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Chapter I

Introduction

Since the emergence of campus-based women's centers in the 1960's, women's centers have proliferated and gained greater acceptance on higher education campuses in the United States. During that time, the missions of women's centers have evolved on a continuum that ranges from acting as agents of individuals to agents of institutional change (Griggs, 1989). This continuum gave rise to diverse approaches to the development of campus-based women's centers on American higher education campuses and subsequent considerations for its leaders.

The effective leadership of a campus-based organization is often dependent on a coherent philosophy that encompasses mission and vision, as well as the ability of the leader to articulate, inspire, and facilitate the same, thereby attaining the intended program goals, objectives, and outcomes. Consequently, the role of the leader is significant in defining the program and directing academicians and practitioners toward a cohesive vision that includes the identification, pursuit, and attainment of programmatic goals, and pedagogical objectives (Rosser, Johnsrud, & Heck, 2003).

Statement of the Problem

Indeed, an understanding of campus-based women's center leadership necessitates an understanding of leadership style. However, an analysis of the leadership of campus-based women's centers has proven to be elusive, primarily because there is a lack of empirical research in the field. Additionally, women's centers are continually redefining themselves based the need to constantly respond to the requests and interests of its students as well as the parameters defined by the higher education institution. The
women's center leader functions in an environment of shrinking budgets, staffing limitations, organizational change, and internal and external forces that create organizational and administrative parameters for directors who are expected to effectively lead the program. Consequently, the women's center leader is often faced with atypical problems that demand innovative styles of leadership and solutions. Nonetheless, the unique needs of each individual campus-based women's center creates challenges for women's center directors that results in them exercising leadership styles that address those concerns and consequently define their programs.

Vera and Burgos-Sasscer (1998) conducted research intended to assess the greatest challenges that women's centers will face in the five years following their study. Respondents noted inadequate funding as their greatest challenge. They contended that limited funding presents organizational and administrative challenges that range from the lack of secretarial support to depleted operational funds for essential components of the programs before the end of the fiscal year. Other challenges mentioned by the study's respondents include an attitude of indifference and apathy toward women's issues as echoed in the national political agenda.

Kasper (2004a) examined the most prevalent obstacles encountered by campus-based women's centers and their leaders as they run their organization. Data collected from a national survey identified several key themes that were derived from the participant's responses. The study affirmed that the themes that most frequently presented challenges for women's centers were those of inadequate funding, negative attitudes towards feminism, a climate of apathy, and the lack of visibility on campus. Respondents were concerned that the lack of funding limited the ability of their programs
to adequately market and publicize services and hire additional staff. Additionally, they noted that the prevailing stereotypes towards feminism and the feeling that general equality has been achieved over the past decades continue to present itself as a challenge to the viability of women’s centers. This is exacerbated by a sense of apathy towards the relevance of women’s issues in higher education in the 21st century. The lack of visibility of women’s centers on campus is an obstacle whose implications are two-fold. The location of the center on campus can indicate the degree to which it is a university priority. It also indicates a lack of recognition of the significance of women’s center programs within the university community.

Kunkel (2007) also reiterated fundamental challenges faced by women’s centers in the 21st century campus: the negative perception of feminism and simple indifference at best to the concerns of women. This lack of concern may stem from the fact that “young women may not be aware of the challenges that many women face and think the women’s movement of their mothers generation solved all those problems” (p. 582).

Increasingly, women’s center leaders function in an environment of shrinking budgets, staffing limitations, organizational change, and internal and external forces that present challenges to the sustainability of their programs. Additionally, directors are expected to effectively lead their programs in the midst of these challenges. Therefore, the women's center leader is often faced with problems that demand innovative styles of leadership and solutions. Because of the challenges that leaders face they often employ different styles of leadership in an effort address the situational circumstances, issues and concerns unique to their program and institution. Consequently, this study aims to
identify the leadership styles often used by women’s center leaders in the administration of their programs.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study will examine the organizational and institutional variables that influence the leadership styles of campus-based women’s center directors. Furthermore, the researcher will examine the leadership frame (or frames), as measured by Bolman and Deal’s (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self), used by the organizational leaders of campus-based women’s centers at public and private four-year universities in the southeast United States. Currently, there is a lack of empirical research on the leadership styles of directors of campus-based women’s centers and no research currently exists that specifically addresses the leadership styles of the leaders of campus-based women’s centers in the United States. In addition, no studies provide a conceptual framework by which the leadership styles of campus-based women’s centers can be examined.

The Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) has been used to conduct analyses of leadership styles in the private sector, government, schools, and higher education (Bolman & Deal, 1991c, 1992a). In that regard, its validity (Bolman & Deal, 1990) and reliability (Bolman & Deal, 1991b) has been confirmed. Appropriate tests will be utilized to determine whether significant differences or similarities in data exist among directors of campus-based women’s centers.

**Theoretical Perspective**

Guiding this study is the work of Bolman and Deal (1984, 1990, 1991a, 1991b, 1997), who have developed a model for the study of leadership in organizations. They
identified the main characteristics of leadership as the ability to establish union, initiate and maintain commitment, and to inspire trust, and build relationships. Their leadership model clarifies the lenses through which a leader may view the challenges that need to be addressed and define the course of action toward resolution or goal attainment.

Bolman and Deal’s (1990, 1991, 1997) Four-Frame Leadership Model identifies four categories (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) that describe a leader’s orientation, how a leader thinks and acts in his/her decision making, and responds to organizational needs and situations. Structural leaders view their mission as creating a rational system within the organization through the implementation of well-developed organizational goals. The human resource leader is concerned with creating an environment where the members of the organization understand their importance. This is accomplished through motivation, teamwork, and coaching. The political leader strives to achieve the organization’s mission and goals by embracing the notion that internal and external conflict and scarce resources are part of the reality of organizational life. Finally, the symbolic leader aspires to achieve organizational goals by encouraging creativity, recognizing traditions, and motivating the organization’s members to rely on their own vision and inspiration.

Previous studies utilizing Bolman and Deal’s Four-Frame Leadership Model have indicated that the human resource frame is the most used frame by higher education administrators (Borden, 2000; Cantu, 1997; Mosser, 2000; Small, 2002; Turley, 2002). It was also determined that the symbolic frame was found to have a significantly positive influence on leadership effectiveness (Turley, 2002) and overall job satisfaction (Mathis, 1999). Other studies noted that the political frame was the least used (Borden, 2000;
Mathis, 1999; Mosser, 2000; Small, 2002) and several other studies found that approximately 50% of higher education administrators used multi-frame leadership styles (Mosser, 2000; Sharpe, 2005).

The Bolman and Deal (1991, 1997) Four-Frame Leadership Model was selected for this study because of its integration of leadership theories into four frames that are identified as effective for the analysis of leadership in different situations. This theory has been utilized to analyze leadership in higher education (Bensimon, 1989; Bolman & Deal, 1997; Cantu, 1997; Miro, 1993) and is particularly appropriate for the study of the leadership styles of campus-based women’s center directors in higher education.

Significance of the Study

This study’s emphasis on leadership of campus-based centers provides insight regarding the leadership styles employed by program directors in their effort to provide the staff and students with the opportunity to function in an environment that meets their needs professionally, pedagogically, and organizationally. A review of the literature indicated a lack of research on the styles of leadership used by women’s center leaders in pursuit of the attainment of their programs goals. This study conducted a descriptive analysis that provides both theoretical and practical benefits to women’s center leaders. Theoretically, the analysis of leadership styles at women’s centers contributes to the available research on program leadership theories. Regarding its practical applications, the descriptive analysis may provide information that will enable leaders to identify their approaches to attaining goals and addressing situations relevant to their programs. It also affords the potential for the identification and application of best practices that are relevant to their specific institution.
This study bears significance because it is believed to be the first of its kind to address perceived leadership styles of campus-based women's center directors at higher education campuses in the United States. Furthermore, the findings of this study will assist campus-based women's centers directors in reaffirming and/or rethinking the nature of leadership in their programs and provide valuable information on the impact that leadership can have on their programs and the population they serve. This study can also be replicated by other campus-based organizations that support women's equity in higher education to ascertain the perceived leadership style(s) of its directors.

As the societal and educational environment rapidly transforms itself, women's centers are constantly seeking to address those changes and adapt their programs in an effort to enhance their productivity and relevance on the 21st century campus. The most prevalent obstacles to the growth and viability of the women's center are funding, attitudes toward feminism, apathy, and visibility. The lack of funding limits the programs ability to hire additional staff as well as market and publicize its services. Prevailing stereotypes towards feminism and the misconception that gender equality has been achieved over past decades presents a challenge to women's centers. Increased apathy regarding the relevance of women's issues in the lives of the 21st century student has also been a deterrent to program development. Additionally, the lack of visibility, based on limited marketing budget as well as geographic location on campus, presents an obstacle for women's centers in attaining recognition and maintaining significance within the university community.

Bonebright, Cottledge, and Lonnquist (2012) commended the significant gains made by women in positions of leadership in higher education. However, they caution
that higher education must continue to address the challenges that they face regarding the
development of women for positions of leadership. In that regard, they suggest that
women’s centers can potentially play a significant role in the nurturing of future leaders.
They recommended that women’s centers and other campus-based organizations support
women’s leadership initiatives by providing students with opportunities to surmount the
academic and social barriers that exist. Davie (2002) articulated a vision for the future of
campus-based women’s centers that emphasized the importance of leadership
development. The expectation is that women’s centers at universities will make positive
contributions toward redefining leadership in academic and community life.
Consequently, the undergraduate community will embrace leadership development and
engage in practical applications that help empower women in their academic and
professional endeavors.

The initiative aimed at developing leadership through campus-based women’s
centers necessitates that their leaders reflect on their approaches to leadership within their
programs. This provides opportunities for rethinking and reframing their leadership roles
if they are to effectively exercise vision and implement actions that aim to cultivate
leaders. In that regard, it would be meaningful to conduct an inquiry into “how women
leaders in education are integrating their leadership styles into their roles” (Bonebright,
Cottledge, & Lonnquist, 2012, p. 91). Given this mandate, this study aims to contribute
to the study of leadership in higher education by focusing on the leadership styles of
campus-based women’s centers in the southeastern region of the United States.

Research Questions

The following questions will serve as the basis for conducting this study:
Question 1: To what extent do campus-based women’s center directors perceive themselves as using a single-frame leadership style (structural, human resource, political or symbolic)? What are the predominant single-frame leadership styles?

Question 2: To what extent do campus-based women’s center directors perceive themselves as using paired-frame leadership style (as defined by the use of two frames) or multi-frame (as defined by the use of three or more frames)? What are the predominant paired-frame and/or multi-frame leadership styles?

Question 3: What is the nature of the relationship between the type of leadership style(s) used by campus-based women’s center directors and the following demographic factors?

(a) Type of institution (public, private)
(b) Size of the institution
(c) Length of existence of the women’s center
(d) Percentage of the female student population
(e) Administrative structure of the women’s center

Research Design

This study utilized a non-experimental design that is primarily quantitative. The research aim to determine the use of leadership frames by campus-based women’s center directors’ in public and private higher education institutions in the southeast United States. The study uses one survey instrument and one demographic questionnaire to gather data on what factors influence the leadership frame of the women’s center director. Once the completed surveys were returned, the data was be analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). A bivariate analysis will be conducted with five independent variables and the organizational leaders’ perceived leadership frame(s) as the
dependent variable. Proportions for categorical data will be analyzed using the chi-square statistical test to determine whether there was a significant relationship between the dependent (leadership frame) and independent variables.

**Definition of Terms**

*Bolman and Deal's leadership frames:* A model that categorizes organizational thought into four perspectives or frames (structural frame, human resource frame, political frame, and symbolic frame). Frames are lenses through which leaders view their world, order experiences, and make decisions. Leaders often rely on a frame (or frames) “to gather information, make judgments and determine how best to get things done” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 12). A leader’s frame use may be categorized according to the following:

*Single-frame leadership style:* A leader who uses one of the four possible leadership frames (structural frame, human resource frame, political frame, and symbolic frame) as determined by the score on Bolman and Deal’s (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self).

*Paired-frame leadership style:* A leader who uses two of the four possible leadership frames (structural frame, human resource frame, political frame, and symbolic frame) as determined by the score on Bolman and Deal’s (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self).

*Multi-frame leadership style:* A leader who uses three of the four possible leadership frames (structural frame, human resource frame, political frame, and symbolic frame) as determined by the score on Bolman and Deal’s (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self).
**Four-frame leadership style:** A leader who uses all of the four possible leadership frames (structural frame, human resource frame, political frame, and symbolic frame) as determined by the score on Bolman and Deal’s (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self).

**Frame-less leadership style:** A leader who uses none of the four leadership frames (structural frame, human resource frame, political frame, or symbolic frame) as determined by the score on Bolman and Deal’s (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self).

**Effective leadership:** Effective leadership establishes vision, sets standards for performance, and creates focus and direction for collective efforts (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 297).

**Leadership:** Leadership is “a subtle process of mutual influence fusing thought, feeling, and action to produce cooperative effort in the service of purposes and values of both the leader and the led” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 296).

**Southeastern United States:** For the purpose of this study, the operational definition of Southeastern United States is the 11 states accredited by The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools’ Council on Accreditation and School Improvement (SACS CASI). SACS CASI includes the following Southeastern states – Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia (http://www.sacs.org).

**Women’s Centers:** Campus-based women’s centers that mainly operate on one campus, offering a range of support services and programs to campus women (Steinman, 1984).
Scope and Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study includes only the forty-four accredited four-year public and private universities in the southeastern United States that currently have campus-based women’s centers. The study also relied on the Bolman and Deal’s (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) which was used to determine the leadership styles of directors of campus-based women’s centers at the forty-four institutions included in this study. This study is limited in that it does not address the culture/climate of the institution given that the same may impact the leadership style of program directors.

This study is limited to results that are dependent on the self-identified leadership frame (or frames) of the directors who complete the survey. Additionally, in order for the study to be noteworthy, the researcher must have an acceptable return rate. This study addresses four-year public and private universities in the Southeastern United States that currently have campus-based women’s centers. Therefore, inferences cannot be made about institutions in other states. Additionally, the data is entirely self-reported data. Therefore, my results will be limited to the extent that the directors are providing honest responses.

Summary of Chapter

The procedures described in this exploratory study are intended to examine the leadership frames used by the organizational leaders of campus-based women’s centers at public and private four year universities in the Southeast United States as measured by Bolman and Deal’s (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self). The analysis of the data will determine if any relationships exist between the leadership style of women’s
center leaders and demographic variables. Chapter 2 summarizes the literature and related research efforts related to the topic at hand. Chapter 3 addresses the procedures, processes, and methodology. Chapter 4 reports the results that answer the research questions. Chapter 5 states the findings and draws conclusions derived from the findings regarding the leadership styles of campus-based women’s center directors and provides suggestions for further research.
Chapter II

Literature Review

Overview

This literature review examines the research on the leadership styles of organizational leaders of campus-based women’s centers as well as the organizational and institutional variables that influence their leadership style at public and private four-year universities in the southeast United States. The first section conducts a review of some of the theories that influence the study of leadership and leadership styles. The second section provides an analysis of the historical context of campus-based women’s centers in higher education in the United States and a review of issues surrounding the mission, goals, organizational structure, needs, services and challenges of women’s centers nationally over the past thirty years. The third section addresses the relationship between women’s center leadership styles and institutional characteristics.

Leadership

The world has historically had numerous examples of leadership of varying degrees that range from the exercise of influence within a social system to leadership where influence was international in scope. Likewise, in today’s organizations, evidence of leadership can range from leading workplace teams to leading a multinational corporation. Bass (1990) contended that the quality of leadership is the single most important factor that can positively or adversely impact an institution. Therefore, in organizations, effective leadership is an important factor that can significantly influence individuals and/or groups to achieve the goals of the organization.
Yukl (1998) viewed leadership as the process of one individual exerting influence over others to ensure that the activities and relationships in a group or organization work towards and achieves a goal. Trow (1985) in his analysis of the exercise of effective leadership in American universities, suggested “leadership in higher education in large part is the taking of effective action to shape the character and direction of a college or university, presumably for the better” (Trow, 1985, p. 143). The literature describes leadership as a complex process that requires the interaction of four components: leaders, followers, the context within which the situation occurs, and the results. These components suggest that the leader has to have a clear vision and goal for the organization and a rationale for the actions being requested of the followers since he is capable of influencing their beliefs, actions and environment within which the members function (Doyle, 2001). She also emphasized that the relationship between leader and follower is significant since leaders can emerge under a variety of conditions including when a situation demands an innovative response or when appointed based on their attributes and the needs of the organization.

Fullan (2001) contended that leadership functions in a culture of change that necessitates appropriate action if it is to be individually and organizationally effective. Like Burns (1978), he prioritizes the moral purpose as being “about both ends and means” and suggests criteria for the implementation of effective leadership in today’s organizational culture. Fullan (2001) suggested that effective leadership has to have a meaningful sense of purpose, employ strategies that motivate members to analyze and address problems, ensure goal attainment through measured indicators of success and ultimately awaken people’s intrinsic commitment by mobilizing their sense of moral
purpose. It is in this context of changing demands, driven by external and internal organizational forces and the need for the organization’s leadership to respond to the same, that a survey of leadership theories, leadership styles and their impact on higher education leadership, as well as the leadership of campus-based women’s centers will be conducted.

**Leadership Theory**

Over the latter half of the twentieth century, several theories have been developed regarding the study of leadership. These theoretical approaches are often organized into six categories. They include trait theories, behavioral theories, contingency theories, path-goal theories, power and influence theories (transactional and transformational leadership), and cultural and symbolic theories. It should be noted that although these categories are useful to describe the process that has driven the field of leadership theory, they are not exclusive in the everyday practice of leadership and some models have demonstrated higher degrees of effectiveness in combination or in certain situations.

**Trait theory.**

Trait theory is viewed as one of the earliest approaches to the study of leadership. It’s based on the premise that certain individuals are “born leaders” possessing certain intellectual and/or physical characteristics (Yukl, 1998). Therefore, trait theory emphasizes the identification of physiological, attitudinal, psychological, and ability traits for the study of effective leadership (Bass, 1990; Bensimon, Newman, & Birnbaum, 1989). Research supporting this “great man” theoretical approach presupposes that individuals are born with certain traits that make them natural candidates for leadership (Bass, 1990). It focused on great leaders of the past who tended to be from the
aristocracy since those from the lower class were systematically denied the opportunity to lead. However, it became apparent that this system was flawed since it rarely gave consideration to the importance and impact of the situational context on one’s ability to lead (Yukl, 1998).

Stodgill (1984) conducted a critical examination of 124 trait studies and concluded that the trait approach in isolation yielded negligible and conflicting results. In this regard, further research was conducted by industrial psychologists who shifted their studies to focus on the relationship between leader personality traits and leader effectiveness rather than comparing leaders and non-leaders. Meanwhile, Stodgill (1981) reviewed 163 additional trait studies and identified several variables as significant to leaders. These included: vigor and persistence in the pursuit of goals, commitment to responsibility and task completion, initiative in social situations, self confidence, willingness to accept consequences of decision and action, willingness to tolerate frustration, and ability to influence the behavior of others. Such research suggested that the demands of the situation in large part determined the appropriate qualities, characteristics and skills for effective leadership in that specific situation. Consequently, the concept advocated by trait theory that leaders are born with all the attributes necessary for leadership did not endure (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

Behavioral theory.

As the merits of trait leadership and its premise that effective leadership was predicated by whom a leader was (lineage), or whether the leader possessed “inherent” traits of leadership could not withstand close scrutiny and interest began to shift from
identifying critical leader traits to the study of observable leader behavior. This approach focused on leaders' behaviors that could be directly observed, learned, and changed.

Furthering this notion was an emerging interest in the behavioral activities of leaders and the impact that a leader's behavior has on the followers. Various scholars (Stogdill, 1984; Hemphill, 1955; Blake & Mouton, 1976) sought to identify the describable actions of a leader and the process of goal attainment. This line of research suggested that leadership ability can be taught and learned. Consequently, behavioral research viewed leadership success/failure as predicated on the actions of leaders as well as specific behaviors which contribute to leader success and/or failure.

Studies initiated at Ohio State University led by Ralph Stogdill, proved to be influential in the analysis of behavioral approaches to leadership. The research identified two major sets of leader behaviors; consideration which is relationship oriented and initiating structure which is task oriented (Stogdill, 1948). Consideration addresses the degree to which leaders' behaviors move toward creating and nurturing positive relationships with subordinates by demonstrating concern, open communication and respect and trust for them in a friendly supportive manner. Initiating structure addresses the degree to which a leader focuses on behaviors that include planning, coordinating, problem solving and maintaining performance standards and procedures. The emphasis is on the activities of the group as well as the leader's own role toward the attainment of organizational goals. The Ohio State University's research also noted that effective leader behavior occurs when both domains of consideration and initiating structures are incorporated. Leaders who were high in both dimensions of consideration and initiating structure were identified as dynamic leaders while leaders who were low in both
categories were considered passive leaders. However, Yukl (1998) expressed concern
with the Ohio State University study’s focus on primarily two variables, consideration
and initiating structure. Of particular interest was the fact that little attention was given
to the possibility that a leader’s behavior could be contingent on the situation.

**Contingency theory.**

Contingency theory focuses on the contextual forces and dynamics that influence
leadership. Doyle and Smith (2001) contended that a leader’s style can be substantially
influenced by those they are working with, and the environment within which they are
functioning. They also suggested that in addition to the significance of the process by
which leadership emerges and the context within which the leader functions, effective
leaders develop the ability to change their style contingent upon the demands of the
situation.

Fiedler (1967) examined the influence that situations can have on the relationship
between leader attributes and leader effectiveness. He noted that leader effectiveness can
be determined by the actions of the group towards the leaders’ vision and the goals of the
organization. He contended that leadership style (motivational approach) and leader
effectiveness (the degree to which the leader exercises situational control) can also
significantly impact the decisions and actions of the leader and subsequently, the
situation being addressed.

Fiedler (1967) also posited that the nature and influence of motivational strategies
can be a determining factor regarding leadership effectiveness. He found that
relationship oriented leaders who maintain close interpersonal relationships with co-
workers are most effective while task oriented leaders who place greater value on task
accomplishment are least preferred by their co-workers. Fiedler’s theory proved useful in identifying appropriate leader-situation matches but acknowledged that further study was necessary to determine why and how leader attitudes influence effectiveness through shaping group behavior and asserting situational control.

**Path-goal theory.**

Fiedler’s work in the area of contingency theory was a credible departure from the concepts advocated through trait theory. However, House and Mitchell (1974) disputed the significance of the emphasis that Fielder placed on the need for the situation to match the leader. They contended that a positive leader situation can be achieved by matching the situation to the leader as well as modifying the leader’s behavior to meet the demands of the situation. The Path-Goal Theory of leadership advanced by House (1974) suggests that “the motivational function of the leader consists of increasing the personal payoffs to subordinates for work-goal attainment, and making the path to these payoffs easier to travel by clarifying it, reducing roadblocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction” (House, 1971, p. 324). Consequently, leaders can encourage and support their followers by providing rewards that are valued by employees, providing clear instructions that reduce ambiguity regarding job expectations, providing coaching, guidance and training so that employees can perform their expected tasks and making the path that they should take clear and easy by removing barriers to goal accomplishment.

House and Mitchell (1974) contended that leaders must analyze the situation and implement the appropriate leader style. In that regard, they identified four dimensions of leader behavior that match a set of situational demands. The four styles of leadership appropriate to a given situation are as follows:
• When the task is boring, situational leadership is demanded.
• When role ambiguity exists, directive leadership is needed.
• When the task is undefined, participative leadership is suggested.
• When there is a lack of challenge, achievement leadership is appropriate.

The notion that leaders clarify the path for the members, remove road blocks along the path and increase the rewards along the route begins to expand the role of the effective leader to that of motivator, facilitator, and visionary. However, this approach assumed that there is a primary way of achieving a goal and the leader has the roadmap; an approach that casts the leader as the knowing person and the follower as dependent. It also assumed that the follower is predictable and is amenable to specific strategies being implemented depending on the situation.

**Power and influence theory.**

French and Raven (1959), in a seminal study, identified five ways that leaders can influence others: legitimate power, reward power, coercive power, expert power, and referent power. Legitimate power is derived from the internalized values of the followers who determine that the leader has the legitimate right to guide his/her behavior. Reward power refers to the leader’s ability to influence subordinates by rewarding desirable behavior. Coercive power is the exercise of punishment to deter undesirable behavior. Expert power is bestowed on the leader by the followers because of the leader’s knowledge and interpersonal skills. Referent power is attributed to the leader based on their liking of and desire to be associated with the leader.
However, Blau (1964) cautioned that the power approach is limited in that it is primarily a one way flow of influence from the leader to follower. He gave greater merit to the social exchange theory which emphasized reciprocity between leader and subordinate. In that regard leadership is viewed as more than a unidirectional process but a “dynamic two-way process in which superiors and subordinates repeatedly interact to build, reaffirm or alter their relationship” (Zahn & Wolf, 1981, p. 26).

Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) proposed two approaches to the study of power and influence, the social power approach, which focuses on the influence of leaders on their followers and the social exchange approach, which examines the reciprocal relationship between leaders and followers. However, it is the notion that the leader has the ability to exert influence that can persuade others to comply with his/her goals has provided the impetus for further analysis of the persuasive relationship between leader and subordinate (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Several approaches to the study of power and influence have indicated that a reciprocal relationship between leader and members can be transformational to both leaders and members of an organization.

**Transactional and transformational leadership theories.**

Burns (1978) and Bass (1997) are credited with asserting a new way of thinking regarding leadership theory through the identification of two types of leadership: transactional and transformational. Burns defined transactional leaders as those who “approach their followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another” and posits that transactional leadership is based on an exchange and bargaining process between leaders and followers in an effort to achieve organizational goals (Burns, 1978, p. 3). However, Burns (1978) cautioned that this process often involves the exchange of
extrinsic rewards in an effort to meet the leader's goals which often supersedes those of the subordinates.

Noting the limitations of the transactional model, Burns (1978) and Bass (1990) identified an important distinction between the transactional and the transformational approach to leadership. Burns (1978) contended that unlike transactional leadership which appeals to the concerns of the individual and where the focus is primarily on discrete finite exchanges and goals, transformational leadership emphasizes the interaction between the leader and others in the organization where the leaders and other members of the organization interact and motivate each other to higher levels of actualization. Bass (1997) posited that leaders can transform followers by inspiring them to recognize the goals of the team or organization as integral to their own interests and actualizing their higher-order needs. Bass also observed that transformational leaders provide a vision of the future, provide intellectual stimulation by encouraging followers to creatively approach both old and new organizational situations.

Burns (1978) asserted that the transformational approach is an important component of effective leadership since it requires the ability to motivate and work collaboratively so that others are inspired to follow and commit to the goals of the organization. He suggested that transformational leadership appeals to the higher ideals and social values of others that encourage them to view their efforts towards achieving organizational goals as a collaborative and ongoing process. Transformational leaders also influence their followers by modeling the articulated values themselves and using charismatic methods to attract people to those values and consequently to the leader (Bass, 1997).
Kouzes and Posner (2002) conducted research that found that the successful leadership process is transformational in that it emphasizes inspiring and empowering others in the organization to achieve organizational goals. They deemed five actions as key attributes to successful leadership and posited that a successful leader models the behaviors that he/she wants the organization to adopt, inspires through a shared vision that captures the imagination of others, challenges the process through innovative efforts, empowers others to put their ideas into action and encourages others to be passionate about the goals and mission of the organization. They contend that transformational leadership is based on reciprocity since subordinates in an organization also have expectations of their leader. Some of the expectations and qualities attributed to and expected of a successful leader include being honest, visionary, competent, inspiring, supportive and imaginative.

Katz and Salaway (2004) found transformational leaders to be effective role models who inspire, empower and motivate staff toward a shared mission and vision. When juxtaposing transactional leadership against transformational leadership, Jung and Avolio (1999) observed that transformational leadership aims to establish enhanced relationships between leaders and members that emphasize trust and commitment rather than contractual obligations. What becomes paramount is the shared mission and vision of the members of the organization that is influenced by leaders who positively lead by example. Jung and Avolio (2000) also cautioned that transformational leadership frequently involves working in a climate of change that tends to create uncertainty and anxiety within the organization. However, they asserted that effective transformational leadership can be attained when the level of trust between leader and followers is high
such that both parties are inspired to pursue and persist in their efforts to surmount organizational challenges and achieve goal attainment.

Bennett (2007) in an analysis of academic leadership found room for both the transactional and transformational in the leadership discourse and proposed a complimentary relationship between transactional and transformational leadership styles. Bennett advised that an over emphasis on differentiating between transactional and transformational leadership may invite an adversarial approach to the analysis and application of both leadership styles since good organizational management is a prerequisite for effective leadership and vice versa.

Meanwhile, Downey (2001) voiced a concern with both approaches and asserted the following:

Both transactional and transformational concepts focus too much attention on the leader and encourage the erroneous belief that organizations rely on a gifted individual or two for their prosperity or even survival. This in turn bespeaks a culture of dependence and conformity which is at odds not only with how universities actually operate but with an ideal of highly distributed leadership which is the heart of the collegium (Downey, 2001, p. 237).

Cultural and symbolic theories.

Further analysis of leadership in today’s rapidly changing world has given rise to the notion that an examination of leader style and the situational context are effective but somewhat limited variables of analysis. Leadership in contemporary organizations relies on other variables that recognize a process that includes and is influenced by the use of communication, symbols, myths and sagas.
Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) suggested that leadership is a complex process that "functions within complex social systems whose participants attempt to find meaningful patterns in the behavior of others so that they can develop common understandings about the nature of reality" (p. 21). They contend that the cultural and symbolic approach to the study of leadership is a useful departure from the previously described theories. Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) posited that in the cultural and symbolic context, leadership is not perceived as an objective endeavor where leaders display traits, exercise power or demonstrate behaviors aimed at influencing followers, but rather it's viewed as a subjective and interactive process where leaders construct a new reality that reflects desired ends that are congruent with followers' beliefs.

Bennis (1976) observed that leaders' decisions are influenced by the external and internal forces of regulations, court decisions, unions, and embargos. Consequently, symbolic leaders function as change agents whose influence includes the use of symbols, activities, myths, rituals, and ceremonies that inspire a shared vision that reflects the mission of the organization and its values.

Birnbaum (1988) cautioned that although leaders may be able to influence the values and actions of followers through the use of symbols and management of meaning, it does not necessarily translate into affecting substantive change. Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) advised that the effectiveness of the cultural and symbolic approaches is greatest when integrated into the leader's repertoire of styles.
Leadership Styles

Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2004) identified six leadership styles that can emotionally impact and inspire the members of an organization to respond in ways that correlate to the style(s) applied by the leader. They contend that:

1) The Visionary leader articulates a shared vision that includes a destination but not necessarily a strict roadmap of how to get there. However, since information is shared openly with the members, this type of leadership can inspire the creativity of the general membership, empower its members, nurture a learning community, and initiate a transformation of the climate and culture of the organization.

2) The Coaching leader places emphasis on identifying and aligning individual wants to organizational goals. This style suggests that identification of the positive personal and professional attributes of the individual member can create opportunities for the alignment of their career aspirations to their subsequent actions and professional contribution toward the achievement of organizational goals.

3) The Affiliative leader works toward creating harmony within the organization. Rather than focusing on the members' occupational needs, the leader emphasizes a collaborative approach that addresses the emotional needs of the members. This leader style generally requires the integration of other styles of leadership in order to effectively impact the goals and climate of an organization.

4) The Democratic leader values the input and participation of the members of the organization. This style prefers teams that engage in discussion, listening, feedback and collective decision making before a course of action is determined and pursued.
5) The Pace-Setting leader often models exemplary standards and sets challenging goals and expectations for the members. This approach is based on the premise that the members are competent in meeting expectations; otherwise it’s necessary to identify poor performers and demand more of them.

6) The Commanding leader leads through the exercise of power. This style relies on the articulation of clear directions and full compliance is expected of the members. Leaders resort to this approach in times of crisis or when no other alternatives have proven to be successful.

Fullan (2001) indicated that, of the six leadership styles initially identified by Goleman et al. (2004), both the coercive [commanding] style (people resent and resist) and the pacesetting style (people get overwhelmed and burn out) demonstrated a negative impact on organizational climate and consequently performance. It was also noted that a significantly positive relationship existed between the other four styles and organizational climate and performance. However, Jung and Avolio (1999), in their research on leadership style and its impact on different groups, concluded that a specific leadership style can be perceived differently by followers and can have different effects on their motivation and performance.

**Bolman and Deal Four-Frame Leadership Model**

Using prevailing research on leadership and organizational theory, Bolman and Deal developed a four-frame model for the analysis of leadership styles that explains how leaders approach a given situation. Each frame describes a perspective through which a leader’s style may be examined. They identified themes of existing theories of leadership and organized them into four frames: structural frame, human resource frame, political
frame and symbolic frame. They describe frames as windows on the world and lenses that bring it into focus. These frames allow leaders to order their experiences, gather information and make appropriate decisions. Table 1 represents an overview of the four-frame approach that provides opportunities for an understanding of leadership in organizations.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphor for Organization</th>
<th>Structural frame</th>
<th>Human Resource frame</th>
<th>Political frame</th>
<th>Symbolic Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Concepts</td>
<td>Factory or machine</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Carnival, temple, theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of Leadership</td>
<td>Rules, roles, goals, policies, technology, environment</td>
<td>Needs, skills, relationships</td>
<td>Power, conflict, competition, organizational politics</td>
<td>Culture, meaning, metaphor, ritual, ceremony, stories, heroes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Leadership Challenge</td>
<td>Social architecture</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Inspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attune structure to task, technology, environment</td>
<td>Align organizational and human needs</td>
<td>Develop agenda and power base</td>
<td>Create faith, beauty, meaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The structural frame describes the leader as a social architect who views the organization as a rational system requiring the implementation of formal roles and tasks
that aim to achieve specific goals with maximum proficiency and human performance through the coordination and integration of individual effort. The human resource frame identifies the leader as a motivator and facilitator who views the organization as a family and places emphasis on developing a symbiotic relationship that affords individuals the opportunity to exercise their creative talents and energy towards the attainment of the organization's goals. The political frame presents the leader as an advocate who aims to persuade, through influence, negotiation or coercion when appropriate and views the organization as an environment of scarce resources, and conflicting power relationships that can lead to diverse interests and behaviors, as well as, inspire creativity and innovation if properly managed. The symbolic frame describes the leader as artist and visionary with the potential to create meaning in the workplace experience thus viewing the organization as a centre where drama, rituals, role play and cultural activities and norms give meaning to the goals of the organization and experiences of the individual. Subsequently, the individual is a member of workplace community where artistry and self-expression and positive energy is encouraged.

Bolman and Deal (1997) posited that frame analysis filters out some things while allowing others to pass through, thus helping the leader to order experiences and make effective decisions. They further asserted that every leader relies on a personal frame (or multiplicity of frames) that shapes his/her mental image and helps him/her assess information, make judgments, and determine how best to accomplish goals. They contended that one’s perspective on a situation can determine the appropriate leadership frame or frames used for assessment and action in a given situation. Therefore, the use of multiple perspectives or frames can benefit the educational leader who functions in an
environment of constant change, institutional demands, programmatic trends and individual needs.

Emphasis on the cognitive styles of managers has contributed to an understanding of the relationship between frame preferences and leadership effectiveness. Bolman and Deal (1997) voiced an important distinction between the roles of manager and leader based on their observation of the frame(s) selected by a leader for a given situation. They “found that effectiveness as a manager was particularly associated with the structural frame, whereas the symbolic and political frames tended to be the primary determinants of effectiveness as a leader” (p. 278). They further contended that the ability to use multiple frames was a consistent correlate of effectiveness.

Finally, Bolman and Deal (1997) suggested of their own work that reframing extends beyond a simplified view of leadership and posited that frame theory offers a definitive framework for analysis of the leadership process. They noted that depending on leader and circumstance, each can lead to compelling and constructive leadership. However, they also caution that although the frames provide a useful distinction, no specific frame is appropriate for all situations.

Previous research conducted using Bolman and Deal’s theory of leadership frames has primarily been in the areas of government and business studies (Bolman & Deal, 1991b; Childress 1994; Eck 1997), elementary and secondary school studies (Eckley, 1997; Harlow, 1994; Miro, 1993; Strickland, 1992) and in higher education studies (Bensimon, 1989; Bethel, 1998; Borden, 2000; Crist, 1999; Mathis, 1999; McCellan-Holt, 2000; Mosser, 2000; Russel, 2000; Small, 2002). Most relevant to the current study
are those conducted in the area of higher education, which predominantly have been
dissertation research studies. A synopsis of their findings follows.

Bensimon (1989) concluded that for college presidents, multi-frame leadership
was not the most effective leadership strategy. Bethel (1998) found that three significant
relationships existed between leadership frames and the domains of organizational
effectiveness. Crist (1999) indicated that significant differences in the chief academic
officers’ job satisfaction were related to the leadership frame of their presidents. Mathis
(1999) found that faculty tended to express higher intrinsic and overall job satisfaction
when their chairpersons primarily employed the symbolic frame while extrinsic job
satisfaction scores of faculty were higher when their chairpersons employed the symbolic
or human resource frame. The study also found that faculty whose chairs employed a
multi frame leadership style demonstrated higher job satisfaction scores than faculty
whose chairs used either a single frame or no frame leadership style. Small’s (2002)
study supported the relationship between a department chairperson’s leadership frame(s)
and the organizational effectiveness of a nursing department.

Bolman and Deal’s work is useful to this study because it has consolidated major
schools of thought regarding organizational leadership into four perspectives (or frames)
that serve as both windows on the world of organizational leadership and lenses that
bring that world into focus. This study proposes to identify the frame (or frames) used by
leaders of campus-based women’s centers at colleges and universities in the southeastern
region of the United States.
Leadership in Universities

Trow (1985), through his analysis of the exercise of leadership by college and university presidents in American universities, concluded that the primary purpose of higher education leadership is to ensure that appropriate initiatives are implemented that positively impact the vision and actions pursued by the organization and define its character. In that regard, he observed that higher education leadership can be characterized along four dimensions; managerial, academic, political and symbolic forms of leadership.

Trow provided a description of the four dimensions noting that managerial leadership refers to the ability to manage the organization’s support activities through the effective exercise of staff selection, budget management, goal setting and other infrastructure concerns. The academic dimension describes leadership that recognizes excellence in teaching, learning, and research and innovatively strengthens academic structures. Political leadership is reflected through the resolution of internal and external demands and pressures while advancing the organization’s goals and symbolic leadership is evidenced through the leader’s ability to project and embody the character, goals and values of the institution.

Trow (1985) observed that leaders need not excel at all times in all the dimensions and suggested that various situations require the application of the appropriate frame(s). He contended that individual leader attributes and styles help determine the degree to which a leader’s talents and energies contribute to their diverse responsibilities that vary from issues of academic life to organizational, community, and governance goals. However, Trow (1985) was also careful to note the complexity of the organizational
character of higher education and its impact on its leaders. He contended that regardless of the leadership role in the institutional hierarchy, whatever the emphasis or however a leader defines the character and purpose and fills the dimensions of the leadership role, leader effectiveness requires "the legal authority and resources to act, to choose among alternatives, even to create alternatives, in short, to exercise discretion. Without that discretion and the authority and resources behind it, [the leader] cannot exercise leadership, whatever his personal qualities" (p. 144).

**Campus-Based Women's Centers: A Historical Perspective**

Campus-based women’s centers emerged in the 1970’s as a direct result of the feminist movement. The aim was to meet the socio-cultural and campus life needs of women in higher education, and afford them the support necessary to achieve their educational goals. Consequently, women’s centers facilitated female students in their adjustment to campus life, the complexities of their evolving roles as nontraditional students and the challenges of degree attainment (Steinman, 1984).

Within a decade, the women’s center on a college campus was defined as an organization that operates primarily on one campus and offers a range of support services and programs to campus women (Steinman, 1984). In an effort to provide a detailed conceptualization of campus-based women’s centers, Gould (1985) noted that centers that refer to themselves as a women’s center should have their own space, have an identity that is separate from other organizations on campus, have the capacity and willingness to respond to a variety of women’s needs and have an identifiable group of people who organize and carry out the activities of the women’s center.
Willinger (2002) suggested that at its establishment in the early 1970’s, the goal of campus-based women’s centers was to address concerns promulgated by the second wave of the women’s movement. The primary purpose of most of the centers organized during that time was to further initiatives, through programs and services that helped women achieve equity in their educational and professional pursuits.

Although the early 1970’s is regarded as the period where women’s concerns came to the forefront of social and campus life, Brooks (1988) cautions that there is no clear record that delineates the evolution of women’s centers. The provision of services that address the needs of women originated approximately 30 years ago on college and university campuses under the umbrella of continuing education programs for women. Many of the services provided for women at that time continue to match those provided by present day campus-based women’s centers. Hayes-Smith and Hayes-Smith (2009) furthered that the development of centers on campuses intended to provide women with an environment that afforded assistance with common issues and a sense of belonging and safety. In that regard, the mission of campus-based women’s centers focused on providing information for women who were new to higher education, as well as personal counseling for women who were balancing family, school and career responsibilities (Bengiveno, 1996).

By the commencement of the new millennium there were more than 460 campus-based women’s centers in the United States (Kasper, 2004a). Vera and Burgos-Sassier (1998) contended that as a result of the significant contribution that campus-based women’s centers have made regarding the empowerment of women for three decades, have created opportunities for women to access education as well as provided the support
that makes possible their personal and professional success. Kasper (2004a) noted that during that evolutionary period, the focus on issues of importance to women was also experiencing change. Consequently, women's centers reframed their mission to encompass a broader range of goals including educating and assisting women with issues related to sexual discrimination and sexual assault.

Davie (2002) commended the accomplishment of campus-based women's centers over the past thirty years noting them as viable organizations that provide meaningful service to both the constituents that they serve as well as the institutions of higher education that host these centers. Through the efforts of women's centers, opportunities were created for individual growth in the areas of interpersonal, social and professional relationships while the diversity of women's center programs and student population have contributed to social change and activism on campuses. At the institutional level they are commended for their transformational efforts in the areas of education and leadership; implementing initiatives that advance the empowerment of women, enhance education and contribute to the pursuit of excellence by institutions of higher education. Therefore, the ability to maintain the availability and visibility of women's centers on college and university campuses remains an essential organizational component of the 21st century university campus (Hayes-Smith & Hayes-Smith, 2009).

Mission and goals.

Campus-based women's centers have been established through variety of divisions and funding sources. Their origins can be traced to student driven initiatives, a faulty or staff member, a program or division administrator, grant acquisition, or private funding from community interests (Kunkel, 2002). Consequently, women's centers may
vary in their goal orientation, administrative and reporting hierarchy, funding sources as well as staffing patterns.

Yet the women’s center in higher education has evolved to become a dynamic entity that is driven by internal and external forces that have helped establish the core principles that define its needs and goals as well as frame the structural patterns that shape its organizational structure and ability to meet the needs of its constituents. However, organizational development of the women’s center usually occurs in a dynamic institutional and social environment necessitates that its goals and objectives are reflected in its mission. In that regard, it is imperative for campus-based women centers to understand the needs of the demographics they serve and ensure that the mission of the program aligns with the culture and objectives of the institution in which it is based and vice versa (Davie, 2002).

Kunkel (2002) explains that her opening of a women’s center at The University of Colorado-Bolder was motivated by her understanding of the needs of the University’s female clientele which she ascertained could be met through access to the services of a women’s center. She contended that “women’s needs on the university and college campus are...different from men’s needs because of this country’s historical tradition of ignoring, excluding, and trivializing women and treating them as less important, less productive, less rational, and less serious than men” (p. 5).

In a needs assessment of female students at higher education campuses, Kunkel (1994) identified five major areas of concern to women. These were categorized as safety, education and awareness, support and advocacy, equity, and community. Davie
(2002) concurred with her findings and affirmed their relevance by noting that “these in fact are needs that shape women’s centers throughout the United States” (p. 6).

The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) posited that the needs of women attending institutions of higher education were instrumental in shaping and defining the mission of women’s centers. As a result, efforts were made to ensure that needs were consistent with the mission, goals, and culture of the home institution (CAS, 2010). This relationship between the mission of the women’s center and the institution was viewed as reciprocal. Davie (2002) indicated that “the programs of each particular women’s center are shaped by that center’s mission, whether it is formally stated or informally understood, and that center’s mission is, in turn, shaped by the culture of the institution where it resides” (p. 5). Willinger (2002) affirmed and went beyond this reciprocal relationship between the women’s center and the institutional goals. Willinger (2002) insights that one of the most significant factors that determine the growth, development, and survival of campus-based women’s centers is the center’s ability to adopt a mission that matches that of the host institution, and an organizational structure that is consistent with other campus-based organizations.

As the needs of women attending higher education were determined, it was found that a common characteristic of the mission statement of campus-based women’s centers was to offer its female student population as well as staff and faculty information, support and resources that address issues of equality and equity (Kasper, 2004a). Clevenger (1988) conducted a study that described the characteristics of campus-based women’s centers by gathering data on the existence of mission statements and the goals articulated in the same. The results from 124 community college and university-based women’s
centers found that 72% of the respondents reported having a written mission statement. A content analysis of the mission statements of those organizations identified areas of commonality. Most mission statements indicated an interest in providing aid and services directly to women so that they may reach their full potential in their academic efforts, their professional pursuits and their personal lives. Consequently, it was found that many mission statements expressed the need for the women centers to take an active role in addressing the needs of students both on campus and in the community.

**Programs and services.**

The role of women’s centers is often guided by a vision that is based on identified needs as articulated by their mission. This framework helps determine specific goals and programs and services appropriate to the academic and social needs of their clientele. It should be noted that the programs and services that are offered at each women’s center is intended to address the specific needs of campus women at the specific institution for which it was designed.

Early centers used the theme of empowerment to characterize their activities and services. This theme allowed for an array of services to be offered at women’s centers that included the following: films, lectures, workshops, seminars, information referrals on health, housing, child care and employment, personal counseling, support groups and career planning, library collections on women’s issues, and women’s center newsletters (McKinight, 1986). By the latter 1970’s, emerging social forces necessitated the rethinking and reframing of the themes that characterized women’s center activities, thus, placing a focus on advocacy and institutional change. Centers subsequently began to address issues such as sexual harassment, rape prevention, and health services
(McKinight, 1986). In that regard, various programs also developed initiatives that allowed for campus-based women’s centers to provide a variety of support services essential to the personal, intellectual and social growth of its constituents. Welch (2009) noted that the most common services found among women’s centers included academic programs, information referral, anti-harassment/violence against women education and advocacy programs (Welch, 2009).

Bryne (2000) sought to illustrate the extent of the role that campus-based women’s centers play, indicating that it extends beyond providing support services and educational programming. He noted that women’s center activities contribute to the participation and enhancement of opportunities for both the university center and community members. This is accomplished through the promotion of community services, political activism, program planning and implementation, office management, peer-counseling, research and writing, academic excellence, leadership, and activism.

**Perceptual perspectives.**

The role of campus-based women’s centers may vary from one program to another given the needs of the population that they serve, as well as the interest of the host institution. Welch (2009) addressed the perceptual perspective of others regarding the role of campus-based women’s centers as well as how the centers perceive themselves and the role that they perform. Welch posits that the prevailing perspective of women’s centers from the outside is one where “women’s centers are often seen as sites of advocacy around violence and harassment against women, feminist sites investigating patriarchal structures, sites of career development, and sites for women returning to school” (p. 18). As a result of this perceived structural constraint framework, many
centers are looking for new models of organizing themselves that extent beyond the boundaries of a service organization to include a more feminist mandate.

Although the majority of campus-based women’s centers still adhere to a multi-service orientation, there are limitations to this approach. A multi-service orientation when subjected to limited institutional support can result in its inability to achieve all its goals. Nonetheless, women’s centers remain responsive to the needs of their constituents and continue to face the challenges affiliated with addressing the scope and diversity and uniqueness of the needs of their clients (Miller, 2002).

**Challenges**

Campus based women’s centers in the United States in the early 1970’s were initially intended to focus on the inequities faced by women in the classroom and on campus. That responsibility has expanded to include gender and social concerns that are being addressed through educational programs and campus oriented empowerment initiatives. This expanding array of responsibilities has provided growth opportunities for female students and other members of the education community while providing administrative and service challenges for the women’s center programs in their effort to meet the needs of the campus community. Kucyk and Kachman (2011) contend that the women’s centers aim to provide a safe environment, education support, equity and social justice support and a sense of community for students, faculty and staff. These responsibilities are broad ranging and vital to the well being of the institution and the success of its students (Davie, 2002). These service aspirations have created challenges that must be met by campus women’s centers. Many misconceptions continue to impact
the ability of women’s centers to maximize their service capability and in some instances to maintain its existence and viability.

**Gender equity.**

A challenge that program leaders are required to address is the notion that gender equity has been attained in the area of student enrollment and is no longer an issue of concern. Kasper (2004a) reported that women’s centers directors felt that the institutions often felt, that since demographics reflect that women have surpassed men at the undergraduate level and have been surpassing men in graduation rates except in professional categories, subsequent efforts to address other women’s equity issues are not viewed as a priority. Directors also expressed concern that within the academic community the curriculum has marginalized issues of gender, sexuality and equality and subsequently contribute to the marginalization of campus women’s centers and the programs and the population they serve.

**Institutional philosophy.**

Another factor that impacts women’s centers is derived from the institutions philosophy. This may emphasize a resource versus research approach to program development that can result in women’s centers having to decide whether their focus is on promoting change through service and empowerment or research and scholarship, or a combination of both. This philosophy and subsequent mission orientation can determine the nature of staffing and service. Davie (2002) categorizes the focus of women’s centers as being community activist/action centers that are staffed by volunteers, student services/resource centers that are under the umbrella of student affairs divisions and directed by masters-doctoral level professionals. Synthesis centers that are aligned with
academic affairs divisions led by directors with doctorates or faculty members and research centers that are faculty managed and focus on research and publication.

These categories give rise to the notion that women's centers are subject to a variety of reporting lines each with their own policy and administrative nuances. Kasper (2004b) noted that approximately 40% are responsible to student affairs, 20% to academic affairs and the others are responsible to a variety of other campus divisions such as health/wellness and diversity. Kasper (2004b) also observed that the reporting line assigned to a women's center can define its mission and the focus of its services which might not necessarily align with the needs of its student population. An academic line may emphasize service to faculty, staff and students while a student affairs reporting line may focus on providing service primarily to women students.

The diverse avenues through which centers are established also results in organizational structures that are equally varied. This provides challenges for organizations as they attempt to model organizational effectiveness patterns and best practices. Kasper's (2004b) study found that 42% of the respondents stated that center directors reported to the director of student activities, while another 22% percent reported to the provost of their educational institution. De La Pena (2009) found that organizational and leadership structures vary from center to center and certain centers can be found to have a director who makes the majority of decisions whereas at other centers, there is no director present. Rather, they are led by a group who act collectively to make decisions, on behalf of the organization.

Indeed, the range of service attributed to the center can be expansive. Some centers are structured to serve primarily female students. Other centers serve staff,
faculty, and the off-campus community in addition to students. However, in spite of the various differences in the organizational structure of campus-based women’s centers, one element is common among them; they are an asset to the university and the constituents they serve, acting as advocates, providing services and aspiring to transform their students and their institutions as agents of social change.

Institutional commitment.

The degree of institutional commitment has been reported to vary depending on the degree of closeness that the program has to upper level decision makers on the organizational flow chart. Clevenger (1988) conducted a study that revealed that a degree of separation of four or more levels from the president’s office resulted in the respondents perceiving their center as being constrained by a lesser degree of institutional commitment. This perception could also be shared by other departments in the campus community who are competing for scarce resources and may impact the degree to which partnerships are formed and resources shared.

Partnerships.

A center that wants to remain viable and continue to provide service to its constituents could also be interested in forming alliances with other organizations on campus and in the community. These organizations may include career and student services, campus and public safety, multicultural affairs, lesbian, bi-sexual, gay and transgender student services, health center, and counseling and testing services. However, partnering can be seen as a challenge in an environment where programs are competing for limited resources. Other campus organizations may differ in their willingness to collaborate on the basis of whether they are responsible to academic or
non-academic administrative hierarchical strands within the institution. They may also
differ in their opinions of the services that women need and centers provide.

**Internationalization.**

Increasingly, higher education institutions are being populated by international
students. This creates opportunities for the expansion and inclusion of a global
perspective on women's and gender issues, as well as provides support that addresses the
unique needs of women from different cultural orientations to successfully integrate their
world views with that of American higher education and vice versa. This enhances
opportunities for an appreciation and practice of leadership that facilitates growth through
inclusive and collaborative efforts at the educational and community and societal levels.
However, internationalization initiatives are costly and additional resources and
partnerships with other programs that focus on logistical and multi cultural concerns of
international students may be necessary while deferring expertise in women’s issues to
the campus based women’s center.

**Funding.**

Given the needs of its constituents, the funding priorities of the institution,
academic philosophy and the direction of social forces on and off campus, women’s
centers are challenged with defining its mission so that it may continue to provide
invaluable services of the past, immediate needs of the present and proactively prepare to
meet the demands of emerging trends in higher education and society. However, the
various sources of funding that contribute to the creation and evolution of women’s
centers can also be a deterrent to the predictability of resources necessary for the
maintenance and growth of women’s centers.
Women’s centers that are overseen by the institution, generally receive funding from the same either directly, through budget appropriation, or circuitously, through the allotment of space and/or support services (Bengiveno, 2000; Clevenger, 1988). In instances where student activity fees comprise the source of funding for student run women’s centers, they are typically “highly transient and generally uneven in quality and their level of activity varies widely from year to year” (Clevenger, 1988, p. 3).

Vera and Burgos-Sassier (1998) asserted that funding also varies according to whether the women center is university-based or located on a community college campus. They contend that “university-based woman’s centers receive the least financial support from their institutions. Community college programs fare somewhat better because of federally funded programs that target the special populations the host institutions serve” (p. 4). Kasper (2004b) conducted a study of campus-based women’s centers during the 1999-2000 academic year that aimed to create a point of reference for the current structure of women’s centers, as well as identify their administrative and programmatic practices. The research was formulated around the results of a survey of 75 women’s centers housed at both public and private four-year colleges and universities. The results derived from the study indicated that “57% of the centers in public universities receive their funding from the college or university, while only 38% of the centers at private universities cited this as their primary source of funding” (p. 488).

Throughout their evolution within higher education institutions, women’s centers have endured budget cuts, downsizing, shifting politics and administrative changes that are reflective of the changing fiscal reality facing higher education institutions. Adequate funding is a challenge that has limited the ability of women’s centers to maximize its
efforts at goal attainment (Clevenger, 1988; Marine, 2011). However, Willienger (2002) affirms that “women’s centers are dynamic organizations-sufficiently flexible to exist successfully in a wide range of academic institutions, far-reaching in addressing issues important to women and responsive to societal changes and the impact of those changes” (p. 47).

**Leadership in Women’s Centers**

The research found on the leadership of women’s centers was conducted primarily to understand factors that are related to the personality, characteristics and nature of feminist leadership of administrators of campus-based women’s centers. Mitchell (1976) conducted an investigation of the occupational, educational, personal characteristics, and personality factors of women administrators. The methodological approach utilized a random sampling of 214 administrators from a population consisting of 488 administrators. A two part survey instrument was used to collect educational occupational and personal characteristics of each of the respondents.

The findings revealed that the educational background of most administrators consisted of a bachelors degree. An analysis of their occupational characteristics found that most administrators held the title of director for one or more years prior to their appointment to their current position. Additionally, directors were previously employed as counselors, teachers and students. The study also determined that personality characteristics were found to be significantly connected to the age, marital status and number of children with the respondents having a median age of the 40 years and were mostly married. The results of the study were intended to be used as guidelines for the
selection of administrators, revision of educational curriculum, as well as the development and improvement of women's center programs.

Travers (2009) utilized an ethnographic portraiture to describe the leadership practices of campus community center directors at the University of California, San Diego. The study focused on the collaboration of social justice centers at the university (The Cross-Cultural Center, Women's Center and Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Resource Center) and their leadership practices. It addressed issues related to the nature of the relationship between the directors of the Campus Community Centers with an emphasis on team work, identity and community, as well as the barriers that challenge these relationships. Findings from an in-depth qualitative study revealed that the centers rely on each other to function and that they demonstrated growth overtime. It was hoped that universities may use these findings to rethink and reorganize their vision of campus community centers and consider the viability of making them interdependent.

Griggs (1989) conducted a study that addressed the major tenets of feminist leadership as practiced by university women's centers and university women's studies programs. It sought to describe the environment in which feminist leadership exists through an investigation of the organizational structure of those programs. It also sought to identify feminist leadership characteristics by women's center directors that could influence and encourage those in similar occupational positions to seek alternatives to traditional models of leadership. Through the utilization of three survey instruments and a two sample groups comprised of 236 university women's center directors and 286 directors of women's studies programs, the findings revealed that in those programs,
some elements of feminist leadership were present, others were not and some were unable to be determined.

Chavez (2003) replicated the study conducted by Griggs (1989) to provide a descriptive and comparative study of feminist leadership characteristics of campus-based women's center directors and directors of women's studies programs at Southern California intuitions of higher education to ascertain the relationship between feminist values and leadership. The methodological approach utilized two surveys adapted from the initial study conducted by Griggs (1989). A sample consisting of 54 directors/chairs with forty-three respondents confirmed the presence of feminist leadership in the Southern California University system. Additionally, 65 percent of women's center directors and 95 percent of women's studies directors/chairs indicated that feminist leadership values greatly influence their leadership practices.

**Summary of Chapter**

This chapter conducted a review of several theoretical approaches to the study of leadership that included the trait, behavioral, contingency, path-goal, power and influence, transformational, and cultural and symbolic theories. It also examined Bolman and Deal's Four-Frame Leadership Model that's derived from their analysis of previous leadership theories. Their analysis surmised that leader styles can be organized using the structural, human resource, political and symbolic frames. Several studies using the Four-Frame Leadership Model were introduced that examined leadership styles in higher education.

This review also conducted a historical discussion of campus-based women's centers with emphasis on the challenges facing their leaders. Although the literature is
extensive when it comes to the study of leadership in general, and leadership in universities, there is little that addresses leadership generally and leadership styles specifically of campus-based women’s center leaders. The research on campus-based women’s center leadership emphasized variables related to occupational, educational, personal characteristics, team work, identity community, and feminist leadership characteristics and values. The literature also suggests that a variety of internal and external forces that are driven by student and organizational needs may result in rethinking and reframing program development, administrator selection processes, and curriculum development initiatives.

However, of the studies that addresses campus-based women’s centers there is no study that explores the leadership styles of campus-based women’s centers. This study will potentially add to the literature on the leadership frame(s) of women’s center leaders through an analysis of the relationship between leader styles and specific demographic variables on the programs that they lead.
Chapter III

Methodology

Purpose of the Study

This study aims to examine the leadership frames used by the organizational leaders of campus-based women's centers at public and private four year universities in the southeast United States. There is currently a lack of empirical research on the leadership styles of directors of campus based women's centers and no research currently exists that specifically looks at the leadership style of the leaders of campus-based women's centers in public and private four year universities in the southeast United States.

The methodological approach of this study proposed the use of both descriptive and correlational quantitative methods of analysis. The descriptive component of the research focuses on providing a precise description of characteristics, phenomenon or situations (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). This method was used to answer the research questions on the primary leadership style (styles) of campus-based women’s center directors. The correlational component analyzes the data collected to determine the strength of the relationship between two or more variables (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). This method was used to answer the research question on the relationship between the demographic and institutional variables and the leadership styles of campus-based women’s center directors. This chapter describes the participating universities, study population, research design, research questions, data collection, instrumentation and data analysis.
Participating Universities

The universities selected for participation in this study were derived from The Women's Center Mailing list at www.creativefolk.com. This website maintained by Gerri Gribi has been used in previous studies to obtain the mailing list of campus-based women's centers nationally (Kasper, 2004a; Kasper, 2004b). The creativefolk.com women’s center mailing list indicates that there are currently 44 public and private four-year institutions of higher education in the southeast United States that have campus based women’s centers. This study focuses on the leadership styles of the directors of campus-based women’s centers at those 44 institutions.

Study Sample and Population

The individuals sampled for the study will comprise of the leaders of campus-based women’s centers at 44 public and private four-year institutions of higher education with such programs in the southeast United States (see Appendix A). This sample represents all the four-year institutions in the states covered by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The sample is comprised of the undergraduate universities that had campus-based women's centers in those states at the time of this study. This sample was chosen because empirical research on campus-based women's centers has generally proven to be limited. Moreover, the majority of research that does exist focuses predominantly on campus-based women’s centers in the northeast United States (Bengiveno, 1996). Subsequently, the target population for this study is all campus-based women’s centers at public and private four-year universities in the United States.
Research Design

The methodological approach of this study proposed the use of questionnaires consistent with the principles of quantitative inquiry. Measurement and data analysis from Likert-type scale items was conducted along with analysis of data resulting from the administration of a demographic questionnaire that requests the necessary leadership and institutional data. The survey procedure included an email letter (see Appendix B) sent to the director of each campus-based women’s center that described the study, requests consent to conduct the study, and invited the director and institution to participate in the study.

Directors were sent the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) (1990) (see Appendix C), along with a brief demographic questionnaire (see Appendix D). Data for the study was compiled and statistically analyzed using the Statistical package for the Social Sciences (SPSS v. 21.0). The intention was to gain at least a thirty-five percent response rate. If this goal was not met within the original two-week deadline for responses, all participants received two weekly reminders by email with the survey instruments attached, requesting that they respond if they have not already done so within one week. The emails were numerically coded to avoid duplication of responses while maintaining confidentiality.

Research questions.

The data analysis outlined after each research question is designed to address the afore mentioned question proposed for this study.

Research Question 1.
To what extent do campus-based women's center directors perceive themselves as using a single-frame leadership style (structural, human resource, political or symbolic)? What are the predominant single-frame leadership styles?

**Method:** Bolman and Deal's Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) was used to gather the data. A means score was used to analyze the data. In the instrument, each of the four frames of leadership is represented by eight items: structural frame (items 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, and 29), human resource frame (items 2, 5, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, and 30) political frame (items 3, 7, 11, 19, 23, 27, and 31) and symbolic frame (items 4, 8, 12, 20, 24, 28, and 32). Respondents used a five-point Likert-type scale to rate the degree to which they demonstrate the use of leadership frame(s). A mean score of 4 or more (80%) indicates consistent frame use (Mosser, 2000).

**Research Question 2.** To what extent do campus-based women's center directors perceive themselves as using a paired-frame leadership style (as defined by the use of two frames) or a multi-frame leadership style (as defined by the use of three or more frames)? What are the predominant paired-frame and/or multi-frame leadership styles?

**Method:** Frequency and percentage of respondents exhibiting use of 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 frames was used as the basis for analysis.

**Research Question 3.** What is the nature of the relationship between the type of leadership style used by campus-based women's center directors and the following demographic factors?

a. Type of institution (public, private).

b. Size of the institution.
c. Length of existence of the women’s center.

d. Percentage of the female student population.

e. Administrative structure of the women’s center.

**Method:** Categorical data was analyzed using the Chi-square statistical test to determine whether there is a significant relationship between the dependent variable (leadership style) and independent variables.

**Data Collection Procedures**

The survey instrument was be distributed using Qualtrics, an Internet-based survey-administration software program. The researcher sent a preliminary email to the campus-based women’s center directors asking them to participate in the study and to complete the attached Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) (1990) along with a brief demographic questionnaire. The initial email also introduced the researcher, described the study and explained how confidentiality will be maintained. Directors were asked to respond within one month. A reminder e-mail was sent two weeks after the initial e-mail and every week thereafter leading up to the one month deadline.

**Instrumentation**

This study utilized one survey instrument and one demographic questionnaire to gather the data. The Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) (1990) survey was sent to women’s center directors to measure their perceived use of leadership frames. Additionally, completion of the demographic survey by the director was requested.
Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self).

Permission to use the Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) (1990) survey instrument, developed by Bolman and Deal, was obtained from Dr. Lee Bolman (Appendix E and F). The self-administered instrument consists of 32 questions on a five-point Likert-type scale. The scale is as follows: 1 = never, 2 = occasionally, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, and 5 = always. This instrument was designed to identify leader behaviors that are consistent with Bolman and Deal's four frames of leadership.

In the instrument, each of the four frames of leadership is represented by eight items: structural frame (items 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, and 29); human resource frame (items 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, and 30); political frame (items 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, and 31) and symbolic frame (items 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, and 32). Each respondent used a five-point Likert-type scale to rate the degree to which it is believed that he or she demonstrates the use of the leadership frame(s).

Following the return of the Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) survey, a score was calculated for each frame and the mean score for each frame for this sample was determined. Any director above the mean was classified as using that leadership frame (Mosser, 2000), thus allowing for determination of the use of a single or multiple leadership frames.

The validity of the Bolman and Deal's (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) has been established and documented by the authors. Bolman and Deal (1991a, 1991b) determined the instrument's predictive validity by conducting regression analyses of leaders' effectiveness data obtained from colleagues. Their analyses using the four frames predicted a minimum of 74% of the variance in perceived leadership.
Additionally, their findings identified the symbolic frame to be the best predictor of leader effectiveness while the structural frame least predicted leadership effectiveness.

In addition, a factor analysis of 681 higher education administrators “using a conventional procedure (principal components analysis, followed by varimax rotation of all factors with an eigenvalue > 1) ... produced four factors that aligned with the conceptual definitions of the frames [and] yielded a high degree of internal consistency of the instrument” (Bolman & Deal 1992a, p. 321). Meade (1992) also asserted that factor analysis affirms that the survey items effectively measure the four leadership frames.

“The factor loadings for the structural frame ranged from .67 to .69; for the human resource frame, from .64 to .85; the political frame, from .59 to .78 and for the symbolic frame, from .51 to .71. Although different questions showed different levels of strength, the overall picture is that the items were consistent with the theory behind them” (Harrell, 2006, p. 76).

The reliability statistics for the Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) (1990) have been documented by Bolman (n.d.). Samples of managers in business and education ranging from 1218 to 1309 individuals were used for their analyses of this instrument’s reliability. Reliability is calculated and measured using coefficients; the coefficient is used as an index of an instrument’s reliability. A reliability coefficient of zero represents no reliability conversely, a reliability coefficient of + 1.00 represents perfect reliability. When testing the reliability of an instrument, the goal is to have a strong and positive coefficient, meaning as close to +1.00 as possible (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). Moreover, the findings of the analyses of this instrument’s reliability
indicated the following ranges: split half correlation, from .644 to .822; Spearman Brown coefficient, from .783 to .933; and Guttman (Rulon) coefficient, form .780 to .936.

Bolman and Deal (1991b) also found that the instrument’s internal reliability was high, with Cronbach’s alpha for each frame measure ranging from .91 to .93. Cronbach’s alpha confers a reliability estimate that is the average of all split-half correlations corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula. It is held that for the reliability of a survey used in social science research, Cronbach’s alpha be greater than 0.70 (Johnson & Christensen, 2012).

The Leadership Orientation Instrument (Self) has been used in numerous studies (Bensimon, 1989; Bethel, 1998; Bolman & Deal, 1991b; Cantu, 1997; Childress, 1994; Crist, 1999; Eck, 1997; Eckley 1997; Gilson, 1994; Harlow, 1994, Mathis, 1999; Miro, 1993; Redman, 1991; Strickland, 1992). Given the evidence of the validity and reliability of the Bolman and Deal’s Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) (1990), as well as the frequent use of the instrument in educational settings, it was deemed that this instrument is reliable for application to this study.

The following tables reflect findings relevant to the validity (see Table 2) and reliability (see Table 3) of Bolman and Deal’s Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) (1990).
Table 2

Summary of Bolman and Deal’s Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) (1990)

Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Type of Validity</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Validity Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolman &amp; Deal’s Leadership Orientation (Self)</td>
<td>Structural frame</td>
<td>Factor Analysis</td>
<td>.67 to .79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human resource frame</td>
<td>Factor Analysis</td>
<td>.64 to .85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political frame</td>
<td>Factor Analysis</td>
<td>.59 to .78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symbolic frame</td>
<td>Factor Analysis</td>
<td>.51 to .71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Summary of Bolman and Deal’s Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) (1990)*

**Reliability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolman &amp; Deal’s Leadership Orientation (Self)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Reliability Measure</th>
<th>Reliability Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural frame</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha .92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource frame</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha .93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political frame</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha .91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic frame</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha .93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demographic Questionnaire.**

A demographic questionnaire was included at the end of the Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) (1990). The demographic survey included questions on the type of institution, the percentage of the female student population, length of existence of the women’s center, the size of the institution (number of students enrolled) and the administrative structure of the women’s center.
Data Analysis

Once the completed surveys were returned, the data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS v. 21.0). To answer research questions 1 and 2, means will be used to calculate each of the leadership frames. A mean score of 4.0 or higher indicated the use of that leadership frame by the women’s center director.

Research question 3 queries the nature of the relationship between various demographic factors and the type of leadership style(s) used by campus based women's center directors. The data relevant to question three was derived from the demographic questionnaire. A bi-variate analysis was also conducted between the five independent variables and the organizational leaders perceived leadership frames as the dependent variable. Chi-square analysis was conducted to compare the distribution of leadership frames with the five independent variables. An alpha level equal to .05 will be used to evaluate the significance of the observed relationships.

Summary of Chapter

The procedures described in this chapter were designed to determine the leadership frames used by the directors of campus-based women’s centers. This will be measured by Bolman & Deal’s Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) (1990). It also aims to measure the relationships between the demographic (institutional) variables and the use of leadership frames by women’s center directors. A sample of forty-four directors of campus based women’s centers at public and private universities in the southeast United States Directors was surveyed. The methodological approach of this study proposed the use of both descriptive and quantitative methods of analysis.
Chapter IV

Results

The purpose of this study was to examine the organizational and institutional variables that influence the leadership styles of campus-based women’s center directors. Furthermore, the researcher examined the leadership frame (or frames), as measured by Bolman and Deal’s (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) (see Appendix C), exhibited by the organizational leaders of campus-based women’s centers at public and private four-year universities in the southeast United States.

The following research questions were developed to align with the statement of purpose and guide the data collection, statistical methods, and findings of the study. They also served to define the organizational framework of this chapter and ensure that the methodology addressed the same.

Question 1: To what extent do campus-based women’s center directors perceive themselves as using a single-frame leadership style (structural, human resource, political or symbolic)? What are the predominant single-frame leadership styles?

Question 2: To what extent do campus-based women’s center directors perceive themselves as using paired-frame leadership style (as defined by the use of two frames) or multi-frame (as defined by the use of three or more frames)? What are the predominant paired-frame and/or multi-frame leadership styles?

Question 3: What is the nature of the relationship between the type of leadership style(s) used by campus-based women’s center directors and the following demographic factors?

(a) Type of institution (public, private)
(b) Size of the institution
(c) Length of existence of the women's center
(d) Percentage of the female student population
(e) Administrative structure of the women's center

Sample and Response

The sample surveyed for this study consisted of 44 campus-based women's center directors in the southeast United States, of which 19 directors participated in this study but only 15 surveys were usable. Four participants opened and submitted the survey but did not complete any of the questions, and four participants answered most but not all of the questions needed for complete data sets. This resulted in an overall response rate of 34.09 percent which met but did not exceed the targeted response rate.

Data Analysis and Findings

Bolman and Deal's Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) (see Appendix C) was administered to gather the data needed to identify the leader's behaviors that are consistent with Bolman and Deal's four frames of leadership. The survey asked each respondent to answer 32 questions on a five-point Likert-type scale. The scale was as follows: 1 = never; 2 = occasionally; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; and 5 = always. In the instrument, each of the four frames of leadership is represented by eight items: structural frame (items 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, and 29), human resource frame (items 2, 5, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, and 30) political frame (items 3, 7, 11, 19, 23, 27, and 31), and symbolic frame (items 4, 8, 12, 20, 24, 28, and 32). The results from each question were used to determine the degree to which they demonstrate the use of leadership frame(s). A mean score of 4 or more (80%) was the indicator of consistent frame use.
This method of analysis was used to provide the findings for Research Questions 1 and 2. Regarding Question 1, the analysis addressed the extent to which campus-based women's center directors perceive themselves as using a single-frame leadership style (structural, human resource, political or symbolic) as well as the predominant single-frame leadership styles used by the same. Data analysis related to Question 2 identified the extent to which campus-based women's center directors perceive themselves as using a paired-frame leadership style (as defined by the use of two frames) or a multi-frame leadership style (as defined by the use of three or more frames), as well as the predominant paired-frame and/or multi-frame leadership styles used by the participants. A summary of results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Summary of Participants' Average Scores for Each Leadership Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Structural Frame</th>
<th>Human Resource Frame</th>
<th>Political Frame</th>
<th>Symbolic Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 1</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 6</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 7</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 8</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results indicated that, of the 15 respondents, 9 of them indicated single frame usage. Of the four frames, all the respondents who self-identified themselves as using a single frame, it was found that the human resource frame was the predominant single-frame leadership style. One respondent perceived himself/herself as using a paired-frame leadership style and it was found that the two frames that were paired were the structural and the human resource frames.

Five of the 15 respondents perceived themselves as using a multi-frame leadership style. Of those five, two perceived themselves as using three out of the four frames. Both respondents indentified with the political, human resource, and symbolic
frames. Three of the five multi-frame respondents identified with all four leadership frames.

The results indicated the most frequent frame used by all 15 respondents was the human resource frame. The highest mean score was a 5.00, which was found to exist only in the Structural and Human Resource frame categories. Of the three respondents who had a mean score of 5.00, two of them perceived themselves using all four frames. The lowest mean score of 2.13 was identified with the Structural frame. It was also found that the Structural frame contained two of the lowest mean scores when compared to the three other leadership frames.

The third research question addressed the nature of the relationship between the type of leadership style used by campus-based women's center directors and the following demographic factors: Type of institution (public, private); size of the institution; length of existence of the women's center; percentage of the female student population; and the administrative structure of the women's center. The data relevant to Question 3 was derived from a brief demographic questionnaire (see Appendix D) attached to the Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) (see Appendix C). A bivariate analysis was conducted between the five independent variables and the organizational leader's perceived leadership frame mean score as the dependent variable. Chi-square analyses were conducted to determine whether there existed significant relationships between the dependent variable (leadership style) and independent variables. An alpha level equal to .05 was used to evaluate the significance of the observed relationships.
Table 5 summarizes the bivariate chi-square tests between demographic variables and leadership frame responses.

Table 5

Summary of the Bivariate Chi Chi-Square Tests between Demographic Variables and Leadership Frame Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Leadership Frame</th>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>Structural Frame</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resource Frame</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Frame</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symbolic Frame</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Population</td>
<td>Structural Frame</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resource Frame</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Frame</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symbolic Frame</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Structural Frame</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resource Frame</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Frame</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symbolic Frame</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Size</td>
<td>Structural Frame</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resource Frame</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study found no significant relationships between the five independent variables (institution type, female population, time, institution size and administrative structure) and the dependent variable (campus-based women's center directors' leadership frame preference). It is important to note that significance is a function of sample size. Frankel, Wallen, and Hyun (2012) indicated that in a correlational study, data obtained from a small sample size may give an inaccurate estimate to the relationship that may exist between two variables. Conversely, larger sample sizes are more likely to provide significant results.

**Summary of Findings**

This chapter presented the findings of descriptive data that was gathered from the analysis of the survey of campus-based women's centers leadership orientations (self) and a brief demographic questionnaire. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the use of
the four leadership frames and determine the frame(s) preference of campus- based women center directors. The chi-square statistical test was utilized to measure the relationships between a director’s leadership preferences and five institutional variables. It was determined that no statistically significant relationships existed. Chapter 5 will present the summary, discussion, and conclusions related to key findings, as well as recommendations for future research.
Chapter V

Summary, Discussion, Recommendations, and Conclusions

This chapter summarizes the purpose, literature review, methodology, and findings of the study. It also provides conclusions and implications that are derived from the findings. Finally, it puts forth suggestions for future research that are based on the analysis of this study.

This study examined the leadership frame (or frames), as measured by Bolman and Deal’s (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self), used by the organizational leaders of campus-based women’s centers at public and private four-year universities in the southeast United States. Furthermore, the researcher examined the organizational and institutional variables that influence the leadership styles of campus-based women’s center directors. This study was conducted using the data received from 15 campus-based women's center directors in the southeast United States. The data were collected through a survey instrument that was administered to women’s center directors in the southeast United States. Descriptive analyses and chi-square tests were used to analyze the collected data.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

Question 1: To what extent do campus-based women’s center directors perceive themselves as using a single-frame leadership style (structural, human resource, political or symbolic)? What are the predominant single-frame leadership styles?

Question 2: To what extent do campus-based women’s center directors perceive themselves as using paired-frame leadership style (as defined by the use of two frames)
or multi-frame (as defined by the use of three or more frames)? What are the predominant paired-frame and/or multi-frame leadership styles?

Question 3: What is the nature of the relationship between the type of leadership style(s) used by campus-based women's center directors and the following demographic factors?

(a) Type of institution (public, private)
(b) Size of the institution
(c) Length of existence of the women's center
(d) Percentage of the female student population
(e) Administrative structure of the women's center

Summary of Research Findings

The study produced the three findings listed below.

1. Results determined that, of the 15 respondents, 60% of them indicated single frame usage. For the respondents who identified themselves as using a single frame, it was found that the human resource frame was the predominant single-frame leadership style. The results also indicated that the most frequent frame used by 100% of the respondents was the human resource frame.

2. One respondent perceived herself as using a paired-frame leadership style, and it was found that the two frames that were paired were the structural and the human resource frames. Of the 15 respondents, 33.3% perceived themselves as using a multi-frame leadership style. Of those five, two perceived themselves as using three out of the four frames. Both of those respondents identified alignment with the political, human resource, and symbolic frames. Three of the five multi-frame respondents identified with all four leadership frames.
3. The study found no relationship between the five independent variables (institution type, female population, time, institution size and administrative structure) and the dependent variable (campus-based women's center director’s leadership frame(s) preference).

Discussion

The following paragraphs discuss each finding relative to the existing body of literature.

**Finding 1: single frame usage/ predominant single-frame leadership style.**

Campus-based women's centers were established to meet the socio-cultural and campus life needs of women in higher education, and afford them the support necessary to achieve their educational goals. However, as directors strive to meet the needs of their programs and subsequently address their client’s academic goals and socio-cultural concerns, they are sometimes faced with atypical problems that demand innovative leadership styles, especially when operating in an environment of shrinking budgets, staffing limitations and organizational change. All these challenges are further exacerbated by the need to maintain relevance on a 21st century campus (Kasper, 2004b).

Kunkel (2007) reiterated this fundamental challenge faced by women’s centers in the 21st century campus and believed that the negative perception of feminism and simple indifference, at best, to the concerns of women help to proliferate this issue faced by women’s center directors on a daily basis. Kunkel (2007) furthers that this lack of concern may stem from the fact that “young women may not be aware of the challenges that many women face and think the women’s movement of their mothers generation solved all those problems” (p. 582).
Therefore, given the challenges faced by women's center directors while trying to achieve the mission of their programs, they must continually redefine themselves and their organizations, which means making decisions and implementing policies and practices that are in the best interests of their constituents. Bolman and Deal's (1990, 1991, 1997) Four-Frame Leadership Model identifies four categories (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) that describe a leader's orientation, how a leader thinks and acts in his/her decision making, and responds to organizational needs and situations.

The study indicated that 60% of all respondents identified themselves as utilizing a single frame leadership orientation; all single frame leadership respondents identified themselves using the human resource frame. In that regard, the human resource leader is concerned with creating an environment where the members of the organization understand their importance. They identify themselves as motivators and facilitators who view the organization as a family and place emphasis on developing a symbiotic relationship that affords individuals the opportunity to exercise their creative talents and energies toward the attainment of the organization's goals. Given this view of leadership in the midst of the challenges faced by the women's center directors, it is not surprising that 100% of the respondents identified themselves as utilizing the human resource frame.

**Finding 2: paired-frame leadership style /predominant paired-frame and/or multi-frame leadership styles.**

The role of campus-based women's centers may vary from one program to another given the needs of the population that they serve, as well as the interest of the host institution. As a result the majority of campus-based women's centers adhere to a
multi-service orientation. Miller (2002) noted that, a multi-service orientation, when subjected to limited institutional support, can result in a program's inability to achieve all its goals. Nonetheless, women's centers must remain responsive to the needs of their constituents and continue to face the challenges affiliated with addressing the scope and diversity and uniqueness of their clients. Bryne (2000) illustrated the extent of the role that campus-based women's centers play, indicating that it extends beyond providing support services and educational programming and furthered that women's center activities go beyond the host-campus to promote the participation and enhancement of opportunities for both the university center and community members.

Given this mandate of a multi-service orientation, many directors find it beneficial to adhere to a paired or multi-frame leadership style. The findings indicated that only one respondent perceived herself as using a paired-frame leadership style, but 33.3% of the 15 respondents perceived themselves as using a multi-frame leadership style. Of those who indicated the use of a multi-frame orientation, they utilized three (the political, human resource, and symbolic frames) out of the four possibilities. Additionally, 20% of all respondents identified with the use of all four leadership frames. Bolman and Deal (1997) posited that the use of multiple perspectives or frames can benefit the organizational leader who functions in an environment of constant change, institutional demands, programmatic trends, and individual needs.

**Finding 3:** relationship between the type of leadership style(s) and the demographic factors.

This study found that no relationships existed between the five independent variables (institution type, female population, time, institution size, and administrative
structure) and the dependent variable (campus-based women's center directors' leadership frame preference). This is attributed, at least in part, to the small sample size as well as the fact that all respondents identified themselves as having the human resource frame leadership style. Additionally, significance of relationships between leadership frame preference and the administrative structure variable could not be assessed due to the fact that all respondents worked in centers that were professionally staffed; therefore, there was no differential group membership on this variable.

It is believed by the researcher that if this study was conducted again with a national sample of campus-based women's center directors that a relationship between leadership styles and the institutional variables could exist. This hypothesis comes as a result of the literature found on the impact of the institution on campus based women's centers that indicates that their missions and goals are often derived from the respective host institution's philosophies. Thus, determining the institution mission has an impact on the, nature of staffing and services provided by the organization.

Kasper (2004) noted the administrative nuances that arise as a result of various institutional variables, the reporting line assigned to a women’s center by the institution can define its mission and the focus of its services; which might not necessarily align with the needs of its student population. An academic reporting line may result in a programs emphasis on service to faculty, staff and students, while a student affairs reporting line may focus on providing service primarily to women students. De La Pena (2009) noted that organizational and leadership structures vary from center to center and certain centers can be found to have a director who makes the majority of decisions;
whereas, at other centers, there is no director present. Rather, they are led by a group who act collectively to make decisions, on behalf of the organization. Indeed these institutional variables could have some correlation to a director's perceived leadership responsibilities and subsequently their orientation.

**Review of the Limitations of the Study**

This study is limited to results that are dependent on the self-identified leadership frame (or frames) of the directors who complete the survey. Furthermore, not all questions were answered by the respondents who completed the survey, leaving gaps in the data set. Additionally, in order for the study to find a relationship between the five independent variables (institution type, female population, time, institution size and administrative structure) and the dependent variable (campus-based women's center directors' leadership frame preference), the researcher needed to utilize a larger sample or have had a higher return rate.

Moreover, this study addresses four-year public and private universities in the southeastern United States that currently have campus-based women's centers. Therefore, inferences cannot be made about institutions in other states. It should be noted that the data obtained were entirely self-reported data. Therefore, results and conclusions are limited to the extent that the directors are providing honest responses.

**Recommendations for Future Studies**

The results of this study identified several limitations, and consequently, several implications for future research. The need exists for a nationwide study, as well as replication studies in other regions of the United States where a larger sample could be
examined to determine if relationships exist between the five independent variables (institution type, female population, time, institution size, and administrative structure) and the dependent variable (campus-based women's center directors' leadership frame preference). The value of a national study would be to enlarge the sample population thus increase the capacity to eliminate gaps in the data set, increase the opportunity to see regional patterns and make administrative connections.

Additionally, further research is recommended regarding the leadership styles of student directors at student-run organizations in relation to the five independent variables (institution type, female population, time, institution size, and administrative structure). Due to the differing administrative demographics of the respondents, a limitation of the study was the absence of responses from student run organizations. Therefore, this study was unable to yield any inferences regarding the connection between the leadership styles of student directors and the demographic variables. This study can be replicated because of its potential to analyze the leadership patterns of student run organizations and compare them to those of professionally staffed organizations. Such studies can lead to the analysis of both administrative structures and possibly identify best practices for leaders of women's center programs. Ultimately, research in this area will add to the literature on organizational leadership at women's centers and leadership in general.

It is also recommended that other moderating factors be studied for their possible influence on the relationship between campus-based women's centers leadership style and personal characteristics. Some variables worthy of possible consideration include (age, education level, marital status, previous employment history, and length of time at current position). An examination of personal characteristics and their relationship to a
director's leadership frame preference has the potential to add to the literature regarding the influence that personal traits can have on one's leadership style. Additionally, the results could be used as a guide to assist in leadership development and training programs.

This study addresses how campus-based women's center directors self-identify their leadership style utilizing Bolman and Deal's (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self). Other research could be conducted that examines how other members of the organization perceive the director's leadership style through the utilization of the Bolman and Deal's (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument (Other). This analysis of a program director's self-identification of their leadership style versus the perception by other members of the organization of that director's leadership style can result in data that affords an examination of the relationships between two sets of collected data that further contributes to an understanding of the perception of leadership styles of campus-based women's center directors.

Finally, this study is limited to the quantitative approach and relies on statistical data gathered from Bolman and Deal's (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) and a brief demographic questionnaire. A qualitative study should be conducted that interviews campus based women's center directors regarding the academic, environmental, motivational, external and internal support, economic, and institutional forces that result in their perceived leadership styles both by themselves as well as by other members of the organization. A qualitative study has the potential to provide an in-depth perspective on the factors that contribute to a director's feelings and perceptions;
variables that may impact their decision-making processes, their leadership style and their roles as program leaders.

Summary and Conclusions

Higher education institutions and the programs they provide are operating and responding to the needs of a dynamically changing economic and social environment. The campus-based women’s centers and their leaders are charged with meeting clients’ needs through appropriate services and effective leadership. Consequently, in order for the leaders of these programs to function effectively, they must demonstrate the ability to adapt and be innovative and responsive to organizational, programmatic, and customer-driven changes.

Within this context, Bolman and Deal’s (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self) was used as the conceptual framework for identifying the different leadership styles of women’s center program directors. This descriptive study was conducted in an area where little previous research on leadership has been conducted.

The data collected from this study indicated that the human resource frame was used by all of the respondents, while one-third of those respondents also indicated the use of multiple frames in their leadership responsibilities. The use of these leadership styles was self-identified as instrumental in assessing information, making judgments, and determining how to best accomplish organizational goals. This study utilized a quantitative approach that relied on descriptive and chi-square analyses to determine the use of four leadership frames and their relationships to five organizational and institutional variables that may influence their leadership style(s).
Because of its implementation as an initial inquiry into the leadership styles of women's center leaders, it is hoped that further studies are conducted that yield a larger response so that best practices can be derived and a more complete picture can be attained regarding leadership styles of women's centers at public and private four-year universities.
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Appendix A

Public and Private Four-Year Universities in the Southeast United States with

Campus-Based Women's Centers
Alabama
University Of Alabama Women's Resource Center

Florida
Florida International University, University Park Campus/ Biscayne Bay Campus,
Florida State University Women's Center,
Lynn University Women’s Center
University Of North Florida Women's Center

Georgia
Emory University Women's Center
Georgia College & State University Women's Resource Center,
Georgia Institute of Technology Women's Resource Center,
Spellman College Women's Research & Resource Center

Kentucky
Murray State University Women's Center
University Of Louisville Women's Center

Louisiana
Louisiana State University Women's Center
Loyola University New Orleans Women's Resource Center
Nicholls State University Louisiana, Center For Women And Government,
Tulane University Newcomb College Center For Research On Women,
University Of New Orleans Women's Center,
North Carolina

University Of North Carolina at Wilmington, Women's Center
Duke University Women's Center
North Carolina Central University, Women's Center
North Carolina State University Women's Center
University Of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Women's Center
Western Carolina University Women's Center
Warren Wilson College Women's Resource Center

South Carolina

University Of South Carolina-Columbia, Women Student Services
University Of South Carolina Upstate, Center for Women's Studies & Programs

Tennessee

East Tennessee State University Women's Resource Center
Middle Tennessee State University. June Anderson Women's Center
Tennessee State University Women's Center
Tennessee Technological University Women's Center
University of Memphis Center For Research on Women,
University of Tennessee Women's Center
University of Tennessee-Chattanooga Women's Center, Chattanooga
Vanderbilt University, Women's Center

Texas

Rice University Women's Resource Center
Southern Methodist University, Human Resource Women's Center
Texas A&M University Women's Center
University Of Houston Women's Resource Center
University Of Texas at Dallas, Galerstein Women's Center
University Of Texas San Antonio, Center for Study of Women & Gender

Virginia
George Mason University Women & Gender Studies Center
James Madison University Women's Resource Center
Old Dominion University Women's Center
University Of Virginia Women's Center
Virginia Tech Women's Center
Appendix B

Letter to Women’s Center Director
To: Director, Women's Center

From: Ms. Nikkia DeLuz

Doctoral Candidate, Department of Educational Leadership, Lynn University

Re: A Study of the Leadership Styles of Campus-Based Women’s Centers in the Southeast United States

Dear Campus-Based Women’s Center Director,

I am a doctoral student in the department of Educational Leadership at Lynn University. I am seeking your agreement to participate in research for my doctoral study entitled “A Study of the Leadership Styles of Campus-Based Women’s Centers in the Southeast United States.”

In this study campus-based women’s center directors will be asked to complete a survey instrument on leadership styles, as well as a short demographic questionnaire. This survey will take only 4 minutes to complete and will identify the leadership frame (or frames) used by women’s center leaders, as measured by Bolman and Deal’s (1990) Four-Frame Leadership Orientations Instrument (Self). The four frames identified by Bolman and Deal’s instrument are the structural, human resource, political and symbolic frames.

This study aims to conduct a descriptive analysis that provides both theoretical and practical benefits to women’s center leaders. Theoretically, the analysis of leadership styles at women’s centers contributes to the available research on program leadership theories. Regarding its practical application, the descriptive analysis may provide information that will enable leaders to identify their approaches to attaining goals and
addressing situations relevant to their programs. The data analysis will not identify you, your program, or your university. All data will be kept in a secure location upon completion of the study and responses will be reported collectively so that no individual or specific program information can be identified. Surveys will be coded to enable analysis and the actual names of the participants will not be kept.

If you have any questions regarding this study or need clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me at [blurred email address] or via email: [blurred email address]. You may also contact my advisor, Dr. Craig Mertler at [blurred email address] or via email: [blurred email address].

I am appreciative of the busy schedule of women’s center directors and sincerely appreciate your support in this research endeavor. Please complete the survey instrument by March 6, 2013, I look forward to including your institution in this study and hope that it will contribute to the research on leadership style and organizational structure at campus-based women’s centers.

Sincerely,

Nikkia DeLuz

Doctoral Candidate
Appendix C

Leadership Orientation Instrument (Self)
Leadership Orientations (Self)

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

You are asked to indicate how often each item is true of you.

Please use the following scale in answering each item:

1 2 3 4 5
Never Occasionally Sometimes Often Always

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

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

1. _____Think very clearly and logically.
2. _____Show high levels of support and concern for others.
3. _____Have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.
4. _____Inspire others to do their best.
5. _____Strongly emphasize careful planning and clear time lines.
6. _____Build trust through open and collaborative relationships.
7. _____Am a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.
8. _____Am highly charismatic.
9. _____Approach problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.
10. _____Show high sensitivity and concern for others’ needs and feelings.
11. _____Am unusually persuasive and influential.
Please use the following scale in answering each item:

Never  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Always

12. _____ Am an inspiration to others.
13. _____ Develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures.
14. _____ Foster high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.
15. _____ Anticipate and deal adroitly with organizational conflict.
16. _____ Am highly imaginative and creative.
17. _____ Approach problems with facts and logic.
18. _____ Am consistently helpful and responsive to others.
19. _____ Am very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.
20. _____ Communicate a strong and challenging vision and sense of mission.
21. _____ Set specific, measurable goals and hold people accountable for results.
22. _____ Listen well and am unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input.
23. _____ am politically very sensitive and skillful.
24. _____ See beyond current realities to create exciting new opportunities.
25. _____ Have extraordinary attention to detail.
26. _____ Give personal recognition for work well done.
27. _____ Develop alliances to build a strong base of support.
28. _____ Generate loyalty and enthusiasm.
29. _____ Strongly believe in clear structure and a chain of command.
30. Am a highly participative manager.

31. Succeed in the face of conflict and opposition.

32. Serve as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.

© 1990, Lee G. Bolman and Terence E. Deal
Appendix D

Women’s Center Director Demographic Questionnaire
Demographic Questionnaire

1. Type of institution?
   ___ Public
   ___ Private

2. Percentage of the female student population?
   ___ 0 -10 %
   ___ 10-20 %
   ___ 20-30 %
   ___ 30-40 %
   ___ 40-50 %
   ___ More than 50 %

3. Length of existence of the women’s center?
   ___ Less than 1 year
   ___ 1 - 3 years
   ___ 4 - 6 years
   ___ 7 -10 years
   ___ 11 - 15 years
   ___ More than 15 years

4. Size of the institution? (number of students enrolled)
   ___ Less than 2,500
   ___ 2,500 - 4,999
   ___ 5,000 - 9,999
   ___ 10,000 - 19,999
   ___ 20,000 - 29,999
   ___ 30,000 - 39,999
   ___ more than 40,000

5. Administrative structure of the women’s center?
   ___ Student run
   ___ Professionally staffed
Appendix E

Letter Requesting Permission to use Survey Instrument from

Dr. Bolman
To: Professor Lee G. Bolman  
Marian Bloch/Missouri Chair in Leadership  
Bloch School of Business and Public Administration  
University of Missouri – Kansas City  
5110 Cherry Street  
Kansas City, MO 64110

Dear Dr. Bolman,

I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Educational Leadership at Lynn University and my dissertation proposes to study the Leadership Styles of Campus-Based Women’s Centers in Higher Education in the southeast United States.

After reviewing the literature and perusing several dissertations, I have found your Leadership Orientations Instrument appropriate to the research proposed by my study. Therefore, I am requesting permission to utilize your Leadership Orientations Instrument (self) for the purpose of this study. The results of my research are available for your perusal if you are interested.

If you have any questions regarding this study or need clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me at [redacted] or via email: [redacted] You may also contact my advisor, Dr. Craig Mertler at [redacted] or via email: Cmertler@lynn.edu

I would like to thank you in advance for taking time from your busy schedule to consider this request.

Sincerely,

Nikkia DeLuz,

Doctoral Candidate
Appendix F

Approval to use Survey Instrument
Leadership Orientation Instrument

Bolman, Lee G.  
To: Nikkia Deluz

Wed, Oct 31, 2012 at 2:24 PM

Dear Ms. Deluz,

I'm happy to grant permission to use the Leadership Orientations Survey in your doctoral work. Best wishes for a successful study. I look forward to learning about the results.

Lee G. Bolman, Ph.D.
Professor and Marion Bloch/Missouri Chair in Leadership
Bloch School of Management
University of Missouri-Kansas City
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, MO 64113

Tel: [Redacted]

Web: www.leebolman.com