foods is extremely competitive by market segment in the relatively mature packaged goods industry. Although Creighton is small in
relation to others in the industry, they enjoy strong branded products with
dominant positions in some product lines. There is a long institutional history and
culture of collaboration, ethical behavior, and integrity in this mature organization.

Corbin & Cade is one of the largest and highest ranked firms in their
industry. It has both a collegial and collaborative structure that is knowledge
capital intensive in an industry that relies on the intellectual skills and customer
service of its organization members. The firm is both a collaborator and a
competitor with other service firms in their market sector.

Calliope Kids' profits and operations can be impacted by national
economic conditions, customer preferences, and international business risks.
Creighton has similar risk factors, as well as commodity costs, that can be
volatile due to weather and/or national and local legislation that have the
potential to affect profits. By comparison, Corbin & Cade's profits and operations
can be impinged upon by changes in laws and regulations, partnership matters,
oversight concerns, and issues that affect both their clients and the investing
public as a whole. All three organizations face comparable external control
factors from sources such as the Sarbanes Oxley Act, industry rules and
regulations, and both national and international legislative and policy issues. In
addition, Calliope Kids and Creighton Foods have shareholders while Corbin &
Cade has peer review and industry accreditation constraints.
At the Core: Individual Values

All three of the private enterprise business leaders cited honesty and integrity, and the trust, respect, and accountability that flow from these, as the core values that they bring to their leadership. Hanley describes her identity as bound up in a synergy of art and science; service to others and people matter most to Hartwell; and Hayden indicates that knowledge of her personal strengths and weaknesses is important. The women acknowledge that they each had advisors and mentors who provided assistance to them along the way. All of the advisors and mentors were in the work environment in the form of previous bosses and former and current fellow employees. The leaders all agree that increased duties, responsibilities, and authority were the factors that motivated them to seek the leadership position. Hanley adds that her passion for creativity was also a primary factor.

The women each point to a range of skills that they believe are important in their leadership roles. Hanley indicates that she uses humor to temper her drive and ego. Hartwell works on balancing her strong competitive drive with sharp creative skills for both personal and professional gain. Hayden finds the need to demonstrate proven technical proficiency in a core business area as crucial.

Hanley advises others not to take themselves too seriously. As evidence of this, she has created an environment within the organization that strongly encourages employees to “check [their] egos at the door.” Hartwell similarly suggests, that as a leader, it is important to “get over yourself” and essential to
love what you do. Hayden cites good organizational skills and the ability to work on multiple levels at the same time as vital skills for her leadership.

Finally, Hanley asserts that the leader needs to have a clear vision for the organization and continually check for compliance, consistency, and understanding. Hartwell cites advocacy, strategic ability and communication, and persistence on behalf of an idea. And Hayden emphasizes the ability to interact, communicate, and lead as key fundamental to her leadership.

The greatest challenge that each of the three leaders identifies is knowing your own strengths and weaknesses per Hanley, balancing your love of work with your own self-interests per Hartwell, and finding visibility within the organization to appropriately demonstrate your capabilities per Hayden. Hanley would change how much time she spends working, Hartwell would have found more time to listen to and help younger women, and Hayden would find a way to decrease the intense amount of energy it takes to do her job. Hayden also made mention of the compromises her husband has made in his career as a result of being a trailing spouse in hers.

The most significant internal constraints specified by the women were dealing with other people (Hanley) and personal issues (Hartwell and Hayden). In contrast, legal, financial, and accountability issues for Hanley, love of work precluding other loves for Hartwell, and finding a way to use constraints as opportunities for Hayden were cited by the leaders as significant external constraints.
Hanley, Hartwell, and Hayden were all quick to identify the best decision that each of them has made. Hanley discussed getting back to herself; Hartwell pointed to her second marriage; and Hayden realized that staying with the organization at key periods in her life was significant. Identifying one of the worst decisions that each of them made was a bit more challenging, although each of the women admitted to having made their fair share of poor decisions in the past. Hanley asserted that personnel decisions were some of her worst. Hartwell talked about some ideas she had that were "real stinkers." Hayden had a difficult time citing any one specific decision.

Hanley’s job performance is evaluated on the basis of financial indicators for the organization; specifically stock price and earnings per share. Hartwell’s was a combination of financial indicators and having a finely tuned schedule of succession planning. Hayden’s evaluation emphasizes financial and non-financial indicators, pre-determined through a process that is at the same time collegial and highly peer-reviewed.

The Intersection of Individual and Organization

Leaders are the point people for the organization and set the course of business. Hanley’s vision of the organization is centered on the customer; Hartwell’s focused on product and growth; and Hayden’s revolves around the clients, services, and reputation of Corbin & Cade as a whole.

Conflict is also a factor in any business operation. Hanley and Hartwell both indicate that they try to avoid conflict whenever possible. When that doesn’t
work, they discussed the need to find the source of the conflict, engage the parties involved, and encourage communication. Hayden talks about her experiences and the fact that she has found that in most cases, communication is the problem. She adds that her time and participation in the conversation is often all that is needed to solve the conflict.

Bringing the organization to change can be a challenge for any leader. Hanley strongly believes that change is not a point in time, but continual. She relies heavily on the intuitive process to lead change within the company. Hartwell was able to point to larger competitors in the industry and motivate change in reaction to the competition. Hayden indicates that change occurs as a result of documented need, communication from the top, and through a focused approach to problem solving organization-wide.

All three of the leaders agree that equity is more important than efficiency in their businesses. Hanley states that equity is a vital component of the culture of the organization. Hartwell indicates that equity is part of the long standing culture, history, and mission of the company. And Hayden explains that as a service profession with people as their key resource, equity is a requisite and driving force in Corbin & Cade’s collegial culture; sometimes at the expense of efficiency.

The Intersection of Organization and the Public Domain

All three of the private sector business enterprises in this study are strong supporters of the United Way program. In fact, Corbin & Cade has one of the
highest percentages of top level donors in the country. In addition to this charitable organization, Calliope Kids supports the March of Dimes on a corporate level and through individual efforts and contributions. As well, the company makes donations to and supports non profit organizations that are identified by its employees. Hartwell points out that Creighton Corporation had a 100% participation rate in their United Way campaign, as well as a long history of philanthropy in the community. And Hayden discussed Corbin & Cade's immense coordinated effort that involves all of their employees working in their communities on Impact Day. Hayden added that in their business, efforts to balance the public and private good is really one and the same.

Balancing social and cultural issues is also an important aspect of leading an organization. Hanley points to the location of the company offices and asserts that this, combined with a corporate culture that emphasizes collaboration, mediates any social and culture concerns and issues. Hartwell discussed a corporate culture that ensured a balance in this area and adds that she never came “within 100 miles of an ethical dilemma” in the company. Hayden, by comparison, cited the need to consciously balance social and cultural issues with profitability and compensation matters. She explains that her experience has shown that in the end, making a decision because it is the “right thing to do” almost always makes business sense as well.

As leaders, each of the three women has had to deal with the press and the media. Hanley is very cautious about her interactions. Hartwell states that there was very limited access, in part for competitive reasons. Hayden asserts
that she works diligently to proactively manage her contact with the press and media. She does this by purposely using those occasions to highlight and promote the company's agenda.

Hanley and Hartwell both admit that they do not network with other leaders, while Hayden is quick to point out that it is important to both her role and the business. Hayden adds that she appreciates and learns from the insights she gains into the operations of other organizations. In addition, Hanley believes that it is not her place to comment on controversial national or international issues, while Hartwell saw the need to when there were legal and political issues that had the potential to impact the industry and profits. Hayden underscores the need for her to carefully consider and balance public and organizational interests in addressing controversial issues on behalf of the company.

Leading in Business versus Higher Education

Each of the business leaders work with at least one, if not several, higher education institutions in some capacity and each had an opinion on how to improve higher education. Hanley's efforts have shown her that some institutions do not know and understand their 'clients.' She believes that there is a need to better identify and quantify institutional goals, objectives, branding issues, and recognition strategies. Hartwell, in contrast, identifies the need for institutions to put a greater focus on the liberal arts. It is her opinion that organizations can teach the skills necessary for the job, but need individuals who have already developed values and good judgment through a liberal education. Hayden's
experiences have led her to the conclusion that interactions between universities and the "real" world are too limited. She suggests that institutions need to understand and focus on the impact and relevance of their research efforts. Hayden adds that the higher education environment is not unlike Corbin & Cade's where organizations compete for revenues but cooperate professionally.

Advice to Others Seeking this Level of Leadership

All of the women agreed that it is essential to know yourself, your strengths and weaknesses, and where your passion lies. Hanley and Hartwell add that it is also important to "take it easy" and to "find your own way of making it fun." Hayden, by comparison, strongly advises "taking responsibility for your own progress" and keeping a "focus on how you play against the rest of the environment around you."
CHAPTER 8

COURTNEY MERRICK, PRESIDENT, WALDEN STATE UNIVERSITY

Introduction

Dr. Merrick believes in the mission of public universities, the importance of keeping the public trust, and "the sense of serving the public good that's historically been a part of public universities." She states, "I can't imagine myself at any institution other than a public university and, that sense of service that comes with that mission, is very important to me."

Upon meeting Merrick, you can't help but be impressed and inspired by the seemingly quiet and dignified presence that nearly camouflages the power and drive that exudes from this small-stature woman. It becomes readily apparent in speaking with her that she could just as easily teach a class of special education first graders as run a Fortune 500 company; and very probably could do both at the same time. Merrick is in her sixties and has been married for forty years to an academic she met while attending graduate school. Over the years, they have managed to balance their professional careers with a personal life together that includes having three grown children and two grandchildren.

Merrick was the first member of her family to go college and received a Bachelors degree in Early Childhood Education and a Masters degree in Special Education. She spent four years teaching in the K-12 classroom before she
began teaching in higher education. She completed her PhD. in Special Education: Educational Research and rose through the professorial ranks at two institutions before attaining the rank of full professor at a very large, internationally known, public research university. In 1981, Merrick became Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at this same large institution. She functioned in this position as the senior academic officer for the entire System, which delivered programs in 22 geographic locations throughout the state.

After three years in the position, Merrick was promoted to Dean for Undergraduate Programs and Vice Provost of the University. She was responsible for the quality of academic programs and academic support services for students at all 19 undergraduate campuses of the university. As a member of the President's Cabinet, Merrick worked directly with the Faculty Senate on a broad range of issues and worked collaboratively with the deans of the colleges and the directors of the various campuses.

Four years later, Merrick accepted the job of Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs at an institution located approximately 3,000 miles away. In this position, she was the senior academic officer for the campus, which enrolled approximately 22,500 students, and she was responsible for all academic matters, including program planning and review and academic personnel reviews. Merrick held this position for almost four years before accepting the Presidency at Walden State. She is the first female president of this institution.

Walden State University's largest campus is located in a rural area of rolling hills and spring-fed lakes, a short distance away from four major urban
centers in the northeast region of the state. The institution was established almost 100 years ago as a teacher-training school and today, the campus is dotted with both historical landmarks of the past and buildings and facilities that are state-of-the-art. Merrick explains that leading a university with eight campuses "was one of the things that was very appealing" in her decision to accept the position of President at this Walden State. She comments, "I know the power in networks like this, if you get them operating as one university." When asked how one manages eight campuses, Merrick replies, "we try to think of them as one university in many places." To this end, she adamantly believes in and employs a cross-functional "matrix" approach to college and university administration.

Walden State University has grown tremendously and received significant state and national recognition under Merrick's leadership. During her tenure for example, the institution became the second-largest university in the state with eight straight years of record applications and enrollment growth and became one of 37 American universities to be classified as a Doctoral-Research Extensive university by the Carnegie Foundation. In addition, the university has added cutting-edge research centers and world-class student and faculty facilities, and just completed its first comprehensive fund-raising campaign, exceeding the $100 million goal by nearly $22 million.

Today, Walden State University is one of thirteen public universities in the state and enrolls approximately 36,000 students. The institution offers 201 different degrees through ten schools and colleges and receives over $31 million
in external research funding. As well, the operating budget is more than $385 million a year and the university employs more than 4,300 full- and part-time faculty and staff. Walden State is currently one of the largest regional systems in the country.

It is evident in discussions with Merrick that she is extremely focused and driven by an agenda that puts organizational needs and accomplishments at the forefront. She recently made the decision to retire, but doesn't intend to slow down. Merrick anticipates that her current 90-hour work weeks will slow down to 70-hour work weeks during retirement as she works with various boards and on several projects, and she sees no problem with that. She adds, that although the retirement decision did involve some personal reasons, it was driven "almost completely by the readiness of the organization to work through the transition, and I do believe it's right."

When asked what she will miss most when she is no longer President of the university, Merrick replies, "I'll miss the diversity of topics and issues and the people every day, because ... I thrive on complexity and there's a lot of that here."

At the Core: Individual Values

Merrick believes that, as a leader, it is important to

Be who you are first and foremost, to really have the conversation inside your own head about what excites you, what drives you, where you feel
like you're a good fit, and then to go for positions, opportunities that fit that.

She readily admits that she is “a very high-energy person” and “a person who thrives on complexity.” In her opinion, “You really can’t separate who you are in your personal and professional life very easily, although it may play out in different ways.” Merrick believes that her identity “is bound up a lot in work” and “is tied up in being a person who can work in a complex setting with other people and get results.” She explains that it is important to have and rely on strong people around you adding, “You can’t really be in charge of a very large, complex organization if you have a need to manage it all yourself.”

Merrick also believes “in respecting others’ opinions [and] allowing people to have a voice in the organization.” She goes on to discuss the importance of having confidence in your personal management abilities, and that without strong management, there is no real leadership. She sees this as “a focus on being collegial, but also on understanding that people expect an executive to play an executive role.” Her approach to leadership is very inclusive and she explains that there is,

A lot of encouragement for people to get to the unvarnished comments so that we can really be sure that we’ve fleshed out the issues and so forth. But having allowed everyone—not really allowed but really expected everyone - to be in the conversation, there also has to be a decision and there has to be a sense of moving on.
This authenticity that Merrick looks for and expects from others is, in part, due to what she terms her "very forceful personality." She talks about the fact that she purposely tries to mediate this by not "weighing in too much" at the beginning of a discussion, even though she admits that it won't be long before people recognize where she stands. This is important to her because she believes that "the human tendency is [for the discussion] to try to go where they think you're headed, and that's not helpful to the organization in the long term."

When asked what motivated her to seek the leadership position she holds, Merrick tells the story of how "a seed was planted" by a respected professor while she was a faculty member at a very large and well known university. He told her,

'You have an uncanny ability to listen long enough and sort of see through to the absolute center of a problem, and you speak up at just the right time, and you coalesce people's thinking around the core of the issue rather than the peripheral details. You have real leadership potential and I hope that as opportunities come along, you will be willing to consider them.' And that was it.

Merrick acknowledges that during those early years of her career "they were looking for token women and I decided I wasn't going to let myself get angry about being a token." Instead, she focused on doing the job well and getting results. Over time, she believes that she "built a reputation as somebody who could work effectively on problem-solving with diverse groups and get the report written."
Merrick has a very formal network of advisors. She strongly supports and believes in the work of her senior team, which meets every Monday morning, without a set agenda. While there may occasionally be issues from the prior week that haven't been resolved, in general the meetings provide "a sharing of information and each [team member] is expected to bring action items that are at the level that they need a broader discussion." Merrick holds these individuals to high expectations as well. She states,

I expect each of these individuals to be as good horizontally as they are vertically. I expect them to be the leader of their functional area and to really be the in-depth, go-to person in the areas that have been assigned to their portfolio. But I expect them to be equally good working across the organization, because even if something doesn't fall in their portfolio, they bring problem-solving, critical thinking, and communication skills to the discussion, and they need to be ambassadors for the solution.

Merrick firmly believes that one of her major duties is to keep the senior team "knit together." She explains that this translates into an environment where "there's a strong shared agenda, shared values, and clear sense of expectation." She has an identical relationship with the Board of Regents and Merrick explains that, by virtue of this scenario, her administrative team and the Board also have the same strong shared agenda, values, and expectations. The strength of this affiliation is further evidenced in her comment,

I have no fear if one of these people is talking directly to a member of the board because we're all on the same message, we're all on the same
agenda, we know where we’re going, we know what we have to do.

Regents know what each of these executive-level officers is expected to accomplish.

Merrick reveals that this kind of relationship is something that is built over time and describes it as "a very nuanced dance" that she works on "every single day."

"A very high comfort level in a multitasking environment" is a critical attribute in Merrick’s particular leadership role. She also identifies skills, such as "a sense of timing and pacing" with regards to facilitating change in an organization, an ability to "assess the dynamic in a group," and an understanding of what needs to be done if that dynamic "has to be shifted." She cites "the basics" and explains it in this way:

You have to know the academic culture, you have to know a lot about business practices and the bottom line, you have to feel comfortable and confident and be good in public speaking, external activities, and you have to be comfortable sitting in the coffee shop talking to eighteen-year-olds who are worlds apart in terms of generational issues from you, and find it exciting.

Her assessment of this skill set is "fundamentals, combined with the love of complexity, and an ability to turn things off and on and move through an incredibly diverse set of activities in a day."

Merrick credits her initial understanding of the importance of "customer-service," to jobs she held during high school. In particular, she believes that the lessons she learned while working at a "rather high-end women’s clothing store"
during "an impressionable period of life" have stayed with her. In addition, as young faculty members, she and her husband were jointly in charge of a major federal research project. Being responsible for millions of dollars in federal grant money and managing a staff of twenty so early in her career, gave her experience in hiring, firing, evaluating, managing budgets, and meeting deadlines.

Merrick sees "leading change," and not resource constraints, as the greatest challenge to people seeking her leadership position. She emphasizes this point and the unpredictability associated with it by stating,

A decade ago, no one would have predicted the way in which technologies are becoming absolutely ubiquitous and how much of an organization’s resources have to be focused on building the infrastructure and constantly upgrading it. Nobody would have expected some of the regulatory issues that we’re having to deal with. Nobody would have expected the competition from the for-profits.

Merrick identifies an additional component of leading change, as the challenge of “helping an organization understand that, in today’s world, [change] is relentless.” She articulates this as the need to continually “scan the environment” in which the organization operates and the need to be responsive to change with an organizational “culture that is by its nature, more contemplative.” She uses the analogy that change today is like “constant whitewater. There is never the restful pool. You’re just going over the next rapids.”
Merrick expresses frustration with the pace at which things are accomplished in higher education and insists that this is one thing she would change about her job. She indicates that she is impatient when she sees the need for decisions to be made on important issues and worries that “we will be left behind” because “others don’t see the same sense of urgency, and in fact, work to try to put up barriers and obstacles.” She gives the example of working for two years on a new requirement imposed by the state legislature and describes her frustration with the faculty senate process that seeks to undo the work that faculty throughout the organization accomplished through discussions, agreements, and compromises. She worries that at the current pace, “some of the things that we have been doing will not be appropriate anymore.”

Merrick acknowledges that “the major change issues are primarily imposed from outside” of the organization and that a critical concern is to “create some sense of perspective and balance” among the competing priorities of a broad range of constituencies. She puts forth the following as examples of the range of constituents to whom a public university president must be responsive:

Prospective students, currently-enrolled students, alumni, parents, faculty, staff, and staff of all different types – hourly workers, professional staff, executive-level staff – friends, business associates, the general public, the governor, the board of regents, the board of trustees, et cetera, et cetera.

Early in her tenure at Walden State, Merrick worked to more clearly define the university and its mission. She judges this as one of her best, or in her words, “key” decisions, “made at a key time.” She describes the experience this way;
very deliberately worked to try to help people understand that the
[Carnegie classification] that we were in was absolutely right for us and
that we should take great pride in being best in class, in the class that was
best for us, rather than going after something that was probably, to be real
about it, out of our reach and probably not the best way to be serving our
various constituents.

She also recognizes two other “key” decisions that she made early on. The first
was to make Student Affairs a separate administrative division and the second
was to put the infrastructure in place for major fundraising.

Merrick indicates that the worst decision she made was “some hiring
decisions that I had to undo pretty fast.” While she recognizes the human cost
and states that it’s “the toughest thing we do,” she stresses the importance of
“fixing it fast” if there is indeed a problem.

Her job performance is evaluated by the Board of Regents, in a very
formal and public manner that incorporates various constituent groups in the
feedback every other year, and is based on a broad range of benchmarks that
have been determined to be appropriate by both the Board and Merrick. In
addition, “there are less quantitative, but equally important” accomplishments that
are included in the analysis and evaluation. She comments that “in a public
university, it’s a very public process.”
Walden State University is located in a state that has a significant number of higher education institutions, yet remains "an undereducated state by comparison with others." And although the region is a large metropolitan area geographically, "there are hundreds of little government entities" whose lack of cooperation keeps this region from acting and functioning as a major regional player in the state. In effect, Walden State actually functions as the regional institution with eight campuses spread throughout the area. This is a major environmental issue that impacts the institution on an on-going basis and "there are always questions raised about why we need" all of the higher education resources and expenditures.

Merrick discusses her vision for the organization and the new strategic plan "of deep and serious engagement in the region" that "was developed in a very inclusive way." She identifies four principles that form the basis for both the vision and the plan: Innovation in learning, focus on those [they] serve, engagement with the world beyond [their] borders, and building relationships that foster success. She comments, "If you had to say, 'What's the one bumper sticker thing that comes out of that plan;' it's very stakeholder-oriented. And that was my only goal going in."

Merrick emphasizes the need to be responsive to stakeholders and to be an "engaged institution." In general, "that's a hard sell because the culture in academe is around national rankings and those kinds of things." She points out, however, that "when your program is nationally ranked, you're making a huge
difference in your region. So these are not either-or." She was "very persuasive" in chairing a steering committee of approximately 75 people through the strategic planning process and admits that there were "a lot of really interesting logistics to manage in order to keep people engaged in the process." In the end, she was very surprised at how quickly the faculty and administration built consensus around the concept of "stakeholder."

The institution has now "blended" their strategic plan, based on the four principles, with a "continuous improvement type of institution-wide accreditation" that delineates five university-wide goals. This "platform" has become a "seamless initiative" that cascades throughout the organization and is constantly integrated into the activities of the organization. Merrick believes that this platform translates into an institution that is "a part of a national discussion about being engaged and being entrepreneurial and being of service" as well as "being true to a public mission in terms that make sense with today's realities." She points out that this integrated platform "will become the job description for the new president." Unfortunately she adds that "as businesslike" and "as focused on accountability" as the "platform" is, the acceptance and approval of it for accreditation purposes may be threatened by changes to the federal Higher Education Reauthorization Act.

Merrick reports that she deals with conflict in the organization "generally directly." The focus in this process is about "communicating an openness" and an "expectation that we will deal with things." She describes this as,
A willingness to acknowledge that there is a problem and direct engagement in assessing the issues that make up the conflict and then, really, depending on the issue, a team discussion about how we’re going to resolve it.

She acknowledges however, that confidential matters, like personnel issues, are often difficult in the face of the public nature of the Walden State. She explains that,

The bottom line is, we deal with the issue directly behind the scenes but we’ve got to be a little less direct in the public discussion of it, and that’s to protect the individual.

Merrick stresses that equity is more important than efficiency in the organization. However, she is quick to qualify this stating, “Equity doesn’t mean treating everyone alike [and] ...it doesn’t mean that everyone gets the same resources.” She adds, “It means that you’re willing to differentiate appropriately and that there’s a fair and reasonable process for making those decisions; not that in the end everybody gets the same.” Merrick gives the example of a change in their on-campus faculty-staff assistance program as an example of this. She indicates that after analyzing the data, which showed that better service would result from outsourcing this program,

The focus shifted from the decision itself, to how do we communicate the decision so that we don’t create a sense of being disinterested in our people. And in the end it was smooth sailing.
This example leads to a discussion about how, even though the environment is such that "everyone has a voice" and "a seat at the table," in reality there are instances in which certain constituents are given "a bit more deference" by the very nature of this being a public institution; for example, "in a search committee for dean, faculty voices tend to be stronger."

The Intersection of Organization and Public Domain

Merrick believes that achieving balance between public and private good is an area of much concern. She adds, 

That’s an issue that we worry a lot about as public support for higher education ... has dwindled and tuition has increased to the point where it looks like a private tuition price point to some families.

Balancing social and cultural issues is also an area that requires time and attention. Merrick explains, 

In an environment like this, with a mission like ours, you need an array of opportunities available to serve the stakeholders. So in the end there is some balancing because it’s resources, but we look to have a balanced portfolio of recreational opportunities, social, cultural, and intellectual.

She goes on to give numerous examples of each area and adds that it is important for the organization to make certain that there are neither "gaps" nor that they are “overly focused in a single area.” Merrick reports that there are over 200 recognized student organizations that are provided with space and/or resources and that "it happens on all eight campuses.”
Merrick discusses how Walden State participates in civic engagement and emphasizes,

It’s important to know that we do take service to the communities very seriously and that there are numerous academic programs that are designed to provide service. And of course, as a part of it, they also provide wonderful opportunities for students and for research.

She offers many examples of programs and projects that are imbedded within the academics and specifically address engagement outside of the institution, including an applied psychology center that operates within a local hospital and an urban design center that works with neighborhood redevelopment.

In addition, Merrick talks about “expecting our leaders to be engaged in community activities,” which includes serving on nonprofit boards and participating in economic and trade consortiums and various other economic development intermediaries. She personally is very involved in “regional chambers, [and] in local economic development and civic kinds of organizations.” Merrick adds that this is “expected both at an institutional level, in terms of our programming, but also at a personal level, in terms of being directly engaged.”

Walden State University’s need to be responsive to the community is, in part, due to the fact that they are a major social, cultural, and economic engine in the area. With over 4,000 employees, the institution is the largest employer in the county. As such, the university periodically produces a regional impact study in order to “demonstrate to the citizens [that] for every dollar invested, this is what
you get back.” In addition, the institution is “constantly adding and deleting programs, often at the request of external constituents.”

Merrick states, “Our students are leaving with twice the national average debt.” In response to this, both she and the institution as a whole, are very cognizant and focused on “assuring that we have financial aid and that we have scholarship dollars and that we work at a state level on policy issues that shore up student financial aid [with] more grants and fewer loans.”

Merrick reports that the press and the media “play an important role” in Walden State’s operations. She comments on the relationship by stating that “it’s a little frustrating in today’s world” that the media is so focused on “convenient, efficient ways of getting things done,” so they are more apt to come and cover a student protest than to cover a “really ‘good news’ economic development kind of story.” She explains, “It’s hard to get them to drive the forty-five, fifty minutes to [to Walden State when] it’s easier to go across the street.” And although she works hard to build and keep relationships with individuals in the press and media, she contends, “It’s very hard to get them to do features about major positive accomplishments.” She adds that there is not an adversarial relationship with the press in the area and that radio and print people generally do a “pretty good job” of calling recognized authorities at Walden State University when they need expertise in some content area.

Merrick does make connections and communicates with other leaders across sectors. She indicates that this happens from the national level all the way down to the local level. She cites organizations like the American Council on
Education, the Interuniversity Council, and the state northeast regional council on higher education as groups that she is involved with. She also works with a wide range of business leaders, was appointed to the state Business Development Coalition, and serves on the Board of Directors of four major corporations in the region.

Merrick explains that she makes a decision as to whether or not to take a stand on controversial national or international issues "very much on a case-by-case basis" and "on the extent to which it matters for [the] organization." She is quick to add:

We also are very clear about the fact that people have a right to express opinions about controversial issues and need to be able to do it in an environment that is respectful and civil.

Merrick remarks that "sometimes we deliberately create a counterpoint event if we believe that there's not enough balance in the conversation." It is her opinion that the role of Walden State is "to provide a forum so that people can speak out," as opposed to the organization speaking to issues. To this end, the institution holds an annual symposium with renowned speakers to promote discussion and debate on significant topics of interest.

Leading in Business versus Higher Education

When asked if she would do things differently if she led a business organization, Merrick replies, "Probably not." She indicates that she would "probably move a little faster on some things because there wouldn't be as much
governance process,” but adds that her experience on corporate boards has shown her that many of the issues in higher education are still an issue in business organizations. She explains,

You still have a culture and you have an organization of people, and if you don’t do whatever is necessary to help them own the change, you’re going to meet resistance. And so ultimately it boils down to pretty similar kinds of issues.

With regards to whether or not business organizations and higher education organizations are becoming more similar in the face of a knowledge economy, Merrick speculates,

I’ve heard some very creative stories of incentives and energizing a workforce around something that they probably weren’t very excited about in the first place, not unlike some of the things that we have to think about. So while the product is different, there’s a lot of underlying process that is common. And look at how many organizations are now calling their headquarters ‘campuses.’ There is a blending and I think some of it probably has to do with thinking more about the power of knowledge. And you know, your company’s knowledge is a precious commodity; probably not even a commodity - a precious resource.
Advice to Others Seeking This Level of Leadership

Merrick does volunteer work with various women's leadership groups around the country and indicates that she is "pretty convinced about the kind of advice that ought to be given." She offers the following five suggestions:

- First, I really believe that you have to be who you are. You really have to understand yourself, what drives you, what makes you tick, what you're passionate about, et cetera. If you go for a presidency just because it's a presidency and it's not one that suits, you will not be successful and you'll be unhappy.

- Second, you have to do your homework. You really have to work your way through the experiences that prepare you for leadership at this level.

- Third, I think you have to understand the value of a very good team and the importance of clear signals about expectations; in the end they're shared, but it has to be clear where the organization is going and what the expectations are. Then you want to surround yourself with people who are better than you, and get out of the way and let them do what you've asked them to do.

- Fourth, I think you have to find your own personal sense of balance, and we all have a different point there.

- And then, I guess the last thing I would say is, don't take yourself too seriously. These are very powerful positions by virtue of the position, not necessarily the person that's in them. I think that you have to keep
the focus on respect for the office of the president and all that that symbolizes, rather than worry too much about the individual.
CHAPTER 9

ANN MORGAN, PRESIDENT, WINCHESTER UNIVERSITY

Introduction

Being president of a university does have its altruistic rewards. As Dr. Morgan explains,

On Commencement Day, no matter how many hands I’ve shaken and how tired I am after the second commencement, seven hours and four thousand hands later…it is the most exhilarating day.

At 65 years old, Morgan is dynamic, driven, and passionate about her work and the university. She is adamant in her belief that a good quality education and “creating really decent human beings, in a world that really pushes against that in a lot ways,” has a high value. She admits that, ironically, “the higher up you go [in higher education administration], the less contact you have with the reason you got into it.”

Morgan began college with the intention of going into the sciences and believes that had she attended college a generation later, she probably would have majored in math or business administration. Instead, she was dissuaded from the sciences and pursued a Bachelor’s degree in English. With the continued prodding and encouragement of one of her professors, she went on to receive both her Masters degree and her Ph.D. in English and American Literature.
Morgan married her husband of now almost 45 years while she was a sophomore in college. She states, "We got married as young kids and ran away from college and never thought we would ever get one degree, much less six degrees between us." She gave birth to their two sons while working toward her undergraduate and graduate degrees, and was the breadwinner in the family when she began teaching, as her husband was then a full-time student pursuing his Ph.D.

In the 1970s, their reversal of roles was an anomaly in the profession. This trend, however, has continued for the Morgans throughout their professional careers with her job opportunities and promotions taking precedence and directing the course of their lives. Along the way, they even endured a commuter marriage for six years as their jobs were in different states, but Morgan is adamant that they will never do that again. Her admiration and love for her husband are obvious as she adds that "he's a great, great partner, as well as everything else in my life."

President Morgan has been in the business of higher education for forty years. After graduating with her Ph.D., she accepted a position as an Assistant Professor of English at a major public land-grant university and taught for four years. Her initial move into administration was due to budget cuts that threatened the contracts of untenured faculty, like her, at this institution. Facilitated by her English department colleagues who campaigned for her appointment and by the realization that her family was facing the prospect of no income, Morgan applied
for a recently created position of ombudsman for the university. She was hired in 1974 and held the position for two years.

This was a tumultuous time for the institution and, in the midst of her tenure in this role, a new president was appointed to the university. He readily recognized that Morgan was a good judge of character, possessed a keen sensitivity to people's needs, and was able to balance these traits with intelligence, determination, and perseverance. When the position of Dean of Students opened up, he strongly encouraged Morgan to apply despite her lack of experience in administration. She accepted the job in 1976 and spent one year as Dean of Students and six years as Vice President and Dean of Students before being promoted to and serving as Vice President for Administration in 1982 for an additional seven years.

Her experiences and success in these roles prompted Morgan to take on the challenge of a presidency at a small liberal arts college in New York in 1989. Her accomplishments over six years at this institution included the implementation of strategic planning for decision-making and resource allocation, the planning and execution of the institution's first capital campaign, and the creation of a venture capital fund, which afforded stipends to faculty for curricular and course development. The academic focus of the college, minority enrollments, and student retention were also significantly impacted and increased during her tenure.

The lure of an untapped potential for higher education in the state, combined with an opportunistic environment full of energy and vitality, first
attracted Morgan to Winchester University. Opened as a division of the state’s flagship university in 1957, Winchester was renamed and hired its first president in 1965. By 1995, when Morgan arrived, the state had only two major institutions and Winchester’s enrollment was approximately 19,000 students.

Today, the university has 28,000 students, employs nearly 5,000 full and part-time faculty and staff, has an annual operating budget of approximately $225 million, and receives about $69 million in external research funding. The institution is classified as Doctoral-Research Intensive and offers 221 degrees programs through 12 schools and colleges on two campuses. In addition, there are approximately 114 student organizations. The state has led the nation in growth for more than a decade and is unique in its taxation system, its biennial legislative sessions, and in its governance of higher education.

Morgan’s accomplishments during her tenure are numerous. Among them, the university has implemented its first-ever strategic planning process, created more than 100 new degree programs, established a school of dental medicine and a law school, increased faculty and staff by 69%, grown external funding from $19 million to $95 million including an almost 500% increase in research funding, built and completely renovated a total of 23 buildings, and recently set in motion a $500 million capital campaign that has already passed the $300 million mark.

Morgan has always been ahead of her time in many ways. She was the first female hired in each of the administrative positions she has held, including her role as the seventh president and first female leader of Winchester
University. As well, she has worked to establish what will one day be a compelling international "think tank" in the state for intellectual dialogue on pressing global issues. She is extremely active in local, state, and national civic, educational, and business organizations, and has published in a variety of venues.

Throughout the interview process, Morgan spoke candidly and realistically about contentious issues that confront the institution and her personally, as president of Winchester University. The majority of these controversies can be traced directly to the truly unique fiscal, economic, and political factors in the state. And although Morgan is cognizant at all times of the potential pitfalls and hazards associated with these realities, she has consistently and persistently put the best interests of the university ahead of her own personal gain or loss. To this end, in January, 2006, after eleven years of unprecedented growth and achievements at the institution, Morgan tendered her resignation as president in order to preserve the stability and strategic progress of the university, in the face of personal and political differences instigated by the state's Chancellor.

Morgan, who when first interviewed conveyed an enthusiastic and proud demeanor, later exhibited a subdued and reflective air in the interview subsequent to her resignation. Typifying her passion for Winchester, Morgan has made the decision to stay on at the university in a development capacity and will work with the university foundation to raise funds to meet the $500 million capital campaign goal, which will drive the institution's future.
At the Core: Individual Values

Morgan cites “integrity and an absolute sense of caring about the development of human beings” as the core values that she brings to her leadership. She explains,

“That’s the only reason to do most jobs, in my view. There aren’t too many, though, that have at its heart the actual development of intellectual capital and human capital, and this one certainly does.”

And although Morgan believes that she could be a CEO and run a major private enterprise business, it wouldn’t give her “the same level of satisfaction with the outcomes” that she finds in higher education. Morgan emphasizes this point adding, “I care deeply about the life of the mind; my own and others.”

Morgan indicates that she also values diversity and is focused on “making [the institution] truly inclusive and bringing people into it that have not been able to be at the table in the same way as others have.” She explains that this has always been an integral component of her teaching and administration, as well as, her “sense of values” throughout life. In addition, her personal experiences as a female in this historically male environment have taught her “a great deal about other people who are not white and male, and about their sense of disenchantment or disenfranchisement; and that’s been highly sensitizing.”

Morgan characterizes herself as “an academic at heart,” but adds that “you wouldn’t do this for thirty years if you didn’t enjoy the challenge of administrative work.” In her opinion, this is indicative of her “multidimensional sort of mindset.” She explains it in this way;
"My father was the numbers guy. He was the finance person. My mother was artsy and a reader. I really do think there are ways in which I combine both of those things... An odd combination, [but] I am grateful that I have both of those characteristics because I think that in a presidency they serve you really well."

Morgan broadened her scope of interest and range of skills through her experience in administration. She quickly learned that while academicians are able to "spend time analyzing, reflecting, and weighing issues," administrators are faced with the prospect of "constantly reacting to new stimuli with limited time to analyze and assess." As an ombudsman, Morgan had to effectively communicate and persuade others to accept change, in addition to spending a major portion of her time problem solving and negotiating settlements. These abilities helped prepare her and pave the way for her to become the Vice President of Administration. In this position, much of her focus and energy was on labor relations issues and dealing with a very active and powerful union in the area. She had responsibility for budgeting and the building of new facilities on campus as well. At the time, it was very unusual for a woman to be in charge of these areas, and in particular, to be negotiating with labor unions.

All of these activities took her further away from academics however, and brought her to a crossroad in her career. By 1989, she was faced with making a choice between going back to being a faculty member or moving forward to either a provost or a president's position. Morgan explains,
Given that I’d been in two vice-presidencies with some very unusual experience, it made more sense to me to go toward a presidency, even though my credentials are not typical credentials for a president. I had to overcome that [stereotypical preparation], although I brought things that others don’t bring.

Morgan indicates that she had great mentors along the way, all of whom were men. She specifically identifies the president who hired her for two vice-presidencies as being “an absolutely wonderful mentor, a very caring, team-oriented person from whom I learned a great deal.” It is Morgan’s opinion that her unique background was great training for the presidency because it did in fact raise people’s sense that this is a person who has been a faculty in the humanities, who has been a dean of students, who has built buildings and done budgets, and you know that’s a pretty broad-ranging set of skills and activities to bring to a presidency.

The six years that Morgan spent as president of a small liberal arts college were very rewarding for her. She credits this in part, to “a totally dedicated faculty and great students.” However, she “kept feeling such frustration that, here was this great little school … and there was very little I could do to maneuver [it] into an even better position, because there were no resources.” During her tenure, the state had four years of budget cuts, two years of flat budgets, and “there really was a kind of disinvestment in higher education.”

Morgan gives the rationale behind her motivation to apply for the job of president at Winchester University in this way, “I decided that I needed a bigger
palette, a growing, developing place, so that the creative instinct of this job could be fulfilled better.” She talks about her need to “be in a place where I could make a difference [and] I wasn’t sure I was making a difference there.” In contrast, the data show that Morgan has made a tremendous difference in her eleven years at Winchester. She credits her team with helping her to move the university’s strategic plan forward and discusses her approach to developing a network of advisors;

I build the best team I can and hold them close to me, in terms of confidence and caring about what they do, reinforce their value to the institution, and develop a really strong team approach.

Morgan uses her advisors as an important outlet for both positive and negative feedback and she emphasizes the fact that getting their opinions and talking things out is an important aspect of the team process. She points out that she gets some feedback and advice externally as well, from “a couple of regents who are really thoughtful and helpful, and from community members, several of whom are foundation board members.” However, Morgan credits her husband, “by far and away, without any question whatsoever, [with being her] number-one supporter and listener.” Being in higher education himself, her husband “understands the environment.”

Morgan reports that being successful in her role as President of Winchester University requires a broad range and combination of skills. She cites both written and oral communication skills as vital; especially “communication skills for major public presentations or any number of interactions from the very
personal ones, one-on-one, to masses of people to whom you’re speaking at any given time.” She also emphasizes the ability to motivate other people and team-building as being critical to good leadership.

It’s really important to try to get people to see the big picture, to see it apart from their own self-aggrandizement, and to work together to achieve those ends on behalf of the cause or the organization. Equally important she adds, “I always want [individuals] to be accountable for what they’re doing, and I hold a really high standard of accountability.”

Passion is important to Morgan’s leadership as well. She believes that people either have it, or they don’t, and that, while it is “a very underrated and, [possibly] un-teachable, quality,” it can be “contagious.” Finally, Morgan has found that “political acumen” is extremely important in this particular leadership position. She readily admits that she neither likes it nor has a high level of skill in it; “I’ve had to learn what I do know about it, and I never come to it naturally or happily.” Morgan discusses the fact that the politics associated with higher education in this state can be both vicious and personal; “It’s a beat-you-up, throw-you-over-their-shoulder place. No president here has ever gone out gracefully, much less a woman.”

Not surprisingly, Morgan finds “politics” to be the greatest external constraint that affects her leadership at Winchester University. In her experience, “you just have to wend your way through and around, over and under, in ways that are complex.” She talks about the fact that much of the “politics” associated with the position “has [nothing] to do with the values that you’re trying to move
forward. [Instead] it has to do with all kinds of other things, other agendas, and
egos.” Morgan offers this guidepost; “You choose your battles and choose where
you want to be at the end of the day, and how you want people to remember you
and what you have done… I [go] with what is right.”

Internally, the greatest constraint that affects Morgan’s ability to lead is the
“sharp cultural change, growth, and the development of complex programs and
systems” that has taken place over a very short period of time during her tenure.
She describes the institution when she first arrived as much less multifaceted; “a
regional teaching institution with pockets of good scholarship.” The rate and pace
of change since her arrival have been “incredible,” to say the least, however,
Morgan relates,

That’s why I came here. I could see that there were those possibilities. I
don’t know that I ever thought we could do that many things
simultaneously, but boy, have we ever moved!

Morgan believes that the best decision she made was to “create the law
school” at the institution, in part because the university was “not known or
assumed to be the home of major professional schools.” She describes how she
was packing to move to the state when she found out that a donation of
$500,000 was available for a law school. Although “it had been in the planning for
25 years,” the school had gone nowhere. Morgan recalls,

I probably spent close to fifty percent of my time working on the feasibility
study, persuading regents, persuading legislators, and persuading the
legal community that it was a good thing to do.
Accredited in 2003, the law school is already ranked in the top fifty percent of law schools nationally. Morgan sees this as a great accomplishment in that, it has “set the pace and created the template for other professional schools” at Winchester and “for the world at large to see [the university] differently.”

Morgan’s worst decision, from her perspective, was a hiring decision at the vice-presidential level. She relates,

I kept him for four years, knowing from about the third month that he should go, but he was a minority, and I didn’t want to do that. I kept saying, ‘I’ll get him to where I need to get him.’...And it got worse instead of better, and then it was contentious at the end of it. It was a very bad personnel decision.

She indicates that personnel decisions at the senior level are often difficult, and that while “you probably get better at it... it’s never a process that you completely master.”

Morgan’s own job performance is evaluated every three years by way of an exhaustive and very public review. A committee is convened, led by an external evaluator who typically is a president from another accredited higher education institution. Other members on the committee include several regents, as well as student and faculty leaders at the institution. Surveys and interviews are conducted throughout the university over a three day period and a concluding report is presented to the state’s Chancellor and the Board of Regents by the committee. During the intervening years, the chancellor alone is responsible for evaluating the president and giving his/her recommendation to the Board of
Regents. Results are also published in the press and reported by the local television stations.

The Intersection of Individual and Organization

Winchester University is one of two universities in the state, and as such, Morgan explains;

You impact everything and everything impacts you. You can't create a total niche. You have to serve a huge number of needs and be a resource to a huge number of different other entities and needs in the state.

Morgan acknowledges that it took her some time to realize the extent to which “the community did not perceive Winchester as a resource,” in part because “the higher education system was so weak.” As a result, Morgan took it upon herself to contact and connect with high ranking business, professional, and governmental officials in the state and promote the fact that “the university and its development is directly tied to all business development in the community, and that [the institution] needed to be an absolute partner in those efforts and activities.” She candidly admits that early in her tenure she probably underestimated how much out-reach the university was doing, but in the years since, has worked diligently in this area and is a member of the executive committee of the state development authority.

Morgan’s vision for Winchester University is that “it will be the next UCLA.” It is a vision that she has campaigned long and hard for. She sees Winchester University in the future as
A major national and international research university in a booming city that interconnects to its city in a synergistic way back and forth and that provides everything from great athletics to great cultural events to marvelous academic programs, high standards, great students and faculty.

She hopes and believes that the commitment to that vision by members of the university and the greater community will continue after her tenure.

The conversation moves to the topic of how Morgan deals with conflict in the organization and she states that, in her experience, “there is no template for it.” She advocates a situation-based approach to conflict and explains,

Sometimes conflict is truly a seeking of strong leadership and direction, and you can walk into some situations that have been pretty chaotic and get them turned in the right direction by simply asserting certain principles: we’re going to do this, that’s our goal folks, and that’s where we’re going. Then again, she has found that there are times when that type of approach is inappropriate and she finds that the situation requires

Negotiations with everybody as if we’re all equals in the process. And you don’t play the power card, you don’t play the strong directional card, you let it come to you. You try to shape it... and let people think it’s their idea and feel good about that and... try to get them again, marching to the beat of the same drummer.

Morgan talks about a similar process for bringing the organization to change. From her perspective, this is achieved by “the leader articulating the
vision and getting everybody else in a conversation about that vision and how you get there.” Morgan does not believe, however, that the president has sole responsibility for determining and delineating the vision for the organization. She sees this instead as a process that comes about,

Not by imposing it from the top down, but by listening to your constituents and your organization’s people; hearing what they’re dreaming about, and then articulating it all the time, back to them and back to everybody else.

So it’s not an up-down process, it’s not a down-up process; it’s a kind of synergy between the two.

Collegiality is a core component of Morgan’s leadership and she points out that the culture in higher education has “equity as part of its value system.” However, Morgan does not see equity and efficiency as mutually exclusive. She remarks that if it was important to “sacrifice one for the other… you probably would have to let efficiency ride a little bit so that you can make sure equity is dominant.” In general, Morgan finds that it is possible to work with and achieve both simultaneously.

The Intersection of Organization and Public Domain

Morgan sees higher education and the work of the university as simultaneously achieving both public and private good. She articulates it this way;

For every student who gets a degree or is educated here, they get a private good. On the other hand, every one of those human beings you
put out in the world is a public good... if you've trained them well and not
only educated them, but also developed some social and moral character
as a result of education.

Morgan believes that universities are social and cultural organizations and
that, by definition, "education is both [social and cultural]." She insists "that's what
we do for a living." Morgan gives the example of research and professional
development that is "there to serve society in socially important ways and to
solve social problems." She also discusses the importance of the university's fine
arts and performing arts schools, and the students in these programs who can
affect cultural life not only through campus events, but through their activities all
over the world.

Morgan reflects on how Winchester University has changed over the years
in terms of engagement from,

a kind of little tower on the hill here into an institution that really reaches
out, and that … asks the broader community to come into it in a variety of
ways through advisory committees, through fundraising, through the arts,
through the kinds of research projects that we do that we hope directly
affect our community.

She sees civic engagement, being directly connected in every possible way to
the community you serve, as critical to both the community and to achieving the
goals of the university.

In Morgan's opinion, "a public university at its peril would ignore its civic
responsibilities." She refers once again to the institution's responsibility for
growing the minds of its students and for "developing people of conscience and political understanding" who "become more able to make complex decisions in an increasingly complex world." As the president of a public institution, Morgan must always be cognizant of legislative and judicial decisions that have the potential to impact operations at Winchester. She cites the need to be politically astute in her position and she has found that the president's job is twofold; first, to create an environment for great learning and thinking, and second, to bring resources that make that possible. Morgan adds, "The more resources you can bring; the more effective you are."

Another significant component of leading at one of the only two universities in the state is that there is a great deal more scrutiny from the press than is typically found in other states. Morgan compares her experience in New York, an area with 356 colleges and universities, where "you hope that somebody pays attention to you," to her experiences in this state "where [you spend your time trying] to get out of their attention," and half-heartedly laughs.

For a long time, the press in this state expected Morgan to address every inquiry and news item personally. In an effort to better manage the media and her time, Morgan hired a public relations person for the institution two years ago, who has extensive experience working for public agencies. This individual has helped the university to assemble a panel of experts who can act as spokespersons on both academic and administrative issues. Morgan sees this as a very positive move in that this panel is composed of renowned professors who
offer a multitude of different points of view in their areas of expertise, giving the public “a perception of the real intellectual depth” at the institution.

Morgan believes that it is critical to make connections and communicate with leaders across sectors, especially in this state. Although there are very few women in the group, Morgan emphasizes that she knows practically every “major player” in the city and the surrounding area. By the same token, Morgan rarely takes a stand on controversial national or international issues because she has “not felt comfortable that that would be supported.” She has and does, however, speak to issues that are academic in nature or have the potential to affect academics in the state. In her opinion, she draws a line between issues that are purely political in nature versus those that involve educational politics.

Leading in Business versus Higher Education

In Morgan’s opinion, leadership in higher education has changed in relation to the increase of entrepreneurialism in the sector. She has found that she uses “the same philosophies of relationships, what I care about, and what I invest in” both in her external board relationships and as president of a public research university. “It’s not much different.” The real dissimilarity, from her perspective, is that “in the private sector there’s a whole lot more that can and is done because it isn’t in the public eye being scrutinized every minute.”
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Advice to Others Seeking this Level of Leadership

Morgan advises, first and foremost, that it is important to have a "terrifically supportive partner" who can be counted on to both listen and offer valid feedback when necessary. As well, having people on your staff and in your professional life, with whom you can speak and have conversations with total openness and honesty as their hallmarks, are essential. Morgan identifies these individuals as her "support network" and discusses the fact that for women in particular, this is crucial "because you do get lonely out there and there aren't many [women at this same level]." Although there are women in other sectors who can fill this role to a certain extent, Morgan emphasizes that "it's not quite the same thing as having a true colleague."
CHAPTER 10

KELLY MADISON, CHANCELLOR, WESTWORD STATE UNIVERSITY

Introduction

Dr. Madison states, "I'm firmly committed to urban institutions. I wouldn't want to be anywhere else but at an urban institution."

Madison has been described as down-to-earth, straight-talking, and a stalwart advocate for students, faculty, and staff. She is credited by the System President with "fostering an entrepreneurial spirit" at Westword State University and is respected and recognized throughout the community for her work on behalf of the university and the city it serves.

Madison has an unassuming presence and a very humble nature. It is readily apparent, however, that Madison's passion lies in teaching and research and that she is never far from either. She firmly believes that she is still "teaching" when talking with state legislators about current issues in higher education and throughout her tenure as Chancellor, she could be found in the lab on campus every Friday morning designing and conducting experiments.

Madison is a published scientist with over 50 referred articles in Developmental Biology and Education, and has received grants from the country's most influential and well known science foundations and research societies. She has served as a consultant/educator for a major accrediting body...
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Madison received both a Bachelor’s and a Master’s degree in Science. She was a professor of biology, having earned her PhD. in Developmental Biology, and gained an international reputation early in her career for her work in cell development and cell regeneration. Madison has held previous positions in higher education as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Interim Provost at an urban university in another state prior to coming to Westword State.

In 1991, she accepted the position of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at Westword State and moved. One of Madison’s primary goals as Vice Chancellor was to reach out to people and businesses in the community and enlist their support and involvement in the campus and its activities. She was very successful in this endeavor and four years later was named Interim Chancellor when the former chancellor left to take another job in the state. She was formally given the title of Chancellor in 1997 and remained in the position for seven years before retiring in 2004. She was the first female Chancellor of this institution.

Westword State University is a comprehensive undergraduate and graduate research institution located in the capital city of the state. The institution was opened as an extension of the state’s flagship university in 1912. In 1974, the flagship was reorganized into four separate institutional entities. Today, the
Westword is classified as a Doctoral-Research Intensive university offering more than eighty degree programs through seven schools and colleges. The institution specializes in applied research, receives more than $20 million in external research funding, and has numerous partnerships with government, businesses, community organizations, and school districts. With an annual operating budget of approximately $140 million, Westword employs 1,800 faculty and staff members and has an enrollment of over 11,000 FTEs. The university has national outreach professional programs and global outreach through its sciences, engineering, business, and public affairs programs and has more than sixty recognized student organizations.

Under Madison’s tenure, the university has grown and become an engine for economic development in the city. She has been working with the institution and various leaders in the state and in the community at all levels toward the university’s Vision 2010 goal to become "one of the nation’s Top 10 Urban Research Universities." To this end, she fully supported the controversial move to add dormitories and merge the Health Sciences Center with her campus. She states,

The collaboration of educational and service opportunities is immense.
Together we can provide a solution to many of [the city's] problems and potential problems that neither one of us alone could or would do.

Madison is also credited with the development of a film center, a center for entrepreneurial development at the institution, and with the successful "Adopt a School" program. Madison was married to a fellow academic and unexpectedly
widowed shortly after retiring. She has since taken an important senior leadership position with a large university abroad after being aggressively recruited for her skills and expertise.

At The Core: Individual Values

Madison believes that honesty is the important core value that she brings to her leadership. She indicates that her mother taught her this at a young age, and she adds, "To be honest, I'm a terrible faker." Having been in higher education for so long, she also "really believes in the collegial way of doing things" and has "always had an open-door policy." She remarks, "People tend to tell me I'm easy to talk to. They don't mind sharing their concerns with me. Yeah, it takes time, but I think it's worth it." Madison discusses the fact that many of the people, both on and off campus, as well as the students involved in student government, call her by her first name — including the governor. She states, "I never told them, call me this or call me that," however, she felt that when she faced troublesome situations, this kind of casual rapport helped her.

Madison emphasizes that "people" matter most to her, not recognition and adds, "My identity is just kind of to be there. I don't want people recognizing me." She explains this further and acknowledges, "You have to have a certain ego to ever get these jobs and to be able to do them." However, she talks about how important it is for her to put her ego aside and to be open to criticism. She admits,
If people want to criticize me, I want to know what they’re criticizing me about. If it’s something I can change, I’m willing to change it, and if not, I probably would walk away from it. I don’t want to fight them on it.

Madison was strongly encouraged by the university’s faculty, staff, and her predecessor to take on the Chancellorship. At the time, there was another individual at the institution who was also interested in the position. Madison explains that there were several factors that motivated her to seek the position and among them was the fact that she, and many others, did not want to be working under this individual. The consensus was that she “was better than him.” In addition, Madison indicates that “the faculty wanted an academic, and I filled that role.” She emphasizes the importance of a good fit between the leader and the organization and gives the example of the Health Sciences Center merger with the institution shortly after her retirement; “It was pretty much a given that [the new president] would have to be an M.D. … that’s the only way to get the M.D.s lined up behind you.”

Madison became the first female officer at the institution when she was Vice Chancellor. She talks about the fact that some people on the campus purposely came to her during her first year and discussed changes they would like to see implemented, based on the fact that she was a woman. She told them, I can do that. You’re going to be looking for another vice-chancellor next year, and you might not have any women in the pool, I said. Or you can let me do it my way, and I’ll guarantee you that I’ll be successful … but it’s going to take me two or three years.
Madison stresses that although she is “very active” in the American Council on Education’s Committee on Women and has chaired the committee for several years she doesn’t “tend to call these people up to ask advice.” Although she believes that “networking is essential,” she also states that “I think it’s cracked up to be more than it is, at least for me.” She remarks that when seeking advice in a networking kind of situation, “[people] always tell you what you want to hear.” Instead, she looks to groups of people who surround the issue for input. She encourages fact finding and discussion and is not afraid to make the hard choices, however, once the decision is made, “that’s it folks; like it or not.”

When asked what skills are important in order to be successful in her leadership role, Madison answers, “I really think being analytical helps me.” She admits that she doesn’t “get the touchy-feely type thing.” She analyzes a situation, and based on that analysis, she makes a decision and goes with it. Madison states, “I think being very honest with people, when they don’t want you to be honest with them, helps.” She discusses this further and relates it to her background. As a female scientist, she has always worked with men and has no qualms in doing so. However, she adds,

I do think women manage things differently. I think we are definitely more caring than they are. I think we are definitely more people sensitive than they are. But you know, I could fire my mother if I had to.

Madison believes that the greatest challenges to her leadership position are the “people.” She explains,
They're different everywhere and in every situation, but your biggest challenges are always people. They're not issues. The issues are easy to deal with. It's the people behind the issues that make them difficult to deal with.

Madison indicates,

Generally issues are resolved by kind of a consensus so that everybody gets a little something they wanted, but on personnel decisions, you just basically have to say yes or no, and some of my best decisions were there and some of my worst decisions were there.

She reasons that this situation is aggravated in higher education leadership positions, in part, due to the search committee process. Committees, she believes, "are good because they let everybody have a say, but they're bad because ... they can take forever." She adds to this the fact that, at times, there are a limited number of candidates, and, in certain situations,

You're picking between two and three [candidates] and you really don't want [any] of them. And so, you pick one [and] you hope like the devil it works. Sometimes it does, sometimes it doesn't.

As Chancellor, Madison worked for the Board of Regents. Her job performance, however, was evaluated by the president of the state system annually and the report was then given to the Board. Faculty and staff also had input into the evaluation, which covered a broad range of criteria, including fund raising. Madison consistently received high marks and her five year employment contract was renewed without incident.
The Intersection of Individual and Organization

Madison talks about the environment in which Westword State University operates and points out,

It's an urban campus, located right in the heart of the city. That's where I came from. That's where I think ... public education needs to be doing its thing.

She discusses the fact that, prior to her taking the Vice Chancellor position, the institution had never done any fundraising. She began the process by having the director of the university foundation introduce her to people in the city. In her opinion, the fact that she was new to the area helped her to meet people and build relationships. She adds that she “enjoyed the fundraising part ... the making friends. I mean, I can sell the university.”

Madison recounts that she would take faculty members with her when she met with corporate donors. She relates that, in the course of the meetings, the corporate individuals could discern the passion that the faculty had for their work and their discipline, even if they did not fully understand the content area.

Madison contends that one of the better decisions she made was to get the deans of the institution involved as fundraisers. She explains how this benefited both the deans and the institution;

Number one, they all needed to have it on their record that they could raise money, and number two; I needed extra people, because we were starting from way back to try to deal with this.
Fund raising was an important aspect of Madison's job and a critical component of her vision for the university. She contends,

I wanted to get us on a firm foundation getting money. That was my real thing. I thought we had great academic programs, I wanted to continue our accreditations, and so forth, but more than anything, I wanted to at least establish some basis for raising money.

She humbly adds, "I think we did a good job of it. I don't know that I was the one that did the good job of it."

As the subject changes to the topic of how she deals with conflict in the organization, Madison offers a simple answer; "Oh, there's always conflict, and it's always between people. I would try to talk to both sides." She states that "I think I probably ended up in court less than most chancellors do, but that doesn't necessarily mean that I was good at negotiating out of these things." She firmly believes in the chain of command in higher education and during her tenure, she made it a point to support the decisions of her deans, even if she didn't always agree with the deans or their decisions.

Madison respects the history and traditions of higher education, but she is also cognizant of the inherent weaknesses in the system. When asked how she would bring Westword State to change, Madison replies, "Very slowly. It's hard to bring about change in an institution." She concedes that

If it's an academic matter, and it usually is, the faculty has to be convinced that it was their idea. Even though it might've been your idea, they have to be convinced that by golly, you know, we came up with this and it's a
pretty good idea and yeah, I think we ought to do this. And that takes a lot of time, a lot of time.

The point is made that this is a very sluggish process, however Madison is quick to assert that "equity is far more important" than efficiency in the academic organization. She states that the system is "not efficient by any stretch of the imagination," but claims that she "can be like a ferret. I mean I'll just grab a hold and I'll just hang there" in order to get things done. She acknowledges that if asked, the faculty would probably take credit for what was accomplished during Madison's tenure as opposed to crediting Madison herself with the results, but adds, "All that matters is that it got done."

Madison recognizes that this is very different from a business environment and explains it in this way;

In part it's because everybody in higher education is pretty bright. In business they aren't always bright. Sometimes they're just very gifted at handling things, but they aren't really bright. Everyone in higher education is pretty bright, and they've gotten where they've gotten by sitting on their hands and studying. And the last thing in the world you want to do is to challenge their intellect. At least ... I wouldn't want to do that to anyone.

The Intersection of Organization and Public Domain

Madison discusses achieving balance between public and private good in the organization from her perspective as Chancellor and states, "I'm committed to the urban environment and so that would always be first in my mind." She
indicates that the majority of the students at Westword State will take six years to finish their degrees because they work while they attend classes. She stresses, however, that they are very intelligent students who can compete with students from every other leading university. For the most part, the majority of the students will also not be able to spend a semester or two in a study abroad program for the same reasons.

Madison believes that it is important for these students to be able to work in a multinational world and be able to interact with students from other countries on a daily basis so she helped to establish an international program that brings students from China, Russia, and other countries to Westword State. She adds that, although they were questioned on the funding of this practice frequently by the state legislature, it was always approved because “it [is] totally framed within what is best for an urban population.”

Madison’s passion for urban higher education extends to the state college and community college that are located in close proximity to her campus. She indicates that she would meet with the chancellors from these institutions at least once every two weeks and work on shared issues and concerns. She emphasizes that “although there’s a rivalry, there’s really a lot more cooperation.” To their credit, the chancellors made tremendous strides in their efforts to avoid duplication of programs and improve articulation among the institutions.

Balancing social and cultural issues in the organization is also of concern to Madison. She once again stresses that “it takes time” and adds that with “any
major change that we explore … we work them out internally and then we have focus groups.” The process at Westword State is such that,

Every one of our colleges has an external advisory group and we use them as a focus group. We also use the public and get focus groups to come in so that they know what we’re doing, so they buy into it before we get to dealing with it.

Madison acknowledges that although not all of the comments from these groups are positive, they are helpful in framing the issue.

In addition, Westword State has a large number of minority students and cultural groups. As evidence of this diversity, Madison remembers having only one student body president who was Caucasian during her seven year tenure as Chancellor. She made it a point to meet with the student body presidents on a regular basis throughout her presidency and encouraged the students to bring whomever they wanted to these meeting. She remarks that every one of the presidents took advantage of these opportunities. Madison met with various other student groups as well and it is obvious that she enjoyed the interaction. She states that “I think if anything … my administration was quite popular with the students. They didn’t like everything we did, but they liked the way we dealt with them.”

Madison believes that it’s not enough that the institution is located in an urban area; it needs to have an urban focus and serve the needs of the urban environment. Although the students and the faculty were her main priority, she
also focused on identifying and integrating the needs of this urban community into the institution’s goals and objectives.

Madison indicates that legislators in the area are “nicer and easier to deal with than the group” she worked with in another state who she characterizes as “mean and not open.” She explains that the legislators in this state are knowledgeable about a great number of issues, but she is amazed at “how naïve they can be about higher education.” Her overall experience with them has shown her that the “legislators are very reasonable; they care to learn and want to hear from you.”

Budget issues, however, are a different matter. When asked what she would change about the job, Madison states,

I guess what I would like to have is a more certain funding base, not a guaranteed amount of money, but a portion of the budget that was guaranteed. There’s just so many times when you’re under the gun, you have to do this, you have to do that, and you get spread so thin. You can’t do it all the way you’d like to do it.

She is quick to add that she has no problem with performance funding, but believes that “we ought to get something for it.”

Due to Westword State’s location and its public university status, the institution frequently received attention in the media and the press. She emphasizes the fact that “when the newspaper would be attacking, and they always were [because] you’re in a big city,” she relied on her own straight-
forward and easy rapport with them. She recalls an incident, in which she contacted a reporter directly and said,

Look, I'm not going to tell you how to do your job, but I'm telling you on this one, trust me, you're barking-up-the-wrong-tree. This is not going to lead where you think it's going to. And I said it's up to you. I mean listen to me. The reporter did. He didn't follow up on it and I ran into him six months later and he said, 'Best advice I ever got.'

She also concedes, that as one of the four system universities, "it's pretty bad when we all get painted with the same brush, and that's what the media does." Madison looks back on this and has determined that "I think we were treated fairly, and that's about the highest compliment I can pay the media."

Madison enjoyed making many connections with other leaders across sectors as part of her job and fund raising duties. Since her retirement though, she has found these relationships to be even more diverse and significant as they no longer pose the potential conflicts of interest they did while she was in office.

Taking a public stand on controversial national or international issues and policies can be hazardous in a leadership role, but Madison found that "as Chancellor, when it was in our best interest to take a stand on an issue, we took it, period. And I was the spokesperson." She indicated that this was not something that occurred often, but did come up three or four times a year. Madison believes that "there are times when, even though we might not win,
we’ve got to go down in flames.” And, she states, “When we needed to take a stand, we took a stand. And they still do that, and that’s good.”

Leading in Business versus Higher Education

It is Madison’s opinion that in the future, there are going to be more public university presidents and chancellors that have not “come up the university path.” She explains that the culture in academe is such that “we’re used to dealing with highly intelligent people. We’re not used to dealing with the guy on the street who votes.” She continues,

I really think you don’t have to know a subject matter really well to be the CEO of the organization. You can hire people around you people who do know it well, and if you get the right people, you’ll be okay. I also think that we’re entering a place where they’re looking for the best person, and it won’t always be that they’re looking for an academic. All we can give them are academicians.

As this shift in perspectives is discussed further, Madison adds, “it’s going to take a while for the faculty to accept that.”

Madison offers some insight on this issue through the example of the person who became Chancellor after she retired. She indicates that both she and the institution’s previous chancellors had an open-door policy with the faculty. The current Chancellor, however, who is an M.D., “does not like to visit with faculty” and instead refers them to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs. She believes that, in the past, this would have created a
great deal of problems. However, in speaking to an individual in the Chancellor’s office recently she was told that,

Much to [this person’s] amazement, as long as the faculty could talk to someone … [they] never had a major revolt. [The general consensus was]: this is a new regime. He’s an M.D. We’re not used to working for M.D.s. We’ll play it his way.

Madison was surprised by this, but thinks that the issue may be that it is important for faculty to be able to have their say and to have someone in charge “to hear [them] say it.” In the future, maybe it doesn’t have to be the Chancellor who fills this role.

It is Madison’s opinion that the differences in higher education budgeting and the sheer size of the budget would discourage most business people from wanting to take on the leadership of a university because it is not what they are accustomed to. She states, “You’re not going to get a lot of good corporate people, other than people who are near retirement … who will want to do it for humanitarian reasons.”

Advice to Others Seeking This Level of Leadership

Madison asserts that a woman or any member of a minority group “still has to be better than a hundred percent. So perform at a hundred and thirty percent.” In addition, “You may not get any recognition for it, but I still think you’re going to have to be better than [white males] are to get it.”
As well, in order to be a leader in higher education, Madison believes that "you have to fill a niche." She cites the fact that the chancellor before her was a politician, whereas she is an academic. This worked to her advantage at the time of her appointment as the institutional members wanted an academic for the job and she filled that particular function.

Finally, Madison maintains that "you have to take the correct route to the top." Although she indicates that she doesn't think that it's the only way, she does believe that it is the best way. She gives the example, "There are a lot of people who have delusions of being vice-chancellors and chancellors who are now affirmative action officers. It [won't] work." Madison advises,

You’ve got to be in the hard areas; either money - and I don’t mean raising it, I mean managing it: get a Ph.D. in accounting, be in the business end of it, or go up through the academics. Student Affairs; if you're awful lucky you might make it. ... The best way is still to go through academics or ... come in from a nonprofit.
CHAPTER 11

PUBLIC RESEARCH UNIVERSITY SECTOR CROSS CASE COMPARISON

This chapter examines the similarities and differences between the public research university sector leaders in this study and provides a summary of the information detailed in chapters nine through eleven.

Organization and Environment

Of the three universities in this study, Walden State is the oldest. It was established 96 years ago as a teacher training school and today, is one of the largest regional systems in the country. Westword State was established 94 years ago as an extension of the state's flagship university and as a result of the reorganization in 1974, became a separate and distinct campus. Winchester State is much newer, having opened 49 years ago, also as a division of the state's flagship university. It was renamed and hired its first president in 1965.

Walden State, with 36,000 students, eight campuses, and an operating budget of $385 million is the only one of the three universities that is classified as Doctoral Research-Extensive. Winchester State has 28,000 students, two campuses, and a $225 million budget. Westword State has 12,000 students, one campus, and a budget of $140 million. Winchester and Westword are both classified as Doctoral Research-Intensive. Interestingly, Winchester State has
the most degree programs (221), schools and colleges (12), and the most employees (5,000). Walden State, by comparison, offers 201 degree programs through ten schools and colleges, and employees 4,300 people. Westword State offers more than 80 degree programs through seven schools and colleges and employees 1,800 employees. Winchester State also receives the most ($69 million) in research funding, with Walden State receiving $31 million and Westword State, $20 million. In terms of student organizations, Walden has over 200, Winchester has 114, and Westword has more than 60.

Westword and Winchester are both located in large metropolitan areas. Westword has become an engine for economic development in the city through its numerous partnerships with government, businesses, community organizations, and school districts. Winchester, by comparison, has seen ten years of unprecedented growth in both the city and in the number of university-community partnerships and business development programs. Walden, although a major social, cultural, and economic engine in the region, is located in a rural area. The institution has experienced eight straight years of record applications and enrollment growth, added several unique and cutting-edge research centers, and was one of only thirty-seven universities recently reclassified as Research-Extensive.

All of the three universities can be impacted by changes in national and state funding, research grants and opportunities, faculty senates, and by perceived changes to their reputation in the form of college ranking reports and controversies. In addition, all three universities face similar external control
factors in varying degrees from sources such as federal, state, and local rules and legislation, accrediting bodies, governing boards, and alumni.

At the Core: Individual Values

All three of the public research university leaders cited honesty and integrity, and the trust, respect, and accountability that flow from these, as the core values that they bring to their leadership. Merrick describes her identity as bound up in a love of working in complex settings and being able to motivate people to get results. Morgan discusses being an academic at heart with a multifaceted art and science perspective of life. Madison indicates that people and collegiality matter most to her.

The women acknowledge that they each had advisors and mentors who helped them along the way; all of whom were related to work in the form of previous bosses and former and current fellow academics. As well, they all pointed to advisors within their institutions whom they look to on a regular basis. Merrick receives input on issues through a formalized system of advisors - her senior management team. And although Morgan points to her husband as her best and most supportive advisor, she depends on her internal management team and, occasionally, on several key external stakeholders. Madison, by contrast, explains that she relies on the people around the issue to give her the best information and insights. The leaders all agree that increased duties, responsibilities, and authority were the factors that motivated them to seek the leadership position.
The women point to a range of skills that they believe are important in their leadership roles. Merrick emphasizes a sense of timing and pacing which, she adds, also tempers her “very forceful personality.” Morgan finds that passion and political acumen are essential. Madison trusts the analytical skills she has honed as a scientist.

In addition, Merrick cites a high comfort level with multitasking and being able to work with divergent groups to get results. Morgan advises others that a broad range of oral and written communication skills are vital. Madison suggests that it is essential to be willing to make the hard decisions and to “go with” the decision in order to be an effective leader.

Finally, Merrick believes that in order to be successful in her role, it is imperative to respect others’ opinions, the concept of shared values and a shared agenda, to have confidence in your management abilities, and an understanding of the need for leadership. Morgan asserts that the ability to motivate others and to get them to see “the big picture apart from their own goals” is critical. Madison emphasizes the fundamental need to be “people sensitive” and to be honest in all your interactions with them.

The greatest challenge that each of the three leaders identifies is leading the “constant whitewater” of change per Merrick; dealing with people and politics per Morgan; and “always people” per Madison. To this end, Merrick would change the pace at which things are accomplished at her institution; Morgan would change the politics, as well as, the rate and pace of change at hers; and Madison would give post secondary education funding a more secure and
reliable foundation and direction. She adds that she is not opposed to performance funding in higher education.

The women all agree that the most significant internal constraint they face is the organization and processes of higher education and working with academicians. In contrast, the external constraints they delineated varied with Merrick citing competing priorities, Morgan pointing to politics, and Madison indicating funding issues and problems with separating the institution’s identity and reputation from the other three distinct university campuses. They also all identified the best decision they made as having to do with some aspect of their institution’s operations and the worst decision relating to a hiring or firing issue.

The job performance evaluation process for each of these higher education leaders is both very formal and very public. Merrick’s is clearly defined and developed in coordination with the institution’s board of regents while Morgan and Madison’s were much less so. In every case, the performance indicators covered a broad range of areas including such items as graduation rates and retention, research efforts and funding, and engagement with students, the community, and the world, to name a few.

The Intersection of Individual and Organization

As leaders of higher education institutions, the women articulated expansive visions for their organizations that included both short term and long term goals. In every case, components of engagement with the community, research, students, and learning were the core features.
Conflict is very much a factor in higher education leadership. Although the women all pointed to the fact that they try to deal with conflict directly, they also indicated that communication, openness, and chain of command are critical factors in their collegial environments. The extent to which the conflict involves institutional versus personnel issues mediates the degree of transparency the leaders afford the incident or situation.

Bringing the organization to change also presents a great challenge for each of these women. They all agreed that change is slow, difficult, and requires immense faculty involvement. Merrick indicates that she gathers input from various institutional factions and then she communicates change directly from the top. Morgan points to a synergistic top-down, bottom-up approach which relies on faculty participation in conjunction with her efforts to guide, shape, and communicate change. Madison offered similar insights and commented that in order for change to be successful, the “faculty need to believe that it was their idea.”

In the end, each of the leaders indicated that equity is more important than efficiency and pointed to the collegial environment of higher education that facilitates this. However, Merrick added that equity doesn’t necessarily mean equality of resources; Morgan believes that you shouldn’t have to sacrifice efficiency in order to have equity; and Madison stated that the professional nature of the faculty demands equality as one of its defining factors.
The Intersection of Organization and the Public Domain

As public research university presidents, the women in this study all value and appreciate the nature and balance of public and private good inherent in their institutions. Merrick discussed her concerns with the rising costs of public higher education that rival those of private institutions. Morgan pointed to the fact that public institutions, by their very nature, continuously provide both public and private benefits in an on-going cycle. Madison characterized public and private good through examples of community involvement and student opportunities.

Balancing social and cultural issues is also an essential feature of public higher education. Merrick works diligently to make certain that her institution provides a wide array of both social and cultural experiences, adding that it is imperative that the institution have no gaps or be overly focused in any one area. Walden State’s agenda in this regard, is in part, defined by the institution being a driving force in the area’s economy. Morgan states that institutions are innately social and cultural forces in their environment through their missions and civic engagement. Madison, by contrast, explained that the urban setting of Westword State necessarily brought a great deal of diversity. As such, the institution used both internal and external focus groups to help moderate their social and cultural efforts.

The three higher education women all agree that the press and the media are integral components of public university leadership today. Merrick emphasizes that they play an important role, but adds that it is much more difficult to get attention for positive stories than it is for negative ones. In
Morgan’s case, both she and Winchester State receive an intense and immense amount of scrutiny by the press and the media on an on-going basis - much more so than any other leader or institution in this study. Madison and Westword State received frequent attention, however, Madison believes that both she and the institution were treated fairly overall. She credits this to her straightforward and honest approach in dealing with people and reporters.

Networking with other leaders is also a major aspect of public higher education leadership and all three leaders discussed the fact that they spend a great deal of time and effort doing this. Merrick talked about networking at national, state, and local levels professionally and on behalf of the institution. Morgan explained that networking was critical to economic development in the area, institutional fundraising, and to her role. Madison echoed Morgan’s comments and added that she really enjoyed this aspect of her job.

Finally, when determining when to take a stand on controversial national or international issues, the women were consistent in their view that they did so cautiously and rarely, if ever, on issues unrelated to education. Merrick asserts that she looks at important issues on a case-by-case basis and that the institution often provides a forum in which to present a balance of both sides of a controversy. Morgan does not feel comfortable in her role speaking on controversial issues, including those that she personally believes are critical. She does, however, occasionally speak on academic and educational items. And Madison indicated that when needed, the institution would take a stand and she
was the spokesperson. These incidents did indeed occur a couple of times each year throughout her tenure.

Leading in Business versus Higher Education

All of the higher education leaders in this study have been involved with business organizations in some capacity. Based on this, each woman commented on her experience with the private enterprise business sector in general. Merrick’s efforts have shown her that businesses have many of the same issues with change, underlying processes, and energizing the workforce as higher education institutions. Although she concedes that businesses, in general, move at a much faster pace, she believes that knowledge as a resource is creating an atmosphere in the business sector that is more similar to the higher education sector than ever before. She gives the example that many companies today refer to their offices as campuses.

Morgan suggests that private enterprise businesses get more accomplished because they are not constantly in the public eye being scrutinized. Madison, in contrast, asserts that an individual does not have to be an expert in a specialized subject or area in order to be a successful CEO. In higher education however, this is required, and as such, highly trained individuals in narrowly focused areas form the crux of the educational environment. In her opinion, this is the key difference in leadership between the sectors.
Advice to Others Seeking this Level of Leadership

All of the women agreed that it is essential to “be yourself.” Merrick adds that it is vital to find a personal sense of balance and to not take yourself too seriously. Morgan advises others to have a supportive partner in whom you can confide and to develop a “support network” of people in your professional life with whom you can speak openly and honestly. She explains that this is extremely important for women because there are so few females in higher education top leadership positions; “true colleagues.” Madison extends this line of thought and states that “as females, you’re always going to have to do better than 100%.” In addition, Merrick and Morgan both talk about the value of a good team of staff members on whom you can rely. Finally, each of the women discussed the need to have skills directly related to the leadership role. Merrick put this in terms of “you have to do your homework,” Morgan pointed to the skills she acquired in her vice presidencies, and Madison prompts others to “take the right route to the top and be in the hard areas.”
CHAPTER 12

CROSS SECTOR COMPARISON

In chapters seven and eleven, the researcher reviewed the similarities and differences between participants within their respective private enterprise business and public research university sectors. This chapter summarizes and compares the data across the two sectors for the six case studies. This is consistent with the methods and approaches advocated by Lincoln & Guba (1985), Miles & Huberman (1994), Ryan & Bernard (2000), and Yin (2003) for comparing multiple cases in complex settings.

Participants

The six women who participated in this study range in age from 46 to 67 years old, with Hanley at Calliope Kids being the youngest and Madison at Westword University, the eldest. The leaders in the business sector were 46 to 54 years old and the women in higher education were 64 to 67 years old. Three of the women are married (Hayden, Merrick, and Morgan), one is widowed (Madison), one is divorced (Hanley), and one is divorced and remarried (Hartwell). None of the private enterprise business sector presidents have children, while two of the public research university presidents each have two
children (Merrick and Morgan). The third higher education president (Madison) also has no children.

Since completing their degrees, all six of the leaders have had careers and have been employed in the same industry and sector in which they currently operate. With eight years, Hanley at Calliope Kids has shortest tenure in the same organization and Hayden has the longest tenure with over thirty years at of Corbin & Cade. The public research university leaders have tenures of seven to fifteen years in their current roles, although they have longer tenures of over thirty-plus years in the public higher education sector as a whole. In addition, each of the participants was the first woman to hold her position and title.

Organization and Environment

Corbin & Cade, led by Hayden, is the largest private enterprise business organization in this study. It has roughly $7 billion in revenues, approximately 30,000 employees, and 103 offices around the country. Creighton Foods, led by Hartwell, is the second largest with annual sales of $1.8 billion, 4,500 employees pre-acquisition, and six offices around the country in addition to the main office. And Calliope Kids, led by Hanley, is the smallest with $583.2 million in revenues, 3,800 full time equivalent employees, one main office and 648 retail outlets.

Walden State University, led by Merrick, is the largest public research university in this study. It has an annual operating budget of $385 million, 4,300 full and part time employees, 36,000 full-time-equivalent students (FTEs), and eight campuses. Winchester State, led by Morgan, is the second largest with an
annual operating budget of $225 million, nearly 5,000 full and part time employees, 28,000 FTEs, and two campuses. And Westword State, led by Madison, is the smallest with an annual operating budget of $140 million, 1,800 full and full-time equivalent employees, and 11,000 FTEs all on one campus.

In business for 105 years each, Creighton Foods and Corbin & Cade are the oldest organizations in the study. Calliope Kids is the youngest organization, having incorporated 27 years ago. Walden State and Westword State were both established over 90 ago and Winchester State opened as a division of the state flagship's university 49 years ago, but was renamed and hired its first president only 41 years ago.

Calliope Kids, Creighton Foods, and Walden State all function using a cross functional matrix approach. By comparison, Corbin & Cade, Winchester State, and Westword State use more traditional hierarchical leadership structures. In addition, the leaders of Calliope Kids and Creighton Foods characterize their organizations as cooperative and collaborative in nature, in contrast to Corbin & Cade and the three public research universities, which have collegial environments where power is vested equally among the professional colleagues.

The profits and operations of both Calliope Kids and Creighton Foods can be impacted by national economic conditions, customer preferences, international business risks, and production costs, as opposed to Corbin & Cade, which faces threats from changes in laws and regulations, partnership matters, oversight concerns, and issues that affect both their clients and the investing
public. The universities, in contrast, can be impinged upon by changes in both national and state funding, research grants and opportunities, faculty senates, and by perceived changes to their reputations in the form of college ranking reports and public controversies.

The three private enterprise business organizations face comparable external control factors that include the Sarbanes Oxley Act, industry rules and regulations, and both national and international legislative and policy issues. Calliope Kids and Creighton Foods also contend with shareholder issues, as opposed to Corbin & Cade, which has peer review and industry accreditation constraints. The three universities also face similar controls from accrediting bodies. In addition, public research universities can be impacted by federal, state, and local rules and regulations, governing boards, and alumni.

At the Core: Individual Values

From the outset of the interviews, there were three areas in which all of the participants were in agreement. First, every one of the leaders interviewed for this study cited honesty or a synonym for honesty, such as integrity or authenticity, as the most important individual core value that they bring to their leadership. Several participants indicated their belief that trust, respect, and accountability all correspond to and are significant components of honesty. In addition, the leaders underscored both “the need” to be yourself and “the ability” to be yourself in the work environment as key values in their leadership. Hartwell added that a sense of humor and sheer determination are also important to her,
and Morgan explained that “an absolute sense of caring about the development of human beings” and diversity of gender and race are her fundamental core values.

Second, each of the participants stated that a confidence in their abilities and past accomplishments, combined with the lure of increased responsibilities and authority, motivated them to seek more prominent leadership roles. The women had all held previous positions in which they were able to demonstrate technical proficiencies in areas that are critical to their organizations’ operations. As well, the women all expressed a passion and love for their work that served as the impetus to propel them toward loftier goals.

Third, the participants all indicated that they had advisors or mentors who helped to guide them in their careers. The individuals that the leaders identified were previous bosses, fellow employees, or persons in the same industry. In addition, each of the women indicated that these people were males. Madison commented that having chaired ACE women’s programs, she had watched and listened over the years to what other women were doing, what worked, and what didn’t. However, she also stated that she didn’t “tend to call these people up and ask for advice.” Both Morgan and Hanley pointed to presidents they served under as guiding forces.

With regards to what matters most, Hanley and Morgan both spoke about the synergy and multidimensional aspects of art and science in their lives and as critical elements of their identities. Hartwell and Madison, by comparison, indicated that people and a sense of service to others were primary. Hayden and
Merrick however, framed their comments around work with Hayden discussing an understanding of personal strengths and weaknesses and Merrick emphasizing her ability to work in complex settings and motivate people to get results.

The women cited a broad range of skills that they believe are important in their leadership roles and they all agree that good communication skills are crucial. As well, Hanley, Hartwell, and Merrick discussed their competitive drive and the means they use to temper that while Hayden and Madison emphasized their technical and analytical proficiencies. Morgan finds that passion and political acumen are essential skills in her position at Winchester State.

In addition to, and possibly as a result of the passion that Hanley and Hartwell have for their work, they believe that leaders should make a conscious effort to not take themselves too seriously. Hayden and Merrick, in contrast, agree that good organizational skills and the ability to work on multiple levels at the same time are vital. Merrick added that her reputation of being able to work with divergent groups and get results is the key. Along this same line, Madison pointed to the fact that as a leader, she is willing to make the hard decisions and "go with it."

The private enterprise business leaders all talked about their fundamental leadership skills in terms of "compliance," "strategic ability," and "ability to lead" as opposed to the university leaders who stressed "shared values and agenda," and the need to "motivate others to see the big picture apart from themselves," and be "people sensitive." Similarly, the business leaders described both their
greatest challenges and the change they would make in their job as personal points and concerns versus the university women who all cited organizational related challenges and demands.

Hanley categorizes "people" as the greatest internal constraint that she faces. Hartwell and Hayden, however, both cited personal limitations. In contrast, the research university leaders all agreed that the organization and processes of higher education institutions poses the greatest internal constraint. Merrick and Madison specifically addressed the "people" factor as well in their comments. With regards to external constraints, Hanley asserts that legal, financial, and accountability issues all impact the organization. Hartwell explained that for her and many others, the love of work precludes other loves outside of work. Hayden, however, looks to external constraints as opportunities for growth and change. Each of the higher education leaders, in comparison, pointed to specific constraints that impact the public post secondary education sector as a whole; competing priorities, politics, funding and institutional identity.

The best decisions identified by each of the women were all personal in nature for the business leaders and institutionally related for the university women. Four of the leaders however, agreed that a decision involving personnel was both the worst and most difficult decision they had made. Only Hartwell, who cited a decision related to a marketing idea, and Hayden, who admitted that she had made some but couldn’t specifically recall one, did not indicate personnel problems.
Finally, each of the business women is evaluated based on corporate profit factors. Hartwell’s evaluation included a succession planning component and Hayden’s has additional non-financial indicators that are coordinated and determined annually with the managing partners in the firm. The university leaders, in contrast, all have very formal and public job evaluations that encompass a broad range of indicators, the majority of which are not financial in nature. Merrick’s performance is clearly defined and developed in coordination with the governing board while Morgan and Madison’s are less so.

The Intersection of Individual and Organization
As leaders, each of the women in the study has an important role to play in the development and articulation of the vision for their organization. For the business leaders, this vision focused on the components of customer, product, and profit. Hayden indicated that Corbin & Cade also has specific standards related to their reputation included in their vision. In every instance, the institutional vision detailed by the public university leaders covered an expansive range of both short term and long term goals and focused on engagement with the community, students, learning, and research.

Dealing with conflict presents a significant challenge to any leader. Hanley and Hartwell try to avoid conflict whenever possible, but when necessary, they find it, communicate, and engage all the parties involved. Hayden relies on communication and finds that her presence and participation is often all that is needed to solve the problem. The university women, by contrast, try to deal with
conflict directly and stress the importance of communication, openness, and chain of command in their collegial environments.

Collegiality also impacts how the leaders bring their organizations to change. Hanley and Hartwell, whose organizations are more collaborative than collegial, point to intuitive processes, the constant pace of change, and the competitive nature of their industries as impetuses for change. Hayden discusses documenting the need for change, communication from the top, and a focused approach to problem solving. In the more collegial higher education environment, the leaders all acknowledge that change is both slow and difficult and must include faculty participation.

One additional area in the study that each of the six leaders agree on is that equity is more important than efficiency in their organizations. Hanley and Hartwell indicate that equity is a part of the corporate cultures of their businesses while Hayden and the university leaders point to the collegiality inherent in organizations where professionals are the key resource. Merrick adds that equity doesn't necessarily mean equality of resources and Morgan emphasizes that efficiency does not have to be sacrificed in order for equity to exist.

The Intersection of Organization and the Public Domain

The three business leaders in the study and their organizations balance public and private good by being strong supporters of the United Way program and by participating in their communities in other ways. Hayden adds that the very nature of Corbin & Cade's operations make balancing public and private
good one and the same thing. The higher education leaders, by comparison, underscore the fact that their public existence necessitates simultaneous attention to both public and private good and offer examples of benefits to both. At the same time, Merrick expressed her concerns with the rising costs of public tuition that rivals private rates and points to the resulting increases in student loans and debts.

Balancing social and cultural issues is not a problem for Hanley who states that the location of the corporate office and the organizational culture mediate any concerns. As well, Hartwell emphasizes that the corporate culture at Creighton Foods ensured a balance in this area. Hayden and the three university leaders, however, insist that they have to constantly monitor the actions and efforts of their enterprises both internally and externally. Similarly, while Hanley and Hartwell cautiously engage with the press and the media and offer only limited access, Hayden and the higher education leaders recognize the important and often scurrilous role that the press and the media play in their ongoing operations. In addition, while Hanley and Hartwell indicate that they do not network with other leaders, Hayden and the heads of the public universities all admit that it is critically important to both their roles and to their organizations to network with other leaders.

Finally, Hanley believes that it is not her place to take a stand on controversial national or international issues. Hartwell speaks only to issues that have the potential to impact the industry or company profits. Hayden, however, works hard to balance public and organizational interests in addressing
controversial issues on behalf of the company. All three of the higher education leaders rarely, if ever, take a stand on issues unrelated to education. Merrick adds that her institution will often provide a forum in which to present a balance of both sides of a controversial subject. Morgan does not feel comfortable taking a stand as head of Winchester State and believes that it would not be accepted in the community. Madison, however, indicates that she has had to take a stand on behalf of the university several times in the past and willingly took on the role of spokesperson.

Leading in Business versus Higher Education

The private enterprise business leaders each offered suggestions for higher education based on their experiences. Hanley’s insights addressed marketing and client base issues. Hartwell’s suggestions centered on broad-based liberal education training for post secondary students. And in Hayden’s opinion, interactions between institutions and the “real” world are too limited. She suggested that universities need to understand and focus on the impact and relevance of their research efforts.

The higher education leaders also had insights on leading in the private enterprise business sector. Merrick explained that there are more similarities between the two sectors now than in the past and that both face many of the same issues with regard to change, underlying processes, and energizing the workforce. Merrick and Morgan both point to a faster pace in the private enterprise sector and it is Morgan’s opinion that businesses can do this, in part,
because they deal with less public scrutiny. Madison explained that differences between the sectors are due to the highly trained specialists that make up and control the educational environment.

Advice to Others Seeking this Level of Leadership

Throughout the interviews, it became obvious that the leaders have all spent a great deal of time reflecting on their leadership. The six women agree that it is essential to "know yourself" and to "be yourself," with several of the women adding in response to various questions, the importance of knowing your strengths and weaknesses, too. As well, their passion for their work was abundantly clear. Hanley, Hartwell, and Merrick added that it is vital to find a personal sense of balance and to not take yourself too seriously. Hayden strongly advises taking responsibility for your own career and focusing on your role in your environment. Morgan, by contrast, points to the need for trusted colleagues and a support network. As well, she and Merrick emphasize the value of a good senior management team. Finally, each of the university leaders concede that in order to lead in higher education, you must acquire and develop skills that directly relate to the requirements of the leadership role.

Overview

This chapter summarized and compared the data for the participants across the private enterprise business and public research university sectors.
The analytical frameworks and data interpretation are discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 13

INTERPRETATION OF DATA WITHIN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORKS

Introduction

Frameworks are established theoretical bases that provide the lenses through which the researcher identifies, examines, and attempts to explain the collected data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merrian, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2003). Each frame used in this study provided a distinct perspective that influenced and directed what the researcher found to be relevant and significant. An examination of the impact of context on leadership necessitated analytical frameworks that were appropriate across sectors and that mirrored the micro (individual), meso (organizational), and macro (public) dimensions identified in this study.

In chapters seven, eleven, and twelve, the researcher reviewed and summarized the findings of the study within sectors and across sectors. This chapter presents an interpretation of the data within the micro dimension of 'at the core: individual values,' the meso dimension of 'the intersection of the individual and the organization,' and macro dimensions of 'the intersection of the organization and the public domain,' using the respective analytical frameworks of Person-Organization Fit, Schneider's (1987) Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) model, and Mintzberg's (1981) Organizational Configurations. The
supplemental data, under the headings of advice to others seeking this level of leadership and leading in higher education versus business, were also included in the analysis and used to support the interpretation.

Framework One: Person-Organization Fit

Person-environment fit has been researched in various forms for decades (Chatman, 1989; Holland, 1973; Pervin, 1978). It is derived from structural contingency theory, which asserts that various “outcomes,” such as performance and job satisfaction, are contingent on the perceived fit between individual characteristics and organizational characteristics (Burns & Stalker, 1961; Caplan, 1983; Locke, 1976). Two basic assumptions provide the foundation for person-environment fit theories. The first is that individual behavior is a function of the person and the environment. The second is that the individual and the environment need to be compatible (Cable & Edwards, 2004; Kristof, 1996; Ostroff & Rothausen, 1997; Schneider, 2001). Kristof (1996) indicates that “in individual-level investigations of actual fit, the organization construct is no longer verifiable organizational characteristics, but individuals’ perceptions of those characteristics” (p. 14).

Four major levels of person-environment fit are found within the organizational research literature. Each level addresses the similarity or congruence between different organizationally distinct attributes. The first, person-vocation (P-V) fit, refers to similarities between an individual’s choice of vocations and his/her personality and self-concept. The second, person-job (P-J)
fit, assesses the compatibility between an individual’s skills and abilities and the specific demands of his/her job. The third, person-organization (P-O) fit, focuses on the congruence between the values, interests, needs, and abilities of an individual and the characteristics of the organization. Finally, the fourth level, person-work group (P-G) fit, reflects the agreement between individual abilities and characteristics and those of the small work group (Cable & Edwards, 2004; Caldwell et al., 2004; Edwards, 1996; Kristof, 1996; Lindholm, 2003). This last level has become more popular in recent years as the prevalence of teams and collaborative work units has increased.

Person-organization (P-O) fit provided the frame for analyzing the micro dimension of ‘at the core: individual values’ in this study. Research in this area is exemplified by studies on psychological need fulfillment, individual rewards, and employee attitudes (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Edwards, 1991; French et al., 1982; Kristof, 1996). Within this paradigm, two longstanding traditions of research have evolved. The first is based on the concept of complementary fit and exists when “the weaknesses or needs of the environment are offset by the strength of the individual, and vice-versa” (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987, p.271). Kristof (1996) conceptualizes complementary fit as a “needs-supplies and demands-abilities” distinction. In Kristof’s (1996) model, the resources of time, effort, commitment, and experience are alternatively supplied and demanded between individuals and organizations, along with task-related interpersonal and growth opportunities. Congruence is achieved when the individual’s characteristics fulfill a need in the organizational environment and vice-versa.
The second tradition has been conceptualized as supplementary fit and occurs when the individual "supplements, embellishes, or possesses characteristics that are similar to other individuals" in the work environment (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987, p.269). Congruence is typically operationalized in the research by examining an individual's values and the norms and values of the organization. Kristof (1996) conceptualizes supplementary fit by measures of individual personality, values, goals, and attitudes as representative of organizational culture/climate, values, goals, and norms. Values form the basis for investigation as they are "fundamental and relatively enduring" (Chatman, 1991, p. 459) and are at the heart of organizational culture that guides employees' behaviors (Schein, 1992). As well, Ryan and Schmit (2001) posit that "most researchers would agree that organizational climate is a psychological variable and most appropriately measured at the level of the individual" (p. 78).

Fit has shown important positive effects on job satisfaction, commitment, stress, and turnover, and is significantly related to outcomes (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Edwards, 1991; Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown et al., 2002; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). Lindholm (2003) asserts;

Understanding the functional nature of relationships between people and their work organizations calls for a qualitative approach to investigating the causes and consequences of people's experiences and behavior at work (p.130).

And although there is no optimal or universal fit, Pervin (1968) indicates that
A 'match' or 'best-fit' of individual to environment is viewed as expressing itself in high performance, satisfaction, and little stress in the system whereas 'lack of fit' is viewed as resulting in decreased performance, dissatisfaction, and stress in the system" (p. 56).

Data Interpretation using Framework One: Person-Organization Fit and At the Core: Individual Values

A core competency of leadership "is that of being able to maintain best fit" within organizational contexts (Morden, 1997). Hence, one measure of leadership and organization effectiveness in a market sector is manifested by the positive and productive outcomes that result from the congruency or fit between person-organization values. In this study, a high degree of congruency and fit between individual and organizational values was assumed based on the leaders' long tenure in office and by the supporting data related to both individual and organizational achievements, as well as additional market sector and financial data. Thus, examining the values of these individual leaders who have a good fit with their organization is appropriate in the study of and research on the impact of context on leadership.

Jennifer Hanley, Chairman of the Board/CEO Calliope Kids

Creativity is truly at the foundation of who Hanley is both as an individual and a leader. She indicates that it is the driving force in her identity and that her passion for creativity motivated her to seek the leadership position. Hanley discusses the fact that she sees the ability to be creative in every person, but
adds that some people need a little more prodding in that direction than others.
She gives the example of handing out large blank white sheets of paper at a
senior management meeting in order to get her team to think more creatively. In
addition, Hanley cites authenticity and the ability to be herself as core values,
and advises others seeking leadership roles to "know [themselves] really well."

Hanley's creativity and authenticity are essential aspects of the Calliope
Kids business enterprise as well. She explains that the organization as a whole is
driven by an emphasis on Calliope's commitment and connectivity to their
customers and that the organization's ability to respond to their highly interactive
customer base and successfully operate in their highly competitive retail sector
reflects this disposition. In addition, the synergy and balance of art and science
that are major factors in Hanley's identity are also significant factors in Calliope's
engagement with the market and in Hanley's portrayal of the organization as
"entrepreneurial at the core." For example, the company's recent decision to add
a new division and enter into a new retail venture is directly attributable to
Calliope's business strategy and Hanley's leadership style, which seek to match
business opportunities with data-driven decision making in a culture that
emphasizes innovation.

Although Hanley describes herself as "the most reluctant CEO you've ever
met," her vast experience in the retail sector combined with her enthusiasm,
passion, and drive make her the ideal leader for this unique and vibrant retailer.
Lindsay Hartwell, President, Creighton Foods

Lindsay Hartwell’s love for marketing and her work have driven both her career and personal life, often in competing directions. Her passion is evident when she talks about the challenge of balancing the love of work with other personal interests and a major external constraint - the zeal for work precluding other loves. Hartwell even advises that there is great power in loving what you do, but adds that it is important to keep the individual ego in check and learn to reflect on your own behavior. She gives the example of having to learn to mediate and adapt her objectivity and enthusiasm to the rate of change and pace of others as an important lesson in her leadership.

In addition, Hartwell cites humor, sheer determination, and intellectual honesty as her core values. Her personal dedication and determination were a major factor in her invention of a successful and lucrative new pet food product, the tripling of sales within the Wholesome Variety division in one year, and in the delivery of record operating income, sales, and market shares across several categories. Hartwell’s values were also inherent in and reflected in her leadership of the organization. She was not only a respected innovator in the industry, but was recognized for her ability to create new businesses and identify opportunities for turnaround businesses.

Hartwell discusses service to others as central to her identity. She emphasizes the fact that balancing public and private good were “never a problem” at Creighton Foods as ethics and the public good always took precedence. In addition, she explains that equity was highly valued in the
corporate culture and atmosphere of Creighton and stressed throughout the institutional history. Her commitment to service to others was evidenced in the manner in which she stayed on three years with the post-merger organization in order to "get everyone through it."

Hartwell believes that it was "a privilege" to be president of Creighton Foods and attributes her tenure to the unique culture that was clearly aligned with her own values and identity.

Allison Hayden, Chairman of the Board of Directors, Corbin & Cade

Allison Hayden is dually focused on her roles of partner and Chairman of the Board of Directors of one of the largest and highest ranked firms in the professional services industry. She points to knowing her personal strengths and weaknesses as important to her identity and advises others seeking leadership positions to have proven technical proficiency in a core business area and to take personal responsibility for their progress by bringing their own accomplishments and abilities to light.

Hayden discusses trust and integrity as both her personal core values and those of Corbin & Cade. She indicates that the integrity of the organization is key to its success and that Corbin & Cade consistently strives to maintain the investing public's trust in them and in the businesses of their clients. At the same time, she believes that these same values are critical in all areas of life, regardless of a persons' role or position. She explains that she is "not much for beating around the bush" and that her integrity and honesty come through in her
leadership. It is her opinion that part of the reason she was elected to the Chairman of the Board position is because of the partners' trust in her.

Hayden explains her vision for the organization in terms of its clients, products, and reputation and emphasizes that Corbin & Cade works diligently to balance public and organizational interests with profit and compensation issues. As both a partner and Chairman, Hayden is concerned with matters that affect the partners and the partnership structure, as well as their clients and stakeholders. She values the opportunities that she has to exchange information and ideas and influence activities on behalf of the firm; and to this end, Hayden and Corbin & Cade work to proactively manage the press and the media.

In addition, networking is an essential aspect of both Corbin & Cade's business and Hayden's job. Hayden emphasizes that she enjoys the diversity of situations and opportunities for interaction with high-powered people that the position brings, even though her extensive travel schedule challenges her personal energy level. Hayden chooses not to focus on constraints in her position, and in fact, she explains that she turns potential constraints into positive advantages. For example, she cites being a woman in this largely male-dominated industry as an opportunity to bring "diversity of thought" and a "different dimension" to the organization.

In this professional services sector, individuals must be voted on and approved into the partnership and to all senior leadership positions. With 2,700 partners, the selection of Hayden as Chairman of the Board of Directors is
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directly attributable to the congruency between Hayden’s personal values and attitude and those of her peers and the partnership as a whole.

Courtney Merrick, President, Walden State University

Merrick’s leadership at Walden State University is centered on engagement with the community, students, learning, and research; and she works to uphold the public trust and values serving the public good that is inherent in public universities. She indicates that the sense of service that comes with the mission of a public university is very important to her. And, she notes that her personal values and identity are “bound up a lot in work.” As such, she advises others seeking leadership to be who they really are, know what excites and motivates them, and to find a personal sense of balance.

Merrick articulates the vision for Walden State in terms of deep engagement in the region, building relationships, innovation, and inclusiveness. She discusses the importance of providing a wide array of both social and cultural opportunities, while at the same time assuring that no one area is overemphasized or overlooked. She sees both her stance and Walden’s role in controversial public issues as intermediaries that facilitate a forum and provide a balance.

Merrick also indicates that networking at all levels is an essential task and that the press and the media have important roles in higher education. Merrick’s experience both at the helm of a multi-campus public institution and as an officer on the board of directors for various organizations have shown her that the underlying processes of energizing a workforce around an endeavor are similar
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whether the entity is public, private, or something in between. She adds that her greatest challenge is leading change and helping the organization to understand how change is relentless.

Merrick believes that communication is critical. She deals directly with conflict and works to communicate an openness and expectation that the problem will be dealt with. In much the same way, she explains that, as a leader, it is essential to understand the value of a good team and to be able to give them clear signals and expectations. She adds, “Then you get out of the way and let them do it.” It is the overlapping of personal and institutional values and identity and the complexity that Merrick finds in leading an eight-campus public university that truly drive and define her.

Ann Morgan, President, Winchester State University

The lure of a bigger palate where she “could make a difference” and an opportunistic environment full of energy and vitality, first brought Morgan to Winchester State eleven years ago. As president, Morgan has lead the change and charted the progress that has resulted in many outstanding achievements, including the creation of the new law school, which Morgan cites as her best decision. Morgan stresses that she is an academic at heart with a multidimensional art and science mindset.

Morgan’s accomplishments have not come without a price, however. Although her initial attraction to Winchester State and her focus over the years on its expansion were congruent with the goals and demands of the institution, Morgan was unprepared for the scrutiny of the press and the media and the
politics of the state. As evidence of this, she discusses the need for passion and
political acumen as vital skills in her leadership role.

Morgan's allegiance to collegiality is at the forefront of her priorities, even
though she recognizes that this structure has inherent internal constraints. It is
her opinion that public institutions simultaneously balance both the public and
private good and that by its very nature higher education is both social and
cultural. She believes that her job is to create an environment for great learning
and thinking and to bring the resources to the institution that make that possible.
She states, "The more resources you can bring; the more effective you are." In
addition, Morgan points to networking as a critical factor for enhancing the
university's resources and for increasing business development in the state.

Morgan values integrity and truly cares about the development of human
beings and the advancement of Winchester State.

Kelly Madison, Chancellor, Westword State University

Madison is a hard-core academic as well as a highly respected and
extensively published scientist who truly values people, honesty, and the
"collegial way of doing things." Her passion for teaching, research, and urban
institutions is readily apparent and directed her time and efforts as Chancellor of
Westword State University. As evidence of this, Madison points to "teaching
opportunities" (as opposed to conversations) with regents, her research in the lab
every Friday morning, and her joy in networking and fund raising on behalf of the
university.
Although Madison was known for her "open door policy" and straightforward easy rapport, her approach to leadership and conflict was very analytical and calculated. She indicates that being people sensitive is an important skill and that engaging both sides of an controversy is crucial to settling conflict. As well, she emphasizes that it is important to put your own ego aside. She explains that people, not issues, are the real challenge to leadership and adds that both her best decision and worst decision centered on personnel matters.

Madison and Westword State received attention in the press and in the media several times a year due to Westword's central urban setting and its association with the state's flagship university, which was regularly embroiled in controversy. Madison consistently dealt with issues in her typical honest and straightforward approach, which by her appraisal, mitigated many problems. However, Madison asserts that as a leader, it is essential to be willing to make the hard decisions and act on them. This includes her willingness to take the lead and be the spokesperson on controversial issues when necessary.

Madison is "firmly committed to urban institutions." She initiated much of the fund raising that occurred at Westword State and thoroughly enjoyed meeting people and establishing relationships. She indicates that involving deans in fund raising for the university was one of her best decisions as it informed and engaged donors while giving the deans the experience they needed in that area. As well, Madison worked diligently with the other nearby public institutions to integrate the needs of the urban community and its students into the institution.
Madison's leadership at Westword State was consistent with and driven by her personal values (people, honesty, and collegiality), identity (service to others), and passion for teaching, research, and urban institutions.

Framework Two: Schneider's Attraction-Selection-Attrition Theory

The meso aspect of 'the intersection of the individual and the organization' was assessed using Schneider's (1987) Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) framework, which extends the concept of Person-Organization fit. The underlying assumption of this model is that through the ASA cycle, the people and environment of the organization become increasingly integrated, leading to an organization that is representative of the personality types of individuals who dominate and lead in those environments. Congruence is achieved through the progression of people being attracted, selected, and then forming strong relationships, or "matches" with the organization over time. Citing Schneider's propositions (1987) and research directions from their own study, Ryan & Schmit (1996) indicate,

Because individuals will self-select in and out of organizations where they feel they do not fit, or be selected in and out by others who perceive a poor fit, the fit of most employees in most organizations should be fairly high (p. 88).

The first phase of this process posits that individuals are differentially attracted to organizations in which they perceive characteristics similar to their own. Over the years, research based on Holland's (1973, 1985) theory of career...
choice has supported this concept through findings from a broad range of studies in organizational and occupational settings. The results have consistently shown relationships between individual personality types and their vocational choices (Schneider et al., 1998; Spokane, 1985) and has led to the development of personality profile testing for use in recruitment and hiring decisions in many companies.

The second aspect of the framework addresses the selection of individuals by organizations. According to Schneider (1987), people with particular characteristics and attributes that “fit” the organizational environment are selected by employers. Although these individuals may differ in their abilities and competencies, they share a strong acuity and inclination to the pre-existing organizational culture. Socialization that occurs after attraction and selection increases this homogeneity through training programs, learning, and adjustments that are communicated through rituals and cultural norms (Kristof, 1996; Schneider, 2001).

The last component of the framework deals with attrition. Citing Schneider, Ostroff & Rothausen (1997) indicate that “at increasing tenure levels, the people and the situation become more congruent (Schneider, 1983a) and a strong relationship between person and environment is expected (Schneider, 1987b)” (p. 174). Many factors, such as family situations, economic considerations, and labor market conditions, in addition to “fit,” impact an individual’s decision to remain in an organization. Attrition can also be involuntary and at the discretion of the employer. Although the framework makes it difficult to predict whether an
individual will remain in the organization simply because they “fit” or do not “fit,”
longevity in the environment mediates this problem and affirms “fit” (Kristof, 1996;
Schneider, 2001).

Schneider (2001) posits that “there is recent research to suggest that the
measurement of environments can be done based on the attributes of the people
in them” (p. 149). The rationale for this lies in the fact that through the ASA and
socialization processes, people within any organization will be more similar to
each other and in their perceptions of the organizational climate than to people in
another organization. Further, Moos (1976) indicates that climate as a dimension
is a means to compare different environments. And as such, organizational
climate dimensions are measures of environment characteristics (Ostroff &
Rothausen, 1997).

Data Interpretation using Framework Two: Schneider’s Attraction-Selection-
Attrition Theory and the Intersection of Individual and Organization

Longevity, role, and tenure are the presumed indicators of individual and
organizational/environmental congruence. Hence, evaluating the individual
leaders’ perceptions of the organization based on the fact that these individuals
were not only attracted to and selected by their organizations, but have remained
with them for extended lengths of service and achieved the highest level of
organizational leadership, provides an appropriate analytical framework for this
exploratory study and research on the impact of context on leadership.
Jennifer Hanley, Chairman of the Board/CEO Calliope Kids

Hanley is an imaginative and skilled leader who maintains a clearly defined structural and corporate environment that encourages "creative risk takers" while emphasizing consistency and compliance to the organization vision and in day-to-day operations. She credits "going back to being [herself]" as the best decision she made and she encourages this same authenticity in others and in Calliope Kids' dealings.

Hanley believes that equity is more important than efficiency at Calliope Kids and she stresses that "you just live it all the way down the ladder." Her leadership reflects this. For example, she explains that her way of handling a crisis is to "get the players all together, come up with a game plan, and execute to that; very cut and dry." She also points to the organization's commitment to both their corporate charity, the March of Dimes, and to individual employee determined charities as evidence of equity in the company. As well, she indicates that the very location of Calliope's corporate offices eliminates problems with balancing social and cultural issues as these concerns are already distinctly integrated in the region as a whole.

Hanley's position and title support her preference for not networking with other leaders, the constant, intuitive processes she relies on for bringing the organization to change, and in her dedication to her "check your ego at the door" policy. As well, the additional responsibilities and accountability that accrue to her in her role as chairman of the board and CEO of the organization are moderated by the fact that she holds both titles and by the highly competitive retail market in
which Calliope operates that rewards her passion and innovation in responding
to fashion trends and customer preferences.

Hanley served as Calliope Kids’ director of merchandising and design
from 1992 to 1995, left the company for four years, and then rejoined Calliope as
senior vice president of design in 1999. Having held many key management
positions across multiple functions, Hanley has an extensive background and
first-hand knowledge of the core areas of Calliope Kids’ operations. In addition,
Hanley was promoted to CEO shortly after the company narrowly avoided a
bankruptcy. Her role and position in the company, in addition to her promotion
and tenure lend credence to the assumption of congruence and support for
Schneider’s A-S-A theory.

Lindsay Hartwell, President, Creighton Foods

Hartwell’s desire to try new and different things motivated her to seek the
leadership role. Under Creighton Foods’ brand management model of promotion,
her ability to use advocacy, strategic ability and communication skills, and
persistence on behalf of an idea took her to the top of the organization. She
indicates that this model was extremely rigorous and very clearly defined and
that the rewards were “stunning creativity and cooperation” and “a great job.”
Hartwell indicates that the core focus of this model is “virtual leadership,
collaboration, and persuasion” and “if you’re not good at that, this isn’t the field
for you.” The impact and importance of this model at Creighton Foods can also
be found in Hartwell’s job performance evaluation, which included a self-
assessment, a well-developed succession plan, and evidence of a healthy organization.

As president of this major business unit, Hartwell’s accountability and influence were necessarily limited. This detail mitigated much of her interaction and responsibility for some of the larger concerns of the conglomerate as a whole and restricted the breadth and scope of the constituencies to which she had to report. Examples of this include the balancing of public and private good and social and cultural issues, which were initiated and directed at the overall organizational level as opposed to the business unit level.

Hartwell believes that it is essential to balance a strong competitive drive with sharp creative skills in striving for both personal and professional gain. She indicates that she limited the access of the press and the media, in part, because she was uncomfortable with the personal versus team emphasis and adds that one of the greatest challenges she sees in those seeking the leadership role is to “get over oneself.”

Hartwell began her career with this company and stayed with it for twenty-five years. However, perhaps the best evidence of Hartwell’s leadership and her commitment to the organization’s environment is found in Hartwell’s explanation of dealing with conflict at Creighton Foods. She asserts, “[You] find it, communicate it, engage everybody in it, and then join ranks and do it.”

Allison Hayden, Chairman of the Board of Directors, Corbin & Cade

Hayden’s perceptions of the leadership experience reveal that there is limited personal discretion and creativity associated with either her position as a
partner or as Chairman of the Board. Instead, there is a focus and concentration on professionalism in a core competency, productivity, and most specifically, on public accountability. Hayden points out that since she became chairman, her performance evaluations have become much more complex. As both an active partner and leader, the evaluation measures are reviewed and approved in conjunction with several committees and the board in a formal and public manner. This to assure that there is true independence and no potential for conflict of interest with individuals over whom Hayden provides oversight. In addition, her goals and the expectations of her are “very clear” and “very accountable.”

Hayden was motivated to seek the leadership position by taking on more prominent positions with increasing duties and responsibilities. She has found that good organization skills and the ability to work on multiple levels at the same time are imperative skills. As well, she indicates that the ability to interact and communicate with people is an essential element of her leadership. In particular, she finds that conflict in this collegial setting is, in general, “more a matter of communication, or lack thereof” and often her presence and intervention as Chairman, solves the problem.

From Hayden’s perspective, equity is more important than efficiency in the organization as people are its major resource. She adds that although it is a very collegial and collaborative environment, this sometimes gets in the way of being more efficient. Hayden has been with Corbin & Cade for over thirty years and is the highest ranking woman in this professional services industry. She credits her
staying with the firm at important times in her career as her best decision. Her chairmanship in this collegial environment supports Schneider's A-S-A theory and is a testament to both her private and public leadership aptitudes.

_Courtney Merrick, President, Walden State University_

Merrick respects others' opinions and reveres the shared values, agenda, and inclusiveness of higher education. She explains that she has a "very forceful personality" and emphasizes that she has built a reputation as somebody who can work effectively on problem-solving with diverse groups and get results. This she credits, in part, to her high comfort level with multitasking, her sense of expectation, and an understanding of timing and pacing. At the same time, Merrick uses and strongly endorses a cross functional matrix approach to leadership in the collegial public university environment and fully expects her senior management team to be "as good horizontally as they are vertically."

Merrick has had numerous outstanding achievements as president. She credits clearly defining the university and its mission early on in her tenure, making student affairs a separate division, and putting the fund raising infrastructure in place as her best decisions. Under Merrick's leadership, a detailed plan for the on-going and future operations of Walden State has been developed, which simultaneously provides a blueprint for accreditation while assuring Walden of continuity in its long range goals and objectives. Her efforts, as well as the efforts of all of Walden's stakeholders are focused on and measured by this plan. As evidence, her own performance is clearly defined, coordinated, and evaluated by the blueprint.
Merrick believes that equity is more important than efficiency in this collegial environment. She explains that equity means be willing to differentiate through a fair and reasonable process. She adds, however, that it does not always mean that everyone gets the same thing, especially when it comes to allocating resources in public higher education.

Merrick’s vast and lengthy experience in higher education has been focused on delivering quality academic programs and services at large public research universities with numerous campus locations and broad ranges of programs. She was attracted to Walden State University for these same reasons fifteen years ago when she accepted the job of president. Merrick indicates that her recent decision to resign is due in part, to personal reasons; however, it is mainly due to the fact that she believes that the university is stable, healthy, and well placed in its plans and goals for the future.

Ann Morgan, President, Winchester State University

Morgan asserts that the ability to motivate her colleagues and constituents to see the ‘big picture’ is an important skill and she diligently works with the synergy generated top-down and bottom-up to bring the organization to change. She believes that equity and efficiency can be achieved at the same time in this environment without sacrificing either one. However, she highly values the inherent equity of the collegial environment.

Winchester State was “a regional teaching institution with pockets of good scholarship” when Morgan first arrived. She discusses the sharp cultural change and growth of Winchester State and of the development of complex programs
and systems in a relatively short period of time as the greatest internal constraints to her leadership. Her vision is that Winchester will become a major research university with high academic standards and that it will incorporate and connect academic, cultural, and athletic forces synergistically in the community and the institution.

Morgan has been in the higher education profession for forty years. Her early experiences as ombudsman, Vice President and Dean of Students, and Vice President of Administration gave her a solid background in budgeting, building, labor issues, negotiating, facilitating, and dealing with unions. She indicates that these are all necessary presidential leadership skills. However, she also explains that the higher up you go in administration, the less contact you have with the reason you got into it: the students.

Morgan’s success and “fit” at Winchester is evidenced by the voluminous supporting data and in the extensive changes that have taken place during her eleven years in office. Her tenure also confirms and substantiates the strength and intensity of her tenacity in this highly political environment. Morgan’s resignation ‘in order to preserve the stability and strategic progress of the university’ and her decision to stay on at the university in a development capacity to meet the $500 million capital campaign goal, however, most directly confirm the depth of her dedication to both Winchester State and higher education in this growing city.
Kelly Madison, Chancellor, Westword State University

Madison was a stalwart advocate for students, faculty, and staff at Westword State and she proudly remembers that her administration “was quite popular with the students.” She believes that equity is “far more important than efficiency” and she emphasizes that it is essential to respect the intellect of the people in higher education. Madison states that she firmly believes in the chain of command in higher education, and as such, she indicates that she would stand by her deans, even on some occasions when she didn’t always agree with their decisions. Her attitude and actions were consistent with the collegial university setting and with the selection and promotion of Madison to chancellor; an endeavor that was instigated by a consensus of her colleagues.

Madison believes that it is critical to be in the “hard” areas of higher education administration, come up through the academics, or come in from a non-profit organization in order to achieve her level of leadership. Her previous experience included Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Interim Provost at an urban institution in another state. She was the first female officer at the institution when she became Vice Chancellor and her thirteen years at Westword are a testament to her academic skills and expertise as well as to her administrative and leadership abilities.

Madison advises others that you have to fill a niche as a leader and she credits her advancement to chancellor, in part, to the fact that the institution and its members wanted an academic in the position when she took it on. By the same token, she indicates that her retirement was driven in part, by the fact that...
she foresaw the merger with the health sciences center and recognized that the next leader would need to be a medical doctor. Madison’ tenure reflects the basic premises of Schneider’s ASA theory in her attraction to this urban institution, her selection as Chancellor by her peers, and in her attrition when the environment of the university was changed due to the impending merger.

Framework Three: Mintzberg’s Organizational Configurations

Person-Organization Fit and Attraction-Selection-Attrition theories were developed as broad-based theoretical frameworks to explain the relationships between individuals and organizations across a broad spectrum of organizations. As the focus of this research is the impact of public research university versus private enterprise business contexts, the macro aspect of "the intersection of the organization and the public domain" was examined using Mintzberg’s (1981) five configurations of organization design. Through the use of this frame, the researcher was able to evaluate the leaders’ influence and constraints within the context and continuum of the larger sphere of organizational structures and bureaucracies.

The basis of Mintzberg’s theory is that organizations have characteristics of structural and situational elements that converge around five naturally occurring clusters, or “configurations” of organization design. Five core components distinguish organizational structure. As delineated by Mintzberg (1981), organizations begin with an individual who forms the “strategic apex” of the organization. This person hires others “to do the basic work of the
organization, in what can be called the operating core” (p. 104). As the organization grows, managers are hired and form the “middle line” between the person at the apex and the workers. Two additional layers of personnel complete the five part design. The first is the “technostructure” layer, made up of individuals who are involved with the formal planning and control of the organization. The second layer is comprised of support staff, individuals who provide “indirect services to the rest of the organization – everything from the cafeteria and the mail room to the public relations department and the legal counsel” (p. 104).

Mintzberg (1981) has determined that although these elements make up the organization as a whole, it is the degree of complexity of the structure that dictates whether or not an organization has all five parts. “The central purpose of structure is to coordinate the work divided in a variety of ways; how that coordination is achieved – by whom and with what – dictates what the organization will look like” (p. 104).

Mintzberg (1981) outlines eight structural elements: specialization of jobs, training and indoctrination, formalization of behavior – bureaucratic/organic, grouping, unit size, planning and control systems, liaison devices, and decentralization. In addition, Mintzberg (1981) identifies four situational elements: age and size, the technical system that regulates the work of the operating core, environment, and power factors, which include external control and personal power needs. Five organizational configurations emerge from the combination of these structure and situation elements on a continuum of increasing complexity.
The first configuration is characterized by a minimum of middle line and staff personnel and the coordination of work is through direct supervision at the strategic apex. Mintzberg labels this case, the "simple structure," as there is very little need for standardization or formalization in the ongoing management and operations of the organization. In addition, this structure is lean and flexible, which translates into opportunities for rapid innovation and an enhanced ability to respond to simple, dynamic, and often hostile market environments. Typically, organizations with this structure are young and small with the most common form of this configuration being the classic entrepreneurial company.

The "machine bureaucracy" is the second type of organization on Mintzberg's continuum. Standardization of work and an emphasis on an elaborated administrative coordination in the technostructure highlight this case. There is a great deal of both horizontal and vertical specialization, much formalization in the bureaucracy, and product, process, and distribution systems are usually functional in nature. Organizations that fit this configuration are typically old and large and operate in environments that are relatively simple and stable. Formal power is centralized at the top and external controls reinforce the need for bureaucratization and centralization. This configuration is found among large, mature mass-production companies typified by McDonalds, insurance companies, automobile manufacturers, and others where consistency and standardization are critical.

The standardization of skills, as opposed to the standardization of work, and an operating core of highly trained professionals characterize Mintzberg's
third type of design – the “professional bureaucracy.” In this case, the organization is both very democratic and offers considerable autonomy for those at the core and typically has a large support staff that assists the professionals, resulting in “parallel hierarchies” of “bottom-up power for the professionals” and “top-down control for the support staff” (p. 109). In general, the organization is bureaucratic overall but has little formalization due to both horizontal and vertical decentralization. The age and size of these organizations tend to vary; and they normally operate in complex, but stable, environments. This configuration offers great opportunities for the professionals to perfect their skills but has as its greatest weakness the inability to innovate or adapt to change quickly. Hospitals, universities, and accounting firms are classic “professional bureaucracies.”

Mintzberg’s fourth design on the continuum is the “divisionalized form.” This type of organization is characterized by divisions that function more like “independent entities joined together by a loose administrative overlay,” typically referred to as headquarters (p. 110). Specifically, this form is distinct in that “it is not a complete but a partial structure, superimposed on [other structures]” (p. 110). The key part of the organization is the middle line and standardization of outputs is the key means of coordination. There are significant performance control measures that make divisions accountable to headquarters in these entities and there is some evidence to suggest that these systems discourage risk taking and innovation. As well, these organizations tend to be old and very large by virtue of the addition of divisions. They operate in relatively simple and stable environments with diversified markets, however, there is concern that
"enabling organizations to grow very large, leads to the concentration of a great deal of economic power in a few hands" (p. 111). This configuration is seen extensively in its pure or modified form among the Fortune 500 conglomerates.

Finally, the most complex and newest organizational configuration identified by Mintzberg (1981) is the "adhocracy." This form is most appropriate to entities that use sophisticated specialists and support staffs drawn from different areas that combine their efforts through mutual adjustment to form interacting project teams. At the opposite end of the continuum from the "simple structure," these organizations are both complex and nonstandardized. There is little formalization, much horizontal specialization, and situational factors that require complex technical systems. Power is distributed unevenly in the "adhocracy" and strategy and creativity evolve freely through the work of the project teams. Most of these entities are characteristically young and operate in complex and often disparate dynamic environments that call for sophisticated innovation. Organizations, like Martha Stewart Living Omnimedia Inc., that have operations in the publishing (magazines and books), television (programs), radio (satellite radio network channel), and merchandising sectors and operate with matrix structures, typify this configuration.

Mintzberg's (1981) continuum is a means for comparing and contrasting organizations' structure and situation. Mintzberg posits that organizations achieve fit through the proper configuration of structural and situational components, which results in "consistency, coherence, and harmony" in organizational design (p. 115). In turn, the right structure in the right situation
leads to the effective and efficient use of resources, and increased productivity and profitability.

Data Interpretation Using Framework Three: Mintzberg’s Organizational Configurations and the Intersection of Organization and Public Domain

A singular focus on the six organizations identified in this study would necessitate an in-depth analysis and an extensive investigation of both Mintzberg’s structural and situational elements. However, this research is concerned with the leaders’ perceptions of the leadership experience within the organization and its setting. Both businesses and institutions operate in a dynamic environment in which the internal organizational elements and the external forces of the public domain continually influence each other on an interactive and reactive basis, and typically, it is the leader of the enterprise who is the ultimate link between the two environments. In effect, the external environment functions as a performance control system for the leader and the organization. Mintzberg discusses this and states,

The two most effective means to control an organization from the outside are to hold its most powerful decision maker, the chief executive officer, responsible for its actions and to impose clearly defined standards on it (performance targets or rules and regulations) (pg. 116).

The extent to which the external factors influence and impact the organization are therefore, reflected in the leaders’ perceptions of the leadership experience in the public domain. As such, the situational elements of age and
size, technical system, environment, and power in the five configuration model form the basis and provide an appropriate and significant framework for analyzing the macro aspect of this research on the impact of context.

Jennifer Hanley, Chairman of the Board/CEO Calliope Kids

Having incorporated just 27 years ago and with a large seasonal and part-time base of 3,878 full-time equivalent employees, Calliope Kids is a relatively young and mid-sized specialty retailer organization. The company reports $583.2 million in sales revenue for its four divisions and 648 primary business locations. Its dynamic retail sector market, strong functional matrix across divisions, and the impact and significance of Hanley's expertise all suggest that Calliope Kids is an "adhocracy," although this configuration may change as the company expands and prospers (Mintzberg, 1981).

Hanley's emphasis on employees as strategic resources, the shared culture evidenced by Calliope's balance of social and cultural issues and respect for equity, and Hanley's own assessment that change is a constant factor are all indices of a post-modern organization (Bergquist, 1993; Rennstich, 2002; Gibson, 1997). Although Hanley cites legal, financial, and accountability issues as the external constraints that most affect her ability to lead, the structural operating platform of the organization and her unyielding commitment to it, as well as her articulation and underscoring of "no exceptions" in the production processes of Calliope, mitigate and limit her problems in these areas. Interestingly, she indicates that a lack of vision, creativity, and respect for
innovation are the factors that are most troubling in her dealings with external constraint agencies and issues.

As Chairman of the Board/CEO of Calliope Kids, Hanley has great leeway in terms of her personal engagement with the organization and in her ability to determine and delineate the structure and processes of productivity. As the "strategic apex" of this company, Hanley's passion for creativity is evidenced and assuaged in an environment that emphasizes product design and differentiation.

*Lindsay Hartwell, President, Creighton Foods*

As an old and very large "machine bureaucracy," Creighton Foods operated in a market that is extremely competitive by segment in an established and mature industry sector (Mintzberg, 1981). Hartwell explains that Creighton enjoyed dominant positions in some product lines but was scrapping for growth in others.

The company was founded and led by family members for the majority of the company's 105 year existence and Creighton Foods was one of four decentralized business units. Creighton Foods operated using a cross functional matrix approach to organizational leadership and a brand management model of promotion. With approximately 4,500 employees, $1.8 billion in revenue, and seven primary business locations (including the corporate office), Creighton was relatively small in relation to others in the industry. It was an environment that rewarded individuals like Hartwell who are very competitive and yet focused on service to others.
Hartwell's leadership reflected this. She indicates that organizational change was generally in response to competition from larger producers in the market and that leader involvement with political issues occurred only when there was a potential for impact on the industry and/or corporate profits. A long institutional history of philanthropic engagement and culture of collaboration and innovation were also very significant. Employees were encouraged and supported Creighton's involvement in United Way with 100% participation throughout the organization. In addition, Hartwell describes the atmosphere at Creighton as "familial" and "big pillar of the community."

The nature and culture of Creighton Foods changed drastically with the merger and integration of the new organization's culture and operating procedures. This is due, in large part, to the fact that the post-merger enterprise is a large, multi-national conglomerate that is configured as a "divisionalized form" as opposed to Creighton's previous "machine bureaucracy" configuration (Mintzberg, 1981).

Allison Hayden, Chairman of the Board of Directors, Corbin & Cade

Corbin & Cade is a large and long-established intellectual-capital intensive limited liability partnership that was established 105 years ago. As one of the industry's largest and strongest firms, it serves one-half of the world's largest companies. It has 103 regional offices in the United States and the enterprise functions as a "professional bureaucracy" with approximately 30,000 employees, $7 billion in revenue, and four main business units (Mintzberg, 1981).
Corbin & Cade has very formalized indoctrination and new employee training, continuing education programs, and promotion processes. Hayden indicates that change in the organization is the result of documented need communicated from the top that uses a studied and focused approach to solving the problem. She characterizes the organizational environment at Corbin & Cade as one with stringent compliance requirements, formalized ethics programs, and a reliance on reliable reporting and good governance.

This service sector is highly regulated by industry standards, accreditation requirements, and by federal rules and regulations. In addition, the firm is both a competitor and collaborator in the industry as this sector relies upon peer reviews and coordinated efforts by all of the major firms to influence and instigate changes in both federal regulations and industry operating rules and procedures. As a result, Corbin & Cade have a myriad of both internal and external constituencies and stakeholders.

The immense changes that Hayden has witnessed over the last five years in her profession are a reflection of the evolution of bureaucratic organizations and professional bureaucracies as well as the public demands for accountability and responsiveness that have been legislated by the Sarbanes Oxley Act (Caproni, 2001). The industry, as a whole, and Corbin & Cade, must continually monitor and respond to changes in both their own industry and in the industries of the clients that they serve.
Courtney Merrick, President, Walden State University

Walden State University was founded 96 years ago as a teacher training school. Today, it is a Doctoral-Research Extensive university and one of the largest regional systems in the country. In addition, Walden State is the major social, cultural, and economic engine in the area. The institution has approximately 4,300 employees and a $385 operating budget. In addition, the university has ten colleges, 201 degree programs, and approximately 36,000 full-time equivalent students. Walden State had eight straight years of record applications and enrollment growth and has added numerous cutting-edge research centers and facilities to its campuses. As a result, Walden State was one of only 37 universities reclassified as Research Extensive. Today, the university has over 200 student organizations and receives approximately $60 million in federal, state, and local grants and contracts.

Merrick was initially attracted to Walden State University because of its complex eight campus system. Although Walden State has a "professional bureaucracy" configuration, Merrick's leadership in this setting has a "divisionalized form" and corporate feel due to her cross functional matrix approach to leadership. This perspective resonates in her comments and in her characterization of the system as "one university in many places" (Mintzberg, 1981). As evidence, she talks about understanding "the academic culture" and knowing "a lot about business practices and the bottom line." In addition, she articulates the need to continually "scan the environment" and be responsive to change. At the same time, she cites her frustration with the pace at which things
are accomplished due to the organization and structure of higher education, the competing priorities that present significant external constraints, and her concern with public tuition costs that rival those of private institutions.

As further evidence of Walden State's professional bureaucracy configuration, Merrick's job performance evaluation is very formal and very public and is coordinated and evaluated by the Board of Regents and various constituent groups.

*Ann Morgan, President, Winchester State University*

Winchester State University is a relatively young institution that originally opened in 1957 as a division of the state's flagship university and was later renamed and hired its own president in 1965. It is classified as a Doctoral-Research Intensive university and currently employs approximately 5,000 people on its main campus and at its medical/dental campus facility. The institution has twelve colleges, offers 221 degree programs to its 28,000 students, and has 114 student organizations. The annual operating budget for the university is approximately $225 million and it receives an additional $69 million in research funding.

Winchester State has experienced unprecedented growth over the last ten years and has had numerous accomplishments during this same time period. Among them are the creation of more than 100 new degree programs, an increase of almost 500% in research funding, a dental school, and the building and renovation of 23 campus facilities. Configured as a "professional bureaucracy," Winchester State is a collegial organizational form that Morgan
fully respects and supports (Mintzberg, 1981). Morgan uses a traditional hierarchical leadership approach at Winchester State and believes that the president is responsible for articulating the organizational vision and for making sure that "everyone is on the same page."

Morgan indicates that Winchester State is an integral part of the community and admits that she did not fully realize the extent of this when she first arrived. Morgan has found that as one of two public universities in the state, "you impact everything and everything impacts you." She asserts that the institution needs to be an absolute partner in the city's business development and she has worked very diligently toward this goal. However, most apparent in Morgan's leadership experience at Winchester State is the immense impact and influence of politics in the state, as well as, the public scrutiny of Morgan and Winchester State University by the press and the media. As evidence of this, Morgan cites politics as her greatest external constraint and challenge and indicates that the change she would make in her job is also, the politics. The magnitude of the situation and the extent and impact of Winchester's constituencies substantiate a major emphasis on all aspects of accountability in Morgan's leadership experience at this institution. This may be due in part, to the unique taxation system, biennial legislative sessions, and governance structure of higher education in the state.

Morgan's job performance is evaluated every three years by an exhaustive and public review which includes extensive surveys and interviews with the university's students, faculty, and staff. The results are given to the
Chancellor and the Board of Regents. She indicates that it is a very formal, comprehensive, and public process. Of note, the state by-laws were changed in 2005 at the instigation of the new Chancellor of the state system and give the Chancellor the authority to discipline and terminate the presidents of the state's higher education institutions. One year later, the presidents at both of the two state universities (of which Morgan is one) have resigned.

*Kelly Madison, Chancellor, Westword State University*

Westword State was opened as an extension of the state's flagship university in 1912. In 1974, the state's flagship was reorganized into four distinct campuses and Westword State became a separate entity. During Madison's tenure, the institution had approximately 1,800 employees and had an annual operating budget of $140 million. The university also had seven colleges, approximately 12,000 students, over sixty student organizations, and more than eighty degree programs all on one campus. In addition, the institution received over $20 million in research funding.

Westword State was a prototypical "professional bureaucracy" and Madison's traditional hierarchical leadership reflected her respect for both the collegial atmosphere and this structure (Mintzberg, 1981). Madison however, also recognized the shortcomings of this system and acknowledges that the organization and structure of higher education can be a constraint. She explains that committees, which are a major aspect of higher education governance, are important because everyone has an opportunity for input. However, she points
out that change is slow and difficult in this setting and that in general, faculty
need to feel that any change is their idea in order for it to be accepted.

Madison's focus was always on what was best for the metropolitan
population at Westword State and she states that issues, in general, were "totally
framed within what is best for an urban population." Madison explains that the
large student population of Westword State and its work with the other post
secondary institutions in the city helped Westword to balance both public and
private good. Madison also indicates that she relied on both internal and external
advisory groups.

Under Madison's leadership, the university became an engine for
economic development in the city and developed partnerships with government,
businesses, community organizations, and the school districts. Madison indicates
that being at an urban institution mediated some of the problems with balancing
social and cultural issues because of the broad diversity in the student population
age, race, ethnicity, and income. However, she emphasizes that funding is the
one change she would have made in her position, because Westword State was
"always under the gun and spread thin," as are many public institutions.

Madison's job performance was evaluated annually by system president
and a report given to the Board of Regents. She explains that there was a wide
range of criteria that included fund raising and that faculty and staff had input into
the evaluation as well. Madison consistently received high marks and her five
year employment contract was renewed without incident.
The size and environment of Westword State has changed significantly since Madison’s departure, in large part, due to the merger of the Health Sciences Center and to the introduction of dormitories for the main campus. Both of these changes were under consideration and fully supported by Madison before her retirement.

Overview

Three analytical frameworks representing the micro, meso, and macro aspects of this research provided the basis for the researcher to identify, examine, and explain the data that were collected. In the following chapter, the researcher further discusses and interprets the results of the interviews with the public research university and private enterprise business sector leaders.
CHAPTER 14

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

In chapter thirteen, the researcher presented an explanation of the data within three analytical frameworks representing the micro (Person-organization fit), meso (Schneider's Attraction-Selection-Attrition [ASA] framework), and macro (Mintzberg's five configurations of organizational design) aspects of this research. This chapter will discuss the data and the interpretations in order to answer the question that guided this study: Does the context in which leaders operate affect their perceptions of the leadership experience?

Analytical Process

The analytical frameworks used highlighted similarities and differences in the individual leaders' values and identities, perceptions of their individual and organizational congruencies, and in their organizational structures and situational configurations. It was initially anticipated that relatively clear delineations would exist between participants in the private enterprise business sector and the public research university sector. However, the data indicated that distinct patterns were inconsistent within sectors and across divides.
The researcher noted that although the analytical frameworks point out differences and similarities in leader perceptions, they fail to account for other variables that determine and define the context of leadership. Specifically, the researcher found that the analytical frameworks explained the individual leader and organizational characteristics within the micro, meso, and macro dimensions, but did not explain the impact of environment on their particular leader behaviors or on their perceptions of the leadership experience.

As advocated by House (1988) in his rationale for the need to use qualitative analysis to further the study of leadership, the researcher analyzed the data in order to explain the findings that were not addressed by the analytical frameworks of this study, identify the "critical variables" associated with context, and enhance and expand the existing research on leadership and context. This resulted in a grounded theory approach to and analysis of the data in conjunction with the previous linear interpretation using the analytical frameworks.

Emerging Context and Themes and Domains

Consistent with the processes of analysis advocated by Creswell (1998), Glaser & Strauss (1967), Lincoln & Guba (1985), and Miles & Huberman (1994), the researcher sought to analyze and categorize the data to determine the impact of context using both a case-oriented and variable-oriented approach. Through this process, the researcher considered "configurations, associations, causes, and effects within" each case and also looked at the "variables [of
context] and their intercorrelations" across all six of the cases (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 174).

The outcome of this on-going categorization scheme and analytical structure resulted in three overarching themes not explicitly detected or explained by the analytical frameworks the researcher employed. Specifically, differences were found in the manner in which the leaders engage within and outside of their organizational structures, the measures of and means to achieve productivity, and the extent and spectrum of accountability of each of the leaders.

The three themes that emerged are defined as;

- Engagement: Voluntary participation and involvement that reflects an interlocking of interests and anticipation of shared outcomes.
- Productivity: Yielding favorable or useful results in the creation of goods or services and accomplishment of individual and/or organizational goals and objectives.
- Accountability: The obligation and authority to answer for actions and performance in the discharging of individual and/or organizational responsibilities.

In addition, the personal, positional, and public aspects of leadership emerged as domains within each thematic category. These domains reflect both the seven spheres of influence initially identified in The Widening Gyre: Lessons from the American Council on Education's Fourth Women Presidents Summit (Phillips & Van Ummersen, 2003), as well as the three dimensions that resulted when the participants' responses to interview questions were collapsed into three
initial dimensions of at the core: individual values, the intersection of individual and organization, and the intersection of organization and public domain. The domains are:

- **Personal**: Aspects and differences directly attributable to the individual and primarily focused on the individual.
- **Positional**: Point of view or attitude that is explained or justified by the role or position within an organization or an industry.
- **Public**: Connected to or affecting a broader scope of people, community, or government in a manner open to scrutiny by the public at large.

In accord with the methods advocated by Miles & Huberman (1994), the researcher developed three-by-three case-ordered matrices of the themes and domains that emerged in this study and charted case-oriented componential matrices of the individual responses to interview questions for each of the six participants in order to compare and analyze the data (See Appendix II). The researcher coding and assessments were pooled from interview data, supporting documents, and archival records. The matrices are discussed by individual leader and then compared across the six case studies.

**Discussion**

Jennifer Hanley, Chairman of the Board/CEO Calliope Kids

Hanley's responses to the interview questions reveal her focus and emphasis on engagement and productivity within the organization. This is due to the great degree of influence and impact that her personal values, identity, and
creativity impart on Calliope Kids and to the entrepreneurial environment found both within and outside of the company.

**Engagement:**

In particular, Hanley's personal engagement is found in her preference not to network, the fact that she can and does use humor in leadership, in her appraisal that going back to being herself was her best decision, and in her estimation that the great extent of time she spends at work is the one thing that she would change about her job.

Hanley's positional engagement is also significant and comes through in the "check your ego at the door' policy that she advocates within the organization, in the manner in which she deals with conflict (if she can't avoid it), in her belief that it is not her place to take a public stand on controversial issues, and in her citing the Chairman of the Board emeritus as one of her best mentors and almost a "father figure" to her. She also acknowledges that the greatest challenge in seeking her leadership position is in knowing your own strengths and weaknesses.

Hanley's perspective of her public engagement is somewhat limited. The organization supports a corporate charity, as well as individual charities identified by corporate employees, and Hanley asserts that balancing social and cultural issues is not a problem due to the location and environment of the corporate office.
Productivity:

Hanley admits that she is very motivated and fast paced in her leadership. Her personal productivity is driven by the synergy of art and science that is at the heart of her identity and by her ability to balance and use these two approaches appropriately. This same synergy is evidenced in her leadership and positional productivity as CEO and Chairman of the Board of Calliope Kids. Hanley discusses the need to communicate a clear vision and to check for compliance and consistency. She also stresses the importance of equity in the organization and she cites people as both her greatest internal constraint and her area of worst decision making. At the same time, she explains that a passion for creativity is her motivating force and that she sees this same trait in everyone and aggressively advocates it throughout the company. Hanley also asserts that change is constant and that she relies highly on her own and others’ intuitive processes to bring the organization to change.

Hanley’s public productivity is centered on Calliope Kids’ extremely interactive and committed customer base that is at the core of the organization’s vision. The customer is truly the focus of product design and development for Hanley and the entire organization.

Accountability:

Hanley’s positional accountability is evidenced in her job performance evaluation which is based solely on sales and profits. She is very cautious in dealing with the press and the media and does not allow much exposure of herself or her position in the organization. The measure of Hanley’s public
accountability is found in her comment that the greatest external constraint she faces is in dealing with legal, financial, and accountability issues, and in particular, with Wall Street analysts. The reason, she explains, is because there is no creativity or innovation that is valued within these contexts. There were no significant references to personal accountability in Hanley's responses.

In sum, Hanley's leadership emphasizes and is highly centered on the dimensions of personal engagement and productivity, and positional productivity (See Figure 14.1). Her success and perception of the leadership experience in this environment highlights the importance of her personal creativity and drive and to the centrality of her role in assuring that Calliope is responsive to the evolving and ever changing demands of its market. Her leadership is also consistent with the competitive demands and need for continuous innovation described by Bell (1976), Bergquist (1993), Drucker (1989), and Read (1996).
Figure 14.1 Hanley Componential Profile
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Lindsay Hartwell, President, Creighton Foods

Hartwell's leadership was centered on personal engagement and personal and positional productivity. Having spent her entire career at Creighton Foods, Hartwell's perspective of her experience was the result of not only succeeding in a brand management environment for twenty five years, but excelling in it as well.

*Engagement:*

Hartwell emphasized her strong core values of intellectual honesty, humor, and sheer determination in her personal engagement with Creighton Foods. She indicates that her love of marketing precluded other loves and that balancing her love of work with her own self-interest was a challenge. As a result, Hartwell cites her decision to marry again with someone who is a balance of all of the intellectual-type skills and the deeply intuitive right thing to do, as her best decision. She advises others to love what you do, but adds that it is important to "get over yourself."

Hartwell's leadership was also centered on positional engagement. She was very competitive in her position and discusses having to balance her strong drive with her sharp creative skills to achieve personal and professional balance. As well, she points to bad ideas as her worst decision. She also cites her greatest internal constraint as learning to mediate and adapt her objectivity and enthusiasm to the rate of change and pace of others. Hartwell explains that she had great mentors who were professional colleagues along the way and admits that the she did do some networking, but preferred not to. She indicates that
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helping more young women coming up the corporate ladder is the change she would have made in her role.

Public engagement was initiated and determined at the overall corporate level and the organization’s “big pillar of the community” standing served to balance public and private good. However, the company advocated individual contributions to the United Way and individually-directed engagement with philanthropic entities in the community. Hartwell added that senior executives understood that there were “very significant obligations” to be involved with philanthropic activities and outside commitments.

Productivity:

Hartwell was very focused on positional productivity. She asserts that advocacy, strategic ability, and persistence on behalf of an idea were all important skills in her position. Hartwell was motivated to seek the leadership position by the desire to try new and different things and by her success in previous endeavors. She explains that the organization was brought to change by pointing to the competition from larger companies and indicates that the corporate family roots, culture, and institutional history of collaboration facilitated an environment where equity was highly valued and that encouraged communication, engaging others, and joining ranks in the face of conflict.

Hartwell’s job performance was evaluated by a combination of financial measures and on measures showing that the organization was healthy and had effective succession planning in place. She explains that she only took a public
stand on controversial issues when they threatened to impact the profits of the organization or the industry as a whole.

With regards to public productivity, Hartwell insists that the organization vision included both product and profit goals and objectives and that she was never faced with an ethical issue at Creighton due to the corporate culture. No significant references to personal productivity were evidenced in Hartwell’s responses.

**Accountability:**

Hartwell’s personal accountability is evidenced in her identity by her belief that people and service to others is vital. She limited her positional accountability by limiting her access with the press and media because of the personal, as opposed to team emphasis, inherent in the attention. Hartwell’s responses indicated no significant evidence of public accountability.

In the end, Hartwell achieved great personal and professional success in her 25 years at Creighton and her perception of the leadership experience converges on the dimensions of personal engagement and personal and positional productivity (See Figure 14.2). This is due to the fact that these dimensions confirm and compliment her personal drive and passion, as well as,
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Creighton's hierarchical structure and brand management model of promotion. It is also due to the fact that her accountability was somewhat limited as Hartwell was president of a major decentralized business unit, but not the conglomerate as a whole. This environment of semi-autonomous units, and Hartwell's leadership in it, is consistent with the characteristics of post-modern organizations identified by Heckscher (1994) and the leadership skills discussed by Bergquist (1993), Billmoria & Goodwin (2005), and Peters & Austin (1985).

Allison Hayden, Chairman of the Board of Directors, Corbin & Cade

Hayden's leadership is highly focused on all aspects of productivity and on public accountability as Chairman of the Board of Directors of this professional services organization. With 2,700 partners in this limited liability partnership, Hayden's perceptions reflect her experiences and dual roles of partner and leader.

Engagement:

Hayden's personal engagement with the organization is somewhat limited. She cites trust and integrity as her core values and finds that although she loves the interaction with the people she gets to meet, the extensive travel schedule is the one thing that she would change about her job. Hayden explains that the drains on her energy level due to traveling and the repercussions for her trailing spouse are her greatest internal constraints. Hayden admits that she has made some bad decisions in her day, but couldn't bring one to mind. Her professional engagement is even more limited; however Hayden acknowledges that she has
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had some great mentors; most of whom were colleagues. There was no significant evidence of public engagement in Hayden's responses.

Productivity:

Hayden's identity is centered on knowing her own strengths and weaknesses and this aspect is at the core of her productivity. On a personal level, she asserts that finding visibility across the organization to appropriately demonstrate her capabilities was a challenge. Hayden indicates that she handles external constraints by using them as opportunities and she credits staying at the organization at key points in her career as the best decision she has made.

As part of Hayden's positional productivity, she has determined that the ability to interact, communicate, and lead are important skills in her position and she finds that good organization skills, being able to work on multiple levels at the same time, and proven technical proficiency in a core business area are essential. Hayden explains that conflict is often a matter of communication and that her presence often solves the problem. She emphasizes that networking and meeting with high-powered individuals is an important aspect of both her job and the company's business and asserts that she and Corbin & Cade, as a professional organization, work hard to proactively manage the press.

On the public productivity dimension, Hayden defines the organization's vision in terms of their customers, products, and their reputation. She indicates that she and the partners must carefully balance public and organizational interests when determining to take a public stand on controversial issues.
Accountability:

Evidence of Hayden's positional accountability is found in her comments that bringing change to the organization is the result of documented need, communicated from the top-down, with a studied and focused approach to solving the problem and she characterizes the organization as a highly collegial environment of service professionals.

Hayden's public accountability is very significant. She and the entire organization have a great deal of accountability to their peers, clients, and to the investing public as a whole. Hayden asserts that public and private good are of equal importance and concern to Corbin & Cade and that addressing social and cultural issues requires a delicate balance of profit and compensation issues. She acknowledges that her job performance evaluation has become more complex with her role and that it is "very accountable" and "very clear" and is based on both financial and reputational measures. There were no significant indicators of personal accountability in her perceptions of the leadership experience.

In effect, Hayden's leadership at Corbin & Cade is strongly focused on all aspects of productivity and on a great deal of positional and public accountability (See Figure 14.3). This outcome can be attributed to the highly professional nature and blending of public and private interests that are the discerning hallmarks of Corbin & Cade's operating context. As well, Hayden's perceptions are consistent with the consequences of leadership in intellectual-capital
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intensive and post-modern organizations described by Caproni (2001), Gibson (1997), and Heckscher (1994).

Dr. Courtney Merrick, President, Walden State University

As President of an eight campus public research university, Merrick's leadership is highly centered on the dimensions of her positional productivity and on the dimensions of positional and public accountability. This is due to the impact of her personal identity on her leadership and to the inherent accountability of leading a large regional public entity that is a major force and employer in the area.

Engagement:

Merrick's personal engagement is centered on her core value of authenticity, which she describes as being who you are and in knowing what excites you and what drives you. Professionally, she acknowledges that she has a forceful personality and that for her, a sense of timing and pacing is very important to her engagement with others as their leader. She also looks to her senior management team to be her best advisors. Her responses indicated no significant evidence of public engagement.

Productivity:

Merrick acknowledges that her identity is very much “bound up” in her work, her love of complex settings, and in motivating people to get results. Her leadership reflects these aspects of her identity and her responses to the
interview questions reveal a woman who is fully focused on the aspect of professional productivity with no significant indicators of personal productivity.

As components of her positional productivity, Merrick finds that respect for others' opinions, a high comfort level with multi-tasking, working with divergent groups, strong shared values and agenda, and confidence in your own management ability are essential skills for her leadership role. Merrick uses and strongly supports a cross functional matrix approach to leadership and insists that her senior team be equally skilled and accountable both vertically and horizontally. She was motivated to seek the leadership role by continually focusing on increasing responsibilities and getting the job done. Merrick credits her best decision to defining the institution and its mission early on and indicates that her worst decision involved a personnel issue. She cites the organization and structure of higher education as her greatest internal constraint and discusses the challenge of leading change within this setting.

Merrick asserts that networking at all levels is an essential component of her public productivity and vital to the development of the university. In addition, she insists that change is like "constant whitewater" and that it is important to make certain that everyone has a voice. In her opinion, her job is to communicate organizational decisions in an effective manner. Merrick also indicates that she believes that her role and Walden State's, with regards to taking a public stand on controversial issues, is to provide a forum and assure a balance of views.
Accountability:

In terms of her positional accountability, Merrick would change the pace at which things are accomplished, but values the equity that is inherent in higher education collegiality. She believes that it is important to deal with conflict directly and to communicate a sense of openness and expectation that issues will be dealt with. She indicates that her relationships with the press and the media are not adversarial and that they play an important role in public higher education.

Merrick’s public accountability is more detailed. The organizational vision for Walden State is based on engagement with the community, students, learning, and research and Merrick characterizes the institution as the social, cultural, and economic engine for the region. As such, Merrick indicates that there is a wide array of social and cultural interests and activities at Walden State and that she and others within the institution try to make certain that the university is neither overly focused nor that there are broad gaps in their offerings. Merrick cites concerns with rising costs and funding issues in public higher education as problems in addressing public versus private good and adds that competing priorities are her greatest external constraint. Her job evaluation is very formal and very public, but very clearly defined by the long range institutional plan and in coordination with the Board of Regents. There was no significant indication of personal accountability in Merrick’s responses.

In sum, Merrick’s perception of the leadership experience at Walden State University emphasizes her positional productivity as well as the enormity of her public and positional accountability (See Figure 14.4). This setting and Merrick
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lend strong support for the findings by Eckel, Couturier, and Luu (2005d) of a highly market-driven public higher education environment and the leadership appropriate for this context. As well, Merrick’s use of a cross functional matrix approach to leadership is consistent with Steck’s (2003) findings for corporatized universities.

Dr. Ann Morgan, President, Winchester State University

Morgan’s leadership experience at Winchester State University is highlighted by incredible growth and change in a relatively short time period in an urban environment that has experienced these same phenomena. Her perceptions are strongly centered on the dimensions of positional productivity and public accountability that have accompanied the expansion of the university from a relatively small institution to a burgeoning regional public research university.

Engagement:

Morgan cites integrity and caring about the development of the mind as her core values and the focus of her personal engagement and she credits her passion to these foundational values. In addition, as evidence of positional engagement, Morgan points to her previous superior and administrator as her most inspiring mentor and to her husband as her best advisor. She had no significant indications of public engagement in her responses to the interview questions.
Productivity:

Morgan asserts that she is an academic at heart and that she has a multidimensional mindset of art and science which guides her personal productivity. She finds that the ability to motivate others to see the big picture and having a broad range of oral and written communication skills are essential in her positional productivity. In addition, she acknowledges that her worst decision involved a personnel decision and she explains that her best decision was in creating the law school, which created the template for other professional schools at the university and allowed others to envision the university differently. Morgan emphasizes that she was motivated to seek this leadership position by the lure of a bigger palate at Winchester State and admits that the greatest internal constraint she faces is the sharp cultural change, growth, and development in the state and in the complex programs and systems in a short period of time.

Networking is crucial to the business of Winchester State and to Morgan’s public productivity. She asserts that it is critical to make connections with leaders in the community and she has been very diligent in doing so. She acknowledges that she rarely takes a public stand on controversial issues, unless they deal specifically with educational or academic issues, because she does believe that it would be supported. As well, Morgan indicates that although the leader is responsible for determining and delineating the vision, bringing change to the organization is achieved through a synergistic top-down, bottom-up approach.
**Accountability:**

Morgan emphatically indicates that passion and political acumen are important personal accountability skills in her leadership role. She discusses positional accountability and dealing with conflict and indicates that her approach is situational. Sometimes she approaches it with strong leadership and other times, she shapes it and lets others think it was their idea. In this same vein, it is Morgan's opinion that equity and efficiency can co-exist.

Morgan is faced with an immense degree of public accountability. Winchester State's vision and Morgan's is focused on interconnectedness and engagement with the community academically, culturally, socially, and through research. She believes that public education simultaneously works to balance public and private good and stresses that universities are both social and cultural organizations. Morgan adds, however, that she finds people and politics to be her greatest challenge, politics to be the most significant external constraint, and that politics and the rate and pace of change in higher education are the things that she would most change about her job. Morgan also discusses at length the extensive and intensive scrutiny that both she and the institution receive in the press and the media, which is far more than she has experienced at other institutions. Her job performance at Winchester State is evaluated in a very formal, expansive, in-depth, and public manner and her position is controlled by the Chancellor, who reports to the Board of Regents.

In general, Morgan's leadership experience is supported by the literature on the entrepreneurial environment of higher education today. The emphasis on
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the dimensions of accountability, and in particular on Morgan’s positional productivity at Winchester, lend strong support to Rainey, Backoff, and Levine’s (1976) propositions and confirm their descriptions of the challenges and limitations facing leaders of public entities (See Figure 14.5). In addition, Morgan’s experiences are consistent with Kerr and Gade’s (1986) findings that institutions today operate with broader goals, increased governing controls, and further fund raising responsibilities.

Dr. Kelly Madison, Westword State University

Madison describes herself as a scientist and an academic, as well as, a stalwart advocate for students, faculty, and staff. Her leadership at Westword State is highly focused on the positional productivity that one might expect from this individual and on the public accountability that is often found in an environment similar to that of this highly populated metropolitan, public research institution.

Engagement:

Madison’s core value of honesty guides her personal engagement with Westword State and is evidenced throughout her leadership. Madison’s positional engagement reflects this component as well. She believes that it is important to be sensitive to people and to be honest in her dealings with them and she cites this as an essential skill for leaders. As well, she indicates that she has watched and listened to what others were doing over the years through her work with ACE, however, she looks to people around the issues for honest input,
as opposed to formal advisors. Evidence of Madison's public engagement was not found in her responses.

Productivity:

People are a critical aspect of Madison's professional productivity. She cites her greatest challenge as people, her worst decisions being personnel issues, and her best decisions as centered on personnel and in involving the deans in the fund raising efforts of the university. Madison also indicates that the organization and structure of higher education, committees, and, once again people, are the most significant internal constraint she faces. She states that her strong analytical skills as a scientist are an asset and essential to leadership. In addition, she was motivated to seek the leadership position by her peers and through a consensus that she was better than the other candidate. Madison emphasizes that leaders have to be willing to make the hard decisions and "go with them." No indications for personal productivity were found however.

Madison's public productivity was exemplified by her enjoyment in networking and fund raising on behalf of Westword State. She indicates that the one change she would make to her job would be to assure a more reliable and much larger funding base for higher education in the state.

Accountability:

Madison's identity is strongly tied to people and service to others and this aspect is evidenced as personal accountability. Madison's positional accountability focuses on her belief in the inherent equity of collegiality, as well as in the hierarchical structure of a traditional public university. She deals with
conflict by communicating with the people on both sides of the issue and explains that she firmly believes in the chain of command of higher education and is known to stand by her deans and their decisions. Madison operates in a very straightforward manner with everyone and asserts that although the institution received frequent attention in the press and in the media, her easy rapport and honest approach mitigated many problems.

In addition, Madison's public accountability was significant, but not adversarial. She delineates the organizational vision as focused on engagement in the community and with the other nearby public institutions. Madison discusses meeting the needs of their large metropolitan student population and explains that as an economic engine in the area, this was also an important component of balancing public and private good. She asserts that the urban environment and the diversity of the student population, in combination with internal and external focus groups, helped Westword to balance social and cultural issues.

Madison acknowledges that bringing the organization to change is slow and difficult in higher education. She admits that, in general, faculty need to be involved and need to think it's their idea in order for it to be effective. She cites funding issues, institutional identity, and Westword's reputation being co-mingled with the other state university campuses as the greatest external constraints to her leadership and accountability. At the same time, Madison asserts that occasionally Westword had to take a public stand on controversial issues. She points to the fact that she was the spokesperson and although they "might not
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Madison also states that her job performance evaluation was both very formal and very public. The process was guided by the System President and presented to the Board of Regents for approval.

Finally, Madison’s perception of the leadership experience at Westword State University emphasizes both her positional productivity and the public accountability and are consistent with the traditional leadership needs of a professional bureaucracy configuration (Mintzberg, 1981) (See Figure 14.6). In addition, the critical funding issues cited by Madison are reflected and supported in the ACE (2005) essay on “The Changing Relationship between States and Their Institutions,” as well as in the writings of Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport (1999) and Rosenzweig (2001), to name a few.

**Data Display**

The data and the componential analyses that were discussed and presented by individual leader are plotted and displayed for the six case studies in the mega matrix profile of leaders’ perceptions of environment (See Figure 14.7). The mega matrix profile offers a synopsis and comparison of the individual componential analysis matrices that showed the personal, positional, and public extent of each leader’s perceptions of engagement, productivity, and accountability.

The mega matrix profile indicates that the impact of context is somewhat similar for Hayden at Calliope Kids and for Hartwell at Creighton
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Foods. This finding suggests that their highly competitive and fast-paced market sectors, the need for creativity and innovation, and the extent of their personal involvement in the core business area, all result in a higher degree of personal and positional engagement and productivity than found in the other organizations and leaders in this study. In addition, both leaders indicate that collaboration is a significant aspect of productivity in their organizations and that their job performances are evaluated on financial/or and internal measures.

Similarly, Hanley and Hartwell both cite personal matters as their best decision, admit that they do not network because they prefer not to, and choose to limit their exposure in the press and the media. They also acknowledge that public versus private good is addressed in large part, through charitable corporate donations. In addition, Hanley and Hartwell do not perceive the same impact and extent of external constituencies as the other leaders and organizations profiled in this study. This could be due to Hanley's dual roles of CEO and Chairman of the Board and to Hartwell's decentralized business unit, as opposed to being in an overall corporate leadership position. This finding, perhaps, moderates and mitigates some of the emphasis on accountability issues and concerns in their responses to interview questions and in their perceptions of the leadership experience.

In contrast, the experiences and perceptions of Morgan at Winchester State University and Madison at Westword State University are very similar. Morgan and Madison both lead research institutions in large metropolitan cities, and they are highly focused on the aspects of positional productivity and public
accountability in their perceptions of the leadership experience in their environments. In these settings, competition is de-emphasized in favor of collegiality in an environment characterized by a bureaucratic hierarchy, with established procedures and a chain of command that is slow and often difficult to change. Morgan and Madison explain that productivity in their organizations is knowledge-based and that their job performances are evaluated on a complex range of both internal and external measures of accountability.

In addition, these leaders cite organizational accomplishments as their best decision, assert that networking is a crucial aspect of both their roles and the organization's business, and they each either proactively manage or are regularly obligated and involved in matters with the press and the media. Morgan and Madison also report that balancing public and private good is supported through the work and mission of their organizations and the extent of public accountability associated with their roles is perceived to be both broad and intense.

The impact of context is distinctive, however, with regards to Hayden at Corbin & Cade and Merrick at Walden State University. Hayden and Merrick are both highly focused on positional productivity in the organization and in their leadership. Hayden emphasizes technical proficiency in a core area of the firm's business, the ability to interact, communicate, and lead as vital skills, and the importance of being able to work on multiple levels at the same time. Although Merrick's training is not in business, her identity is tied to working in complex settings, with diverse groups, and she is very focused on getting results. She
somewhat similarly emphasizes and leads Walden State like a business through her use of the institution's comprehensive "platform" that monitors and integrates strategic goals and principles on a continual basis throughout all levels and areas of the organization.

Both Hayden and Merrick's perceptions of the leadership experience are also centered on professionalism and inclusiveness. Corbin & Cade partners function in numerous locations in a formal and standardized work environment that is highly collegial and in which Hayden is both an active partner and an elected leader. Similarly, the faculty at Walden State operates in an environment where individuals offer unique and highly specialized areas of instruction, in numerous locations, in a setting that is also highly collegial. Merrick is an academic as well as the leader, however, her approach to leading Walden State is somewhat unique due to the fact that she uses a strong cross functional matrix approach and runs the institution as "one university in many places." Her leadership in this environment is highly coordinated, balanced, and inclusive of all of the campuses and faculty and, in effect, serves to standardize operations.

The limited liability partnership structure with partners serving one-half of the world's largest companies, numerous oversight mandates, and their responsibility to the investing public at large all intensify the accountability and increase the range and impact of constituencies at Corbin & Cade. Somewhat comparably, as both a large regional and public university, Walden State has significant accountability and broad constituencies. The institution is the major social, cultural, and economic engine in the region and has numerous campuses.
which has perhaps, diffused the intensity of accountability and has given the university more flexibility to adeptly address the vast interests of the constituency. As a result, while the two organizations are unique legal, social, and cultural entities, they are practically and contextually closely aligned and have leaders with comparable perceptions of their leadership experiences.

Summary

Each of the leaders in this study has significant achievements and accomplishments, which document and support their successful leadership within the unique context of their organizational environment. This study sought to highlight the individual values at the core of their leadership, their perceptions of the leadership experience as an individual within the organization, and as the leader of the organization within the public domain. In addition, this research sought to develop an alternative framework and to identify the “critical variables” of context that were not explained by the analytical frameworks. The findings of the study and individual leader assessments have been discussed in this chapter. The conclusions, implications for leaders, and areas for future research will be presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 15

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore the impact of context on individual leader perspectives of the leadership experience. The seven broadening spheres of leader influence identified in the ACE report, *The Widening Gyre, Lessons from the Fourth Women Presidents' Summit: Living the Present, Shaping the Future* formed the basis and rationale for this research. A review of the relevant literature on traditional leadership theories, public versus private sector characteristics, the knowledge economy and post-modern organizations, and the entrepreneurial environment of higher education today advanced understanding and summarized the research on leadership and context.

Through purposeful sampling, three private enterprise business sector and three public research university leaders, meeting the criteria of this exploratory comparative case study, were identified. The researcher conducted in-depth personal interviews with the participants and collected supporting documents and archival records. The accumulated data were collapsed into three dimensions for presentation: At the core: individual values, the intersection of the individual and the organization, and the intersection of the organization and the public domain. Responses to two subsequent questions added during the interview phase
regarding leading in higher education versus business and advice to others seeking this level of leadership were also compiled and examined.

The data were interpreted in a linear manner using the theories of Person-organization fit, Schneider’s (1987) Attraction-Selection-Attrition, and Mintzberg’s (1981) five configurations as analytical frameworks representing the micro, meso, and macro aspects of this research. The interpretation within the analytical frameworks explained individual and organizational characteristics within the micro, meso, and macro dimensions. However, the impact of context on the leaders’ perception of the leadership experience was not specifically informed through the use of the analytical frameworks.

Using a process-oriented and variable-oriented grounded theory approach to data analysis, an alternative framework that used three emergent and overarching themes of leader responsibility was developed in order to identify and explain the “critical variables of context.” Differences were found in the manner in which the leaders engage within and outside of their organizational structures, the measures of and means to achieve productivity, and the extent and spectrum of accountability of each of the leaders. The researcher reanalyzed the data using the themes of engagement, productivity, and accountability that emerged. In addition, the data were evaluated using the personal, positional, and public domains within the three themes that reflected the seven spheres of influence initially identified in *The Widening Gyre: Lessons from the American Council on Education’s Fourth Women Presidents Summit* (Phillips & Van Ummersen, 2003).
A synopsis of each participant's perceptions of the leadership experience within her environment was discussed and assessments were summarized and plotted on a mega-matrix profile that displays the "data from all cases on two or more dimensions that [are] related to each other ... so that similarities and contrasts among the cases can be seen" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, pgs. 198-199).

Data interpretation using both the linear and grounded theory approaches, independently, resulted in the same conclusion. This significantly reinforces the trustworthiness of the findings as well as the processes and product of the research and is consistent with the methods advocated by Glaser & Strauss (1967), Lincoln & Guba (1985), and Miles & Huberman (1994).

In this concluding chapter, the researcher states the research conclusion, develops a model for assessing the impact of context on leadership, presents an unanticipated finding, discusses the implications for private enterprise business sector and public research university leaders, and recommends areas for future research.

Research Conclusion

The findings of this research indicate that the context in which leaders operate does indeed affect their perception of the leadership experience. Using the alternative framework for coding and analyzing the data that has as its basis the themes of engagement, productivity, and accountability and three domains representing the personal, positional, and public spheres of influence, similarities
were found in Hanley (business) and Hartwell's (business) responses, in Hayden (business) and Merrick's (university), and in Morgan (university) and Madison's (university). As a result, the researcher established that the leaders’ perceptions of their experiences provide evidence that the specific context of their leadership is significant.

The findings of this study also suggest that there are particular indicators associated with the themes of engagement, productivity, and accountability and the personal, positional, and public domains of leadership. Specifically, the mega matrix profile presented in Chapter fourteen indicates that leaders in public research university environments perceive greater public productivity and accountability in their positions than leaders of private enterprise businesses who perceive more personal and positional engagement in their roles. In light of this, the researcher developed a model to assess the impact of context using specific indicator continuums of organizational environments.

Development of the Model

The themes of engagement, productivity, and accountability were expanded and a model developed based on the literature related to this research, the ongoing review and analysis of the data, and the researcher’s background in business management and organization design and development. This model is consistent with the processes advocated by Miles & Huberman (1994) for drawing conclusions.
In the model, the themes of engagement, productivity, and accountability form the horizontal axis of the chart and the personal, positional, and public leadership domains form the vertical axis. Within these axes are three continuums that represent specific organizational indicators associated with context that were informed by differences the researcher noted in the environments of the leaders in this study. The characteristics of the organization’s environment are assessed and plotted on each of the three indicator continuums.

The First Indicator of Context

The first indicator of context in the model is based on the theme of engagement, which is broadened and delineated on a continuum representing organizational engagement with the market and market forces (See Figure 15.1). This is examined through the primary business activities of the organization, which are assessed in order to determine the entity’s agility and its ability to innovate and respond to customer demands, market trends, and supply and demand factors. An enterprise that can make changes quickly and with relative ease is seen as being discretionary in its engagement with the market. Alternatively, an entity that faces great obstacles and major delays in responding to market forces is non-discretionary.

Hanley’s leadership and Calliope Kids provide examples of high discretionary engagement with the market. The company is greatly impacted by the creativity that is an inherent component of Hanley’s identity and by her
influence and role as Chairman of the Board/CEO. Creativity is also a critical aspect of Calliope’s retail environment and their market forces. The organization’s success is, in large part, determined by both Hanley and Calliope’s abilities to be responsive to fashion trends and to their interactive customer base and relations. This engagement with the market is also evidenced in the entrepreneurialism of the business and in its retail development decisions.

By comparison and at the opposite end of the spectrum, is Morgan and Winchester State. Leading at one of the two public universities in the state, Morgan has significantly less ability and agility to respond to the market forces. For example, should student enrollments indicate that the college of business is in higher demand than the college of education at Winchester State, Morgan cannot quickly and legitimately react to this trend and decide to discontinue offering courses and degrees in education and double the number of offerings in the college of business. Public higher education as a whole is notoriously slow in the decision making and funding practices that would enable Winchester State to increase its program offerings in response to market demands. Hanley at Calliope Kids, in contrast, can and has closed operations that are not profitable with relative ease and speed, as evidenced in the closure of their stores in the United Kingdom.
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The concept of engagement and the impact of the market and market forces are substantiated through studies and literature on the knowledge economy, post-modern organizations, and Mintzberg's configurations (1981). In addition, the propositions outlined by Rainey, Backoff, and Levine (1976) and supported by Denhardt (1984), Hooijberg & Choi (2001), Rocheleau & Wu (2002), and Spillane & Regnier (1998) posit that profit and the "bottom line" in the private sector generally guide decision making and drive goals and objectives, while ambiguity, a lack of consensus, and inefficient quantifiers associated with the "public good" hamper public sector operations.

The Second Indicator of Context

The second indicator of context in the model is conceptualized as the internal processes of employee productivity and is assessed on a continuum representing the range and extent of collaboration and collegiality within the organization (See Figure 15.2). Collaboration, at one end of the spectrum, represents an atmosphere and willingness among individuals of the organization to work cooperatively. Collegiality, in contrast, is a vested power of equality among peers and colleagues in the organization resulting from their shared governance, educational, and/or professional standing. Leadership, performance, and in the end productivity, is facilitated or constrained by the degree of power and participation individuals have within the enterprise.

Hartwell's strong competitive drive, sharp creative skills, and appreciation for service to others served her well at the large, collaborative, and mature
bureaucracy that was Creighton Foods. As well, her ability to innovate and communicate with her team, and advocate on behalf of an idea were essential to both her position and the productivity of the organization as a whole. These skills and aptitudes are congruent with the intellectual honesty, humor, and sheer determination that Hartwell values and that form the basis for her identity. These factors, combined with the rich institutional history and familial legacy of the company, encouraged and facilitated the effectiveness and efficiency of the collaborative process.

In contrast, Madison at Westward State University leads in an environment that is highly collegial. She values and respects this setting and service to others is a central component of her identity. However, she details the constraints on her leadership resulting from the organization and structure of higher education, her frustration with the rate and pace of change, and the fact that people and not issues are her greatest challenge. Her sentiments are not unique to Westward State and are, in fact, echoed in various ways by all three of the public research university leaders in this study.

These elements of collaboration and collegiality, as processes of employee productivity, are recognized and widely discussed in the literature on leadership, management, and team building. In addition, they are critical organizational and motivational factors in post-modern organizations and entities with large numbers of knowledge workers.
Figure 15.2 The impact of context on leadership.
The Third Indicator of Context

The third indicator of context in the model is accountability, which has been operationalized as the extent of external accountability to constituencies (See Figure 15.3). At one end of the continuum are owners, and/or boards of directors and shareholders. The opposite end is characterized by a broad spectrum of stakeholders that includes not only local, state, and national governing entities, but public and private individuals and agencies as well. The larger scope and demands for accountability result in less autonomy for the organization and increased constraints in decision making and leadership.

As Chairman of the Board and CEO of Calliope Kids, Hanley's accountability is mitigated more than would generally be expected because of her direct engagement and guidance in the key areas of design, production, and merchandising. Hartwell's accountability at Creighton Foods was also limited by the fact that she was president of a major business unit, but not of the conglomerate as a whole. In each case however, the organizations had directors and shareholders in addition to their customers, to whom they were responsive.

By comparison, leaders at Winchester State and Westword State have an extensive and expansive array of public and private, regulatory and non-regulatory constituents in addition to the students, faculty, and staff of their campuses. The issues that arise from this lack of autonomy are many and varied and include the competing priorities that Merrick cites, the politics that Morgan finds, and the funding base that Madison points to.
Figure 15.3 The impact of context on leadership.
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Accountability is an essential feature of the context in which an organization operates. This factor is substantiated in the literature on public and private sector leadership, Goodman and Loveman (1991), and Caproni (2001), as well as by governing rules and regulations, such as the Sarbanes Oxley Act.

A discussion of the model and the three continuums was presented using examples from this study (See Figure 15.4). It was anticipated that the model could be used to examine and contrast the impact of context on individual leader experiences in various organizational contexts. An unanticipated finding in the study however, offers additional evidence and further expands the conceptual model presented.

Unanticipated Finding

When this study began, two of the six leaders had previously retired from their positions. During the data collection period, two additional participants resigned. Although this research does not investigate leader effectiveness or efficiency, the lengthy tenures and documented data and achievements of the leaders and the organizations under their leadership indicate that the participants in the study were, indeed, highly skilled leaders. As such, and in light of the findings, this begs the question: Why did the participants resign from their leadership positions?
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The researcher reviewed the extensive data and its application to the model presented above and determined that individual values and identity establish the overarching framework of the entire model (See Figure 15.5). This prominence of individual values and identity is consistent with Person-organization fit and Schneider’s ASA theories. In addition, the aspect of personal values was identified by the participants in the ACE Fourth Women Presidents Summit as being at the core of their individuality and the center point from which the spheres of influence of leadership flow. Hence, the researcher posits the following hypothesis: A balance between individual values and identity and the internal and external factors, and market forces that impact the context of leadership, results in contextual accord. An imbalance of these same elements results in contextual discord.

The researcher theorizes that in an environment of contextual discord, the leader is faced with the prospect of compromising or amending his/her values and identity to make them more consistent with those of the organization, or depending on the extent of discord, severing ties with the organization. Interestingly, the data indicate that leader performance is not impacted in this situation and that, in fact, the individual can continue to function as a highly skilled leader. This is an aspect, however, that requires additional attention and research.
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Although the model and this hypothesis are hypothetical, their bases are anchored in and consistent with the micro, meso, and macro “fit” perspectives advocated by Person-organization theories, Schneider’s A-S-A framework, and the organizational configurations of Mintzberg (1981) that established the analytical frameworks for this study. In addition, these concepts represent a natural flow from and extension of these research foundations. The dimensions of contextual accord and contextual discord are examined and explained further through the perceptions and experiences of the leaders in this study.

Jennifer Hanley, Chairman of the Board/CEO Calliope Kids

Hanley’s values and identity, as previously discussed, are clearly aligned with those of the organization. In addition, her drive in this highly competitive environment, her commitment to collaboration, and her aptitudes in the core areas that impact accountability to Calliope Kids’ constituents are all indicators of individual leader accord with the internal and external factors, and market forces of context. It is recognized, however, that Calliope Kids is a relatively young organization that is continuing to identify its retail niches. As such, Hanley’s leadership and contextual accord could be significantly impacted by changes in Calliope Kids’ market forces.

Lindsay Hartwell, President, Creighton Foods

Hartwell had parallel indicators and similar success in her position at Creighton Foods. However, the context of her leadership changed after the
merger. The new organization did not value service to others, collaboration, and
the intellectual honesty and integrity that are central features of Hartwell's values
and identity and her leadership. Hartwell continued as president for three years
because she felt,

I have a huge obligation to this business and this team, so I'm going to
hold the door open, I'm going to get everybody through it, and then I'll
decide whether I myself want to walk through that door or whether I want
to let it swing shut and go the other way.

Hartwell continued to have record accomplishments and excel in her role,
as measured by sales and profits. However, she found that the new company
"ran like the Army: functional silos, hierarchical as all get out, political as all get
out, and very top down," which resulted in contextual discord. Her departure from
the organization three years after the merger is a testament to both the viability
and credibility of person-organization fit and lends credence to the hypothesis of
contextual accord and discord.

Allison Hayden, Chairman of the Board of Directors, Corbin & Cade

Hayden's 30+ years of employment with Corbin & Cade, as well as, her
selection and election by her fellow 2,700 partners to the position of Chairman of
the Board, is, almost in and of itself, evidence of contextual accord. Added to this
is the fact that she is the highest ranking woman in the company's 105-year
history. Hayden's values and identity mirror those of the organization and, unless
the internal or external factors, or market forces drastically change, Hayden will
mostly certainly retire having worked for the same company all of her life in an
environment of overall contextual accord.

Dr. Courtney Merrick, President, Walden State University

Merrick’s experience in higher education leadership is reflected in the voluminous articles and achievements that highlight her service and the university’s growth. She discusses the need to “be who you are” and “know what excites you.” She indicates that her identity is “tied up being a person who can work in a complex setting with other people and get results.” As well, she believes that “you can’t separate who you are in your personal and professional life very easily.”

Merrick announced her resignation recently and explained that although there are some personal reasons, her departure is driven “almost completely by the readiness of the organization to work through the transition” and by an agenda that reflects the fact that she is “a very high-energy person” who “thrives on complexity.” The market forces that impact Walden State, including the threat of “public tuition that rivals private costs” and “competing priorities,” have changed the context somewhat, but Merrick believes that the plan that she has put in place and the institution’s completion of a major capital campaign have put the university on solid ground. With the institution well served, Merrick is thinking about her next foray into higher education after she leaves Walden State. She has plans to consult with and coordinate foundation and development offices at institutions in Australia and work with them to get “results.” Although she will miss
the immense diversity that her position brought, she is ready to move on. She once again looks to new complexities and opportunities that will challenge her and captivate the major forces of her identity.

Dr. Ann Morgan, President, Winchester State University

Morgan’s resignation as president of Winchester State, in contrast, was not part of her plan. Her intention was to remain in her role for two more years in order to complete the university’s aggressive $500 million capital campaign and direct efforts to celebrate the institution’s 50th anniversary. Unfortunately, the external accountability factors of the context of her leadership changed drastically when a new chancellor of the state’s higher education institutions came on board.

Morgan describes her leadership and states,

My method really of administering is to build the best team I can, hold them close to me in terms of confidence and caring about what they do, and reinforce their value to the institution and develop a really strong team approach.

The new chancellor, however, is a successful business person who is relatively new to the culture and organization of higher education. He fully expects to run the higher education system in the state in the same manner in which he leads his other businesses, of which he is basically the sole owner. He admits that he does not fully value the collegial environment and has publicly stated that in his opinion, Winchester State has operated with too much
autonomy in a "culture of isolationism" (Littlefield, 2006). His perspective on leading Winchester, as well as the accountability and control he expects to have, are most assuredly not in accord with those of Morgan. She is "an academic at heart" and believes that "the fact that you do think like an academic remains a very important part of your value system." She adds,

I know my numbers and my budgets and administrativia well and can manage it and manipulate it, which I think is very important on the one hand. On the other hand, my values are fundamentally academic and that has sort of been the beginning and end of my thinking about life and that's what I hope to, when I retire from the presidency, go back to doing.

Dr. Kelly Madison, Westword State University

Madison's tenure at Westword State University ended with her retirement two years ago. Like Merrick, Madison's move was in part, motivated by personal reasons. However, Madison foresaw a change in the market forces that favored a merger of the institution with the large and prominent university health sciences center. While she supported the change, Madison understood that the internal processes of the new organization would be different. She states,

They wanted an academic when I became chancellor. And then when I finished and moved away, that was when the merger came. I don't know what they really wanted, but it was pretty much a given that it would have to be an M.D. because of the merger with the Health Sciences Center. That's the only way to get the M.D.s lined up behind you.
In each of the instances, it is apparent that the participants led with their values and remained true to their individual identities; even in the face of change. As well, the accord or discord between the contextual environment and their leadership is supported and clearly significant. Several other insights are offered by the model and the examples of the leaders in this study. First, the centrality of individual values and identity to leadership was demonstrated by each of the participants. This is an aspect of contextual accord and discord that deserves additional attention in future studies in order to examine the extent and impact of these factors on leadership in different sectors. Second, the model suggests that less discretion in engagement with market factors, more collegiality, and a greater number and range of constituents increases the overall public aspects of an individual's leadership within an organization. In contrast, more discretion in engagement with market factors, less collaboration, and few constituents increase the overall personal aspects of an individual's leadership. Third, these insights suggest that there may be a point of equilibrium between the three indicators and the individual values and identity for effective leadership in specific contexts. Finally, the model and the examples of the leaders in this study suggest that there are contextual factors that affect leadership and that these factors should be monitored for accord or discord on an ongoing basis by individual leaders.

The researcher acknowledges the dynamic nature of both leadership and context and posits the following propositions based on the findings of this study.
• Leadership is contextual, responsive, and multidimensional and, as a result, calls for varying personal, positional, and public dimensions, perspectives, and degrees of involvement.

• Measurable variables of the indicator market forces exist and can be quantified to establish the extent of discretion and engagement of the organization with the market. These variables include such qualifiers as number of divisions, number of primary business locations, range of products/services, and capitalization resources. Greater discretion in engagement with market forces necessitates more personal and positional leadership engagement within the organization.

• Participative collaboration in organizations facilitates responsiveness to change, conflict, and innovation, while vested collegiality hampers the ability of organizations and leaders to respond to these same factors in a timely and competitive manner.

• A broad spectrum and large number of constituents increases the public accountability of overall organizational leadership. In contrast, leaders of organizations with a limited range and few constituents experience less emphasis on public accountability and more attention to measures of positional accountability.

It is anticipated that these propositions will be researched and tested in the future with other populations using qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method designs.

The participants in this study offered perspectives of the leadership environment at a level that is not often open to research. Their insights and
experiences, combined with their tenures and success in their positions, provide valuable data that were years in the making and that are worthy of the focus and attention of both researchers and students of leadership studies.

Implications for Private Enterprise Business and Public Research University Leaders

The magnitude of the leadership role and its responsibilities are immense. The findings of this research suggest that leaders need to be confident in their values and in the defining factors of their identities. Specifically, the leaders in this study cited honesty and integrity, knowledge of their individual strengths and weaknesses, a respect for equity, mental agility with multi-tasking, and proficiency with a broad range of communication skills as essential. In addition, each of the participants in this study pointed to mentors and/or advisors within their respective professions and all of the leaders articulated organization visions that focused on the productivity of the organization and the relationship with customers/clients. In each case, conflict within the organization was dealt with through communication and engagement and bringing change to each of the organizations involved focused communication from the top across both sectors.

Five of the six participants were quick to cite choices in personnel as their worst decision and they discussed the great difficulties involved with this area of decision making. The private enterprise business leaders all responded that personal matters were their greatest internal challenge and the area that they would change about their jobs. In contrast, the higher education leaders all
indicated that organizational concerns were both their greatest internal challenge and the area that they would change about their jobs.

Of note, Hanley and Hartwell in the private enterprise business sector were in agreement that decisions involving personal matters were their best, they chose and preferred not to network, and they limited their exposure in the press and in the media. Both of their job performance evaluations were measured by financial and/or internal indicators and both of their organizations addressed and public and private good, in large part, through charitable corporate donation plans.

In contrast, Hayden, whose organization is a limited liability partnership, and all of the public research university leaders indicated that decisions involving the organization were their best, networking was an essential aspect of both their roles and their organizations’ operations, and that they each either proactively managed or were regularly obligated and involved in matters with the press and the media. In addition, all of their individual job performances were evaluated on a broad range of both internal and external indicators and they all reported that balancing public and private good is inherent in the work and missions of their organizations.

The purposeful and forthright responses by all of the participants to the interview questions in this study were evidence of the fact that these individuals have spent a great deal of their time and energies in critical self-reflection. The findings of this research also indicate, however, the importance of context as a defining feature of leadership and of the need for leaders to be attuned to the
surrounding realities of their positions and their organizations. In particular, the increasing dependence on knowledge and knowledge workers as commodities has led to a move away from traditional hierarchical leadership structures to more collaborative and even, collegial processes. This setting favors leaders who can engage and motivate others in an inclusive manner, and work with flexibility, openness, and a recognition and appreciation for socially and ethically responsible leadership.

Although higher education has traditionally operated within the confines of collegiality and private enterprise business has not, the structures and organization of both sectors are being challenged and altered. This is attributable, in part, to the coinciding entrepreneurial movement in higher education and to the post-modern organizational thrust in the business sector, in addition to economic, technological, and political forces. As a result, a new form of professional adhocracy may emerge in which public institutions compromise traditional collegiality and businesses eschew typical top-down management in favor of organizational forms and configurations that allow for more flexibility and added adaptability. Instances of this are already evident in for-profit universities, in the move to tenure term contracts, and in the outsourcing of non-core area functions in both business and higher education.

In addition, this research points to an increased emphasis on measured accountability and relevancy, and a blending and overlap of public interest and private benefits. Although public higher education leaders have always been at the forefront of accountability to their broad spectrum of stakeholders, private
enterprise business leaders have historically been able to operate with a narrow range of constituencies; the majority of whom were relatively uninvolved and inattentive to the operations of the company. Today, however, the external accountability environment is much more complex and mindful of organizational leadership and of the interactions of the both the entity and the leader within the public domain. Stakeholders are concerned with measurable results and interested in the relevancy of operations and decision making to the enterprise’s primary mission and purpose. Evidence of this is seen in the recent stream of corporate trials exemplified by Enron, Tyco, and Adelphia, the passage and enforcement of the Sarbanes Oxley Act, and in the current debate and delay in the passage of the Higher Education Reauthorization Act.

This evolution in attention to leadership in today’s context is also apparent in the leader’s engagement with the organization and with the market. Businesses and higher education institutions have in recent years moved away from leaders who are held out as heroes and stars of the enterprise. It appears as though the Jack Welchs and Larry Summers of the world are moving toward extinction. Instead, leaders are becoming place holders in their positions and the primary advocates for the organization. In addition, part of the professionalism that we ascribe to and demand of these leaders is increasingly related to individual character, values, and identity as opposed to the prominent charm and charisma of the past.

At the same time, there is a burgeoning recognition that customers and clients are the driving forces in the market and that change is a constant facet of
the environment. Leaders must be ready and able to engage in and respond to these market forces with speed and agility. Changes in the environment will require a comprehension of and competency in both traditional and new core business areas, such as information technology.

Core business competencies will present challenges for higher education leaders in particular as most have come up through the ranks of academia with limited specialized training in the key business areas of finance, marketing, and administration. For both higher education and business leaders, these new competencies may lead to an increased reliance on and recognition of senior leadership teams, and their effective and efficient team work. In addition, both public and private enterprises will need to more clearly determine and define the characteristics and scope of their customer base in order to be optimally responsive. This last critical aspect, in particular, continues to challenge and hinder the operations of public higher education institutions.

The lines between public and private, social and cultural, and financial and ethical concerns will continue to blur with ongoing expansions in globalization and advances in technology. Leaders will need to cleave to a clear sense of personal and institutional mission and purpose and be adept at communicating consistent expectations. In addition, leaders will be forced to recognize and adapt to the permeable and blurring boundaries of both their leadership influence and control. It is an environment that requires conviction and humility, as well as a keen sense of and concern for people.
Finally, the findings of this study and the experiences and perceptions of the leaders suggest that a sense of timing is a critical personal aspect of leadership and context. Specifically, leaders need to be attuned to the subtle changes and nuances of their environment and need to be psychologically ready for change. They must consistently and continually focus on their own strengths and weaknesses and, at the same time, monitor the opportunities and threats to their roles and positions that are posed by their environment. Central to this is a clearly envisioned and timed personal exit strategy. Three of the four leaders in this study were able to balance and time their retirements in accord with the contexts of their organization; one was not, even though she had a plan for her retirement in place. This unique phenomenon has significant implications for leaders in both the public higher education and private enterprise business sectors and highlights a very personal and profound aspect of leadership that is not often addressed.

Areas for Future Research

The leaders in this study were the first females in their organizations to achieve their level of leadership, and therefore, they were able to offer unique and contemporary perspectives on their roles and positions. However, it is unclear whether the views of the participants were in any way biased by either their gender or by the fact that they are the first generation of female leaders in their organizations. Future research should address both these issues.
Additional studies should also be undertaken with a larger number of participants in a broader range of sectors and industries. Such a move would assist with the quantification and further delineation of contextual variables and potentially lead to the development of a survey instrument, which could foster increased knowledge and understanding of the impact of context and sector differences.

Future research should also examine contextual discord as it relates to leader exit strategies. Currently a great deal of interest and research is dedicated to succession planning from an organizational perspective but little attention is paid to the personal aspect, timing, and crafting of exit strategies. In particular, the contextual conditions and indices of change for leaders in both sectors should be examined, delineated, and compared for similarities and differences in future research.

In addition, none of the leaders in this study set out to be president, chancellor, CEO, or Chairman of the Board of their organization. Each of the participants indicated that she was in some way motivated to seek leadership roles by continually taking on more prominent positions with increasing responsibilities. Future research should look at the motivational factors, changes in motivation, and potential differences in effectiveness that result when individuals decide to seek leadership positions.

It is anticipated that these expanded efforts will inform researchers of leadership and amend, append, and extend the current knowledge base on leadership studies. There is also an expectation that further studies will assist
practicing and future leaders in the area of skill acquisition and will improve leader efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness.

Closing Comments

The context of leadership in the twenty first century will continue to challenge the strongest, the smartest, and even the bravest. However, those leaders who can rise to the challenge and meet the demands with honesty, integrity, trust, and respect will not only win the hearts and minds of their followers, but those of the public and society as a whole. The context of leadership, it turns out, is dependent upon, and flourishes or falters with, accord between individual and organizational values.
APPENDIX I

CASE STUDY PROTOCOL

Leadership in Context: A Comparative Case Study Analysis of Female Leaders in Private Sector Business Enterprises and Public Research Universities
Rationale for the Study

Recent leadership research indicates that gender is not the primary determinant of differences in leadership style, traits, and effectiveness; however, context as a variable has increasingly received attention as a critical factor in leadership. This study will seek to determine if the experiences and perceptions of female public higher education presidents differ from those of female private enterprise sector presidents and will seek to answer the following question:

Does the environment in which women presidents lead affect their perceptions of the leadership experience?

Early higher education institutions in the United States were simple organizations that focused on shaping the minds of young men through the study of classical languages and literature, liberal arts, and religious teachings. Today, public higher education institutions are fiercely competitive social, economic, and technologic powerhouses with complex missions, structures, and issues. They help fuel business and economic development through their direct impact on growth and spending and through the creation of new jobs and businesses, and have become critical sources of scientific talent, research data, and technological innovations for both the public and the private sector. This dynamic environment requires leaders who are able to meet the challenging demands of leadership and incorporate the best practices of both the public and private sectors.

The American Council on Education’s (ACE) 2001 survey of 2,594 college and university leaders reports that the majority of presidents in higher education have never held a prior CEO position (75%), have not been employed outside of higher education for more than one year (39.8%), and come from backgrounds in either education or higher education as their major field of study (43.2%). Of the 14.7% of presidents whose immediate prior position was outside of higher education, only 2% come from the private business sector.

Private enterprise and CEO experience are not prerequisites for successful leadership in higher education. However, in view of the complex public/private nature of higher education institutions today and the singularly focused backgrounds of the majority of the university presidents, it is important for those who seek to lead in higher education to learn about the leadership processes appropriate to both the public and private sectors from others who have been successful leaders in those arenas.
Participant Selection Criteria

This study will not seek to compare or evaluate the individual presidents’ leadership effectiveness or efficiency. Longevity in the position, size of the organization, and substantial organizational annual revenues will be the determinants for both inclusion in the study and evidence of leadership effectiveness. Participants must meet the following criteria:

- be female
- hold (or have held) the title of president, chancellor, or CEO of their organization
- have (or had) at least three years experience in the executive role of the organization
- and in the case of private enterprise sector participants, not own a majority interest in their organization.

Anticipated Outcomes of the Study

This study will be the basis for the dissertation of Angela Hernquist in fulfillment of the Ph.D. in Educational Leadership at the University of Nevada Las Vegas.

As well, forging new insight and understanding into the issues and challenges faced by female leaders can both expand the knowledge base on leadership and provide a framework for the professional development of women seeking leadership roles in complex public/private organizations. It is intended that the insights gained from this research will be the first step in the development of a survey instrument for use in a future quantitative research study that will examine a large population sample of both male and female presidents from both the public and private sectors.
University of Nevada Las Vegas
Department of Educational Leadership
Project Participation Informed Consent Form

Title of Study: Leadership in Context: A Comparative Case Study Analysis of Female Leaders in Private Sector Business Enterprises and Public Research Universities
Principal Investigator: Dr. Mimi Wolverton, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Leadership, University of Nevada Las Vegas
Investigator: Angela Flernquist, Ph.D. Student, University of Nevada Las Vegas
Contact Phone Number: (702) 436-1074

Date
Participant Name
Address

Dear Participant,

Purpose of the Study
You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this exploratory study is to describe and analyze the perspectives of three female public research university leaders and three female private enterprise sector leaders. Specifically, the study will seek to determine if the experiences and perceptions of leaders in public higher education differ from those of leaders in the private enterprise sector.

Participants
You are being asked to participate in the study because of the success you have achieved as a leader in your field and because you meet the following criteria: 1) are female; 2) hold the title of president, chancellor, President, CEO, or Chairman of the Board of the organization; 3) have at least three years experience in the executive role of the organization; and in the case of private enterprise sector participants, 4) do not own a majority interest in the organization.

Procedures
If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to answer questions that were developed based on the issues identified and delineated by the participants of the American Council on Education Office on Women in Higher Education's Fourth Women Presidents' Summit (See Research Questions). These questions will be asked and the answers recorded by the researcher in
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face-to-face interviews. Depending on your availability and desires, you may be asked to respond to questions via e-mail.

**Benefits of Participation**
There may/may not be direct benefits to you as a participant in this study. However, it is intended that the results of this study will be significant at three levels. Theoretically, this research will contribute to the existing body of knowledge on leadership in general, higher education leadership in particular, and on women in leadership and higher education leadership specifically. Substantively, the results will provide insights into the perceptions and experiences of women in leadership positions in both the public and private sectors. Practically, this study will help to identify the personal, positional, and public components of women in leadership positions and to derive generalizations about the influence of context on leadership behavior.

**Risks of Participation**
There are risks involved in all research studies. This study may include only minimal risks. While none of the interview questions are invasive, you may not want to answer some questions. The investigator is available to provide additional detail about the reasoning behind the questions as well as clarifying any of your concerns. As well the principal investigator, Dr. Mimi Wolverton, Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of Nevada Las Vegas, may be contacted for additional information at (702) 895-1432.

**Cost /Compensation**
There will not be financial cost to you to participate in this study. The study will take approximately 3 hours of your time, scheduled in time increments and locations that are convenient for you. You will not be compensated for your time. The University of Nevada, Las Vegas may not provide compensation or free medical care for an unanticipated injury sustained as a result of participating in this research study.

**Contact Information**
If you have any questions or concerns about the study, you may contact the investigator at (702) 436-1074 or the principal investigator, Dr. Mimi Wolverton at (702) 895-1432. For questions regarding the rights of research subjects, any complaints, or comments regarding the manner in which the study is being conducted you may contact the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 702-895-2794.

**Voluntary Participation**
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study or in any part of this study. You may withdraw at any time without prejudice to your relations with the university. You are encouraged to ask questions about this study at the beginning or any time during the research study.
Confidentiality
Several steps will be taken to protect the privacy of the participants and the confidentiality of the information gathered throughout the study. First, participants will be afforded the option of using pseudonyms in place of their real identities. Second, participants will be allowed to require the use of disguised organizational identifications in place of the actual entity names. Third, private information directly attributable to the organizational purposes and/or entities of the participants will not be published without the expressed written consent of the participants. Finally, all data gathered throughout this research study will be kept at a secured location for at least 3 years after completion of the study. After the storage time the information gathered will be shredded and destroyed. Although the investigator and the principal investigator will take every precaution to ensure the privacy and confidentiality of the participants, the identities of the participants may be identifiable due to the small sample size of the study.

Participant Consent:
I have read the above information and agree to participate in this study. I am at least 18 years of age. A copy of this form has been given to me.

________________________________________  ____________
Signature of Participant                        Date

Participant Name (Please Print)

Consent to Audiotape:
Audio recordings will be used during interviews with participants to record responses. You may request that the use of the recorder be stopped at any point during the interview process. The tapes and their transcriptions will be kept in locked cabinets in a secured location in the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Nevada Las Vegas for at least 3 years after completion of the study. After the storage time the tapes and transcriptions will be shredded and destroyed.

________________________________________  ____________
Signature of Participant                        Date

Participant Name (Please Print)
Materials Requested from the Participant

1. Resume or vita (including education background, work experience, community service, etc.)

2. Job description

3. Organization's annual report or report to employees: including the number of people under your supervision and the size of the budget you control.

4. Organizational chart

5. Copies of featured articles about the participant, speeches, and/or community activities.
Research Questions

The Person:
1. What individual core values do you bring to your leadership?
2. How would you describe your identity?
3. What factors motivated you to seek the leadership position?
4. Do you have a network of advisors?

The Office:
5. What skills are important in order to be successful in your particular leadership role?
6. What do you see as the greatest challenges to women seeking your leadership position?
7. What was the best decision you made?
8. What was the worst decision you made?
9. How is your job performance evaluated?

The Institution:
10. How would you describe the environment in which your organization operates?
11. What is your vision for your organization?
12. How do you deal with conflict in your organization?
13. How do you bring your organization to change?
14. Which is more important in your organization – equity or efficiency?

The University as community:
15. How do you achieve balance between public and private good in your organization?
16. How do you achieve balance between social and cultural issues in your organization?

The Institution as a member of the surrounding community:
17. How does your organization participate in civic engagement?
18. What do you see as the organization’s civic responsibility?

The Greater educational and national community:
19. What role does the press and the media play in your organization?
20. Do you make connections and communicate with other leaders across sectors?

The Global community:
21. When do you take a public stand on controversial national or international issues and policies?

Additional Questions:
22. What advice would you give to other women who aspire to your level of leadership?
23. Is there anything you would like to add?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public</strong></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positional</strong></td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXXXX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal</strong></td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HANLEY COMPONENTIAL ANALYSIS MATRIX**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Public</strong></th>
<th><strong>Positional</strong></th>
<th><strong>Personal</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance pub/pri - Corporate &amp; individually</td>
<td>External Constraint - Legal, financial, accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance soc/cul - Location &amp; culture</td>
<td>Org. vision - Customer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill - Clear vision, check for compliance, consistency</td>
<td>Evaluation - Financial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors/mentors - all professional colleagues</td>
<td>Motivation-Creativity in herself and others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with conflict - Avoid it, find, communicate, engage</td>
<td>Worst decision - Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public stand - Not her place</td>
<td>Press/media - Cautious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge - Know your strengths &amp; weaknesses</td>
<td>Equity - Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill - Check your ego</td>
<td>Org. Change - Constant, intuitive process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Change - Time at work</td>
<td>Internal Constraint - People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill - Use humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network - Terrible, no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best decision - go back to self</td>
<td>Identity - Art &amp; science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core value - Integrity</td>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Productivity</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positional</td>
<td>XXXXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXXXXX</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>XXXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HARTWELL COMPONENTIAL ANALYSIS MATRIX
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Balance pub/pri - Corporate culture &amp; family roots in area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance soc/cul - Org. culture, individual actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org. vision - Product &amp; profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positional</td>
<td>Worst decision - Bad ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equity - Culture, collaboration &amp; corporate history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation - Financial &amp; succession planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisors/mentors - all professional colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation - Try new things, success in previous endeavors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill - Balance strong competitive drive &amp; skills with gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public stand - Legal &amp; political issues that impact industry &amp; profits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Change - Help young women coming up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with conflict - Find, communicate, engage everyone, join ranks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal Constraint - Mediate objectivity/her pace to rate &amp; pace of change of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill - Advocacy, strategic ability, persistence on behalf of an idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network - Preferred not but did some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org. Change - Competitive Basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Ext. Constr. - Love of work precludes other loves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill - Get over yourself, love what you do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge - Balance love of work (selfless) with own self-interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Best decision - deciding to remarry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core value - Intellectual honesty, humor, sheer determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity- Service &amp; people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positional</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXXXXXXX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal</strong></td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HAYDEN COMPONENTIAL ANALYSIS MATRIX**
## HAYDEN MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Positional</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance pub/pri - Same, represent public shareholders interests</td>
<td>Public stand - Balance public &amp; org. interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press/media - Proactively managed</td>
<td>Skill - Proven technical proficiency in core business area</td>
<td>Skill - Proven technical proficiency in core business area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisors/mentors - all professional colleagues</td>
<td>Advisors/mentors - all professional colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Press/media - Proactively managed</td>
<td>Press/media - Proactively managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill - Good org. skills, work on multiple levels at the same time</td>
<td>Skill - Good org. skills, work on multiple levels at the same time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with conflict - Communication &amp; her presence</td>
<td>Dealing with conflict - Communication &amp; her presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network - Important to business</td>
<td>Network - Important to business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill - Ability to interact, communicate, lead</td>
<td>Skill - Ability to interact, communicate, lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Change - Energy level</td>
<td>Challenge - visibility to demonstrate capabilities</td>
<td>Challenge - visibility to demonstrate capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. Constraint - Travel &amp; trailing spouse</td>
<td>Best decision - Stay at the org. at key points in her career</td>
<td>Best decision - Stay at the org. at key points in her career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity - Knowledge of strengths &amp; weaknesses</td>
<td>Core value - Honesty, integrity, authenticity</td>
<td>Core value - Honesty, integrity, authenticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core value - Honesty, integrity, authenticity</td>
<td>External Constraint - Use constraints as opportunities</td>
<td>External Constraint - Use constraints as opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positional</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Engagement w/ comm., students, learning/research</td>
<td>Org. vision - Engagement w/ comm., students, learning/research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public stand - Provide a forum &amp; balance</td>
<td>Balance pub/pri - Concern with pub/pri costs &amp; funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network _ Important to role at all levels</td>
<td>Evaluation - Formal/public, clearly defined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org. change - Constant, get input, top-down</td>
<td>Balance soc/cul - Economic engine, no gaps, wide array</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External constraints - Competing priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Positional**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisors/mentors - all professional colleagues</th>
<th>Motivation - Increase in responsibilities, &amp; in getting the job done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worst decision - Personnel</strong></td>
<td>Equity - Collegiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge - Leading change</strong></td>
<td>Conflict - Directly w/ communication &amp; openness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill - Sense of timing/pacing with a forceful personality</th>
<th>Best decision - Defining institution &amp; its mission early on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill - Multi-tasking, work with divergent groups &amp; get results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity - Complex settings, motivate people, get results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill - Respect opinions, shared values &amp; agenda, confidence in mgmt. ability, cross functional matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Int. Constraint - Org/structure in higher education, people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal**

| Core value - Authenticity in self, drive & excites you |

| Engagement | Productivity | Accountability |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>XXX</th>
<th>XXXXXXXXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positional</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Org. vision engagement w/ comm., students, learning/research</td>
<td>Balance pub/pri - simultaneously do both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public stand - Rare, only ed. &amp; academic issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation - Formal &amp; public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Network - Crucial to business and role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance soc/cul - Universities are both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge - People &amp; politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job change - Politics &amp; pace of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Org. change - Synergistic, shape it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External constraint - Politics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positional</th>
<th>Advisors/mentors - all professional colleagues</th>
<th>Best decision - Law school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation - Broad range of skills &amp; a bigger palate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worst decision - Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Int. Constraint - change, growth, dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complex systems &amp; programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skill - Ability to motivate others to see the big picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skill - Broad range of oral &amp; comm. Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Core value - Integrity, authenticity, the development of the mind</td>
<td>Identity - Academic at heart, multidimension of art &amp; science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skills - Passion &amp; political acumen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>XX</th>
<th>XXXXXXXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positional</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

MADISON COMPONENTIAL ANALYSIS MATRIX
### MADISON MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Org. vision -</th>
<th>Engagement w/ urban community, students, &amp; their needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance pub/pri -</td>
<td>Community &amp; students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External constraint -</td>
<td>Funding, inst. Identity, reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network - Enjoy, critical to business, role, &amp; fundraising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job change - Funding base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Positional | Motivation - Other academics & the consensus that she was better |
|           | Equity - Collegiality |
|           | Conflict - People, engage both sides, chain of command |
| Advisors/mentors - people around the issue | Skill - Willing to make the hard decisions & go |
| Skill - Be people sensitive & honest | Best decision _ Personnel, taking Deans to fundraising |
| Skill - Being analytical | Challenge - People |
| Internal constraint - Org/structure in higher ed., people | Press/media - Frequent attention, straightforward, honest |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Core value - Honesty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity - Service &amp; people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

342
APPENDIX III

TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS
**Accountability:** The obligation and authority to answer for actions and performance in the discharging of individual and/or organizational responsibilities.

**Context:** The internal and external conditions, circumstances, and setting in which an individual leader operates and performs her job; environment.

**Engagement:** Voluntary participation and involvement that reflects an interlocking of interests and anticipation of shared outcomes.

**Personal:** Aspects and differences directly attributable to the individual and primarily focused on the individual.

**Positional:** Point of view or attitude that is explained or justified by the role or position within an organization or an industry.

**Private enterprise business:** Profit-motivated organization/entity with ownership interests held and controlled by its shareholders and/or partners.

**Productivity:** Yielding favorable or useful results in the creation of goods or services and accomplishment of individual and/or organizational goals and objectives.

**Public:** Connected to or affecting a broader scope of people, community, or government in a manner open to scrutiny by the public at large.

**Public research university:** Institution of higher education that is supported with public funds, is a political subdivision of the state, and emphasizes research in the provision of educational services to the general public.
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