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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

It is the paradox of our times that precisely when the trust and credibility of leaders are at their lowest, when the beleaguered survivors in leadership positions feel unable to summon up the vestiges of power left to them, we most need people who can lead. (Bennis, 1978, p. 157)

Where have all the leaders gone? This lament is commonly reflected in the press, as well as by others who are concerned with the fate of our public institutions. Perhaps such a concern was most pointedly expressed in the title to an article in Harpers a few years ago: "Our Leaders Are Mostly Dead, and Leadership is in Bad Repute" (Barber, 1975). Events from Watts to Watergate and beyond have helped erode public confidence in our leaders. Large-scale societal issues such as Civil Rights and economic stability have permeated organizational boundaries, creating greater diversity among organizational members. This diversity has, in turn, created multiple constituencies each wanting a voice in the way the organization is run. Many of our organizations have become so complex that the impact of any one person is severely limited (Jennings, 1970; Boyer, 1978; Mills, 1967). Organizational executives, by themselves, often lack the
"total" organizational knowledge and power necessary to make a significant personal impact. As a result, many chief executive officers in both public and private sector organizations have "dropped out," "burned out," or have been "pushed out" by factors not always within their control (Koltai and Erickson, 1979-80; Bauer, 1981). These phenomena have generated speculation that there may be a shortage of "leaders," and a general lack of "leadership" in our society. Maccoby (1979) suggested an alternative hypothesis; namely, that neither the functions of leadership nor the image of the leader fits the needs of large organizations, especially business and government, in an age of rights, limits, new values, and a changing concept of productivity, which have not yet crystallized into a new ideal character (p.17).

In a subsequent book on leadership, Maccoby (1981) made a plea for new images of leadership that would be more consistent with the changing social character. He concluded that good leadership at the top of the organization is not enough; a new model of leadership is needed which brings out the best in the new social character, as well as the older social character that coexists with it.

One area of public concern appears to be with the leadership in agencies of the government such as public health, and education. The focus of this discussion will be on leadership in public educational organizations, particularly those at the postsecondary level.
The prevailing images of leadership in higher education are examined.

**Background of the Problem**

**IMAGES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE PRESIDENCY**

Concerned with the rapid turnover of chief executives who head colleges and universities, Bennis (1978) questioned the quality of management and leadership in higher education institutions. Yet, Hodgkinson and Meeth (1971) have written:

> It is not surprising that some of the ablest, most intelligent, imaginative, and effective presidents have chosen to leave office. Each has his own reason for quitting but no one can doubt that the intolerable frustrations and personal abuses they have had to suffer, combined with the lack of any clear definition of the functions and powers of the office, have been decisive factors in the decision (p. 190).

The tenure of university presidents is estimated to be about four years (Bennis, 1978), a significant change from the eight-year average turnover rate observed by Selden (1960) in his investigation. Average tenure of two-year college presidents is approximately eight years (Nason, 1979).

In a study of college presidents who resigned during the academic year 1975-76, Cole (1976) found two basic reasons for their exists: (1) they resigned because they faced situations with which they felt they could not cope, and (2) they resigned because they had achieved their goals. Problems named most often by
those who had resigned because of their situations, were relations with governing boards, relations with faculty, and budgetary problems.

Walker (1977) suggested three reasons for the increase in presidential exists—whether retired, fired, or relocated:

(1) the university presidency is too complex with too diverse a group of constituents to serve;

(2) the students, faculty, and trustees have misbehaved so outrageously that resignation is the only honorable course;

(3) the president confesses he has simply been inadequate for the task at hand. (p. 53)

What these authors have implied is that chief executives may lack the training and experience needed to cope with the complexities and ambiguities of their jobs, frequently caused by organizational uncertainties. Stated more simply, presidential resignations may be due to one or a combination of the following factors: (1) the job itself, (2) the context within which the job is performed, and (3) the person performing the job. Further examination of the evolution of the American college presidency as well as each of the factors listed above may shed some light on the images of leadership in higher education.
Evolution of the American College Presidency

The American college presidency was modeled after the rectors and chancellors of large European universities, although the position of president is uniquely American (Schmidt, 1957). The functions of the American college president were much broader and more varied than those of European rectors and chancellors. Harvard University, in 1640, was the first American college to use the position and title of president, although other colonial colleges had used titles such as "rector," "provost," and "chancellor" (Thwing, 1926). Prator (1963) described two factors that spurred the growth of the college presidency:

In colonial times, the control of colleges increasingly fell to a board of men chosen from outside the professoriate, an idea taken from the Scots. It meant, however, that the board was forced to rely heavily on the president to assume executive-type responsibilities. The board's authority came to be essentially centered in the presidential office; . . . the teaching staff were seldom permanent and had little professional cohesiveness. Often, the president was one of few permanent members of a college staff. The only secure and sustained professional office in American collegiate education was that of the college president himself (p. 9).

Colonial colleges were generally small, elite collections of scholars, fairly insulated from societal influence. College presidents during the colonial period were ordained ministers (Schmidt, 1957); their primary purpose was to provide moral and intellectual leadership for the institution.
Hodgkinson and Meeth (1971) described the pre-Civil War college president as

the principal faculty member, administrator, educator (who presumably looked after the welfare and extra-curricular activities of his students), fund raiser, record keeper, and accountant (p. 13).

The president was often considered the most important individual in the college.

The post-Civil War period brought two significant changes in the character of higher education organizations. The first change came with the importation of the German university model, with its emphasis on research and rigorous study. These universities were more highly structured, with clearer goals, a more distinct division of labor, and a more highly developed technology. Presidents were full-time administrators, without teaching or clerical responsibilities. As Rudolph (1962) noted,

The clergyman president went into discard because he lacked skill in the ways of the world, because his commitment to the classical curriculum stood in the way of the more practical and popular emphasis which commended itself to the trustees, and because the world in which the colleges and universities now moved was more secular, less subject to religious influence (p. 419).

This period spawned a number of brilliant educational leaders who had a profound impact on the shape of higher education. They were men who Cowley (1980) perceived had enough leisure, vision, and ability to shape the future of their institutions.
The second major change came as a result of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. The first Act, passed before the end of the Civil War, paved the way for the emergence of "public" or "land grant" colleges by setting aside state land revenues for colleges willing to provide non-academic, vocational programs in agriculture and the mechanical arts (Hodgkinson and Meeth, 1971). The second Act made provisions for federal aid to land grant colleges for research, student assistance and building projects. An increase in the diversity in and complexity of American colleges during this period resulted in an expansion of the functions of administration. Educational bureaucracies, helmed by "captains of erudition" (Veblen, 1904) began to take shape. Previously perceived as a moral and educational leader, the president was now seen as an entrepreneur, a more authoritarian practitioner of the principles of scientific management (Dodd, 1962). Cowley (1980) described this period (1890-1910) as the "age of titans."

Societal changes in the first quarter of the 20th Century increased the need for more egalitarian forms of higher education. Junior colleges, and technical and proprietary schools had been established as additional higher education options. Faculty, alumni, and state and federal governments became more involved
in the governance of American colleges. The context of the presidency began to change so rapidly that many presidents could no longer maintain the all-powerful, all-knowing image of the past. According to Hodgkinson and Meeth (1971),

The current status of the chief executive officer is an almost complete reversal of the position of his predecessors. Typically they were the servants of neither the faculty nor the trustees. Early presidents engaged staff members and disposed of them for any reason they considered proper; they frequently selected the members of the board as well, and decided what matters to bring to the board for action; presidents often described plans for the future development of the institution in public before getting approval from anyone; they made budgets, fixed salaries, and often managed investments. All in all, they dominated the life of the institution. . . . Yet this conception of administrative omnipotence has less reality today than the Loch Ness monster (pp. 189-190).

Presidents no longer had time for the thinking, planning, development, scholarship, and statesmanship of past educational leaders (Cowley, 1980). As Ness (1971) lamented, while reflecting on his long tenure as a college president:

The college presidency or deanship, with all its tribulations, was a gentlemanly, at its best even a scholarly, occupation. Whether it can ever be so again is highly speculative. It could go in the direction of the corporate manager or conversely of the institutional warden (p. 3).

The emphasis on management has, in the view of some, reduced the presidential image from one of leadership to that of headship (Cohen and Roueche, 1969; Hodgkinson and Meeth, 1971; Cowley, 1980). It is this
concern that brings attention to the images of leadership in today's colleges and universities. An examination of the president's job may shed some light on the prevailing images of the chief executive of America's modern colleges and universities.

The President's Job

The college president "is like a hunter who spends ninety-five percent of his time swatting mosquitoes, while remembering that he is where he is in order to get a shot at a moose" (Coffman, 1959). This caricature was provided by the former president of a large mid-western university, and reflects a sense of ambiguity and complexity in the job of the chief executive officer.

Parkinson (1970) described the responsibilities of a college president as follows:

The theoretical responsibilities of the modern college president may rank second in importance to the governor, his domain often including a city as well as a campus. He will hold sway over faculty and student bodies numbering in the thousands, over nuclear accelerators and playing fields, a football stadium and a concert hall, a radio station and an experimental farm. He may have his own police force and fire brigade, his own newspaper and airfield, his own shopping center and club. He does everything but mint a coin in his own effigy. Yet, in sharp contrast with an admiral or a general, he has never been specifically trained, assessed or scientifically chosen (p. 2).

According to Cohen and March (1974), "there is no well-defined model of the presidential job" (p. 57).
There is, however, one certainty on which every public college president can rely—he or she will serve "at the pleasure" of the governing board of the institution. The governing board has supreme legal responsibility for both fiscal and policy matters of the institution, and the authority delegated to the president by the board may be extensive or relatively limited. This factor alone may create a number of uncertainties for the president.

Seldom does the academic community agree on (or even understand) the expected role of the chief executive officer (Kauffman, 1980). Pointing out the difficulty encountered in describing the role of president, Kauffman wrote:

Each trustee, professor, student, legislator, and donor has a metaphor for the college or university from which flows an image of the way a president is supposed to be! (p. 12)

Metaphors used to describe the presidential role have varied from political mediator (Kerr, 1963); caretaker (Dodds, 1962); market entrepreneur or orchestra conductor (Kauffman, 1980); dispensing machine operator, zoo keeper, or chief guide (Monson, 1967).

Although these metaphors have little utility in understanding the daily activities of college and university presidents, they do help point out the anomalous and ambiguous nature of the presidential role.
An examination of the literature revealed three major concerns regarding the nature of the college president's job which have been debated without resolution. The first is whether the role of the chief executive is that of "educational leader," or "institutional manager." Faculty may contend that it is the former; the board of trustees may insist it is the latter. Part of the disagreement regarding the president's role may be due to conflicting self-interests, but much of the confusion can probably be attributed to a lack of definition of the functions of "management," "administration," and "leadership." In 1977, Howe warned:

> There is a growing danger of confusing leadership with some combination of management and skill at conciliation among opposing constituencies in an institution. Management and conciliating skills are important, but the sum of the highest possible development of each does not add up to leadership (p. 21). . . . management and leadership are different activities (p. 23).

Zaleznik (1977) claimed that managers differ from leaders in motivation, personal history, and how they think and act. A primary function of a college president, according to Kauffman (1980), is leadership—setting the institution's course through influence on the shaping and reshaping of goals (as opposed to management and control, which is designed to maintain the organization). Dubin (1980), on the other hand, stated that
... effective organizations can be managed and supervised and not led, while some ineffective organizations can be led into their difficulties without the benefit of management and supervision (p. 225).

In contrast to the authors cited above, Stoke (1959) claimed that the president's real job is administration—the art of transforming his visions from the abstract to the concrete (p. 34). In a similar vein, Richman and Farmer (1974) distinguished between "management" and "administration" as follows:

Management involves strategy, innovation, initiating and bringing about change, creative problem-solving and decision-making, actively seeking out alternatives and opportunities, reformulating goals and priorities, redeploying resources, negotiating, resolving conflicts, dynamic or active leadership, diplomacy, statesmanship, and a high degree of risk-taking and entrepreneurship.

Administration implies more routine decision-making and operations, and the implementation of goals, priorities, and strategies, usually determined by others (p. 14).

The reader may ask just how different this description of management and administration is from the distinctions made earlier between management and leadership. The obvious point to be made by these illustrations is that the terms "management," "administration," and "leadership" are without definitive meaning and are often used interchangeably in the literature.

Another unresolved concern relates to the similarity or difference between the functions of a
college president and chief executive officers of business and industry. Many college presidents have modeled their jobs after their counterparts in business and industry. Some authors argue that higher education is a corporate enterprise (a knowledge industry) and that the role of chief executive is similar to that of their business and industry counterparts (Litchfield, 1956; Stoke, 1959; Simon, 1967; Lahti, 1973; Boettinger, 1973). Others, however, have argued that higher education organizations are significantly different from other types of organizations and require unique styles of administration and structure (Corson, 1960; Millett, 1962; Kerr, 1963; Baldridge, et al, 1978). These differing points of view are reflected in the way in which college presidents perceive and carry out their roles, and in the way their roles are perceived by others, particularly governing board members. College governing boards are typically dominated (in numbers) by persons more familiar with management in business and industry, and are often unfamiliar with the complexities of higher education organizations. Thus, their expectations of the president's role may differ from the role expectations that the president has acquired through his/her own training and experience.
A third unresolved issue concerns the chief executive's impact on institutional outcomes. It is argued by some that the work activities of the chief executive make little difference in the long-range outcome of the institution (Mayhew, 1971; Cohen and March, 1974; Mayhew and Glenn, 1975). In essence, these authors have claimed that the organization and its environment determine the amount of power and authority a president has to carry out institutional goals. Cohen and March (1974) stated, for example:

The presidency is an illusion. Important aspects of the role seem to disappear on close examination... Compared to the heroic expectations he and others might have, the president has modest control over the events of college life. The contributions he makes can easily be swamped by outside events or the diffuse qualities of university decision making (p. 2).

They maintained that because of the complexities and ambiguities inherent in educational institutions, the chief executive's job is reactive, parochial, conventional, and has a modest impact on the achievement of institutional goals. They concluded:

It is probably a mistake for a college president to imagine that what he does in office affects significantly either the long-run position of the institution or his reputation as president (p. 203).

In contract to the view stated above, some authors contend that the chief executive is a central figure in shaping the future of the organization (Stoke, 1959; Cohen and Roueche, 1969; Hesburgh, 1971; Millett, 1976;
Burke, 1977). Although they freely admit that many forces impinge upon the president's power and control, they maintain that new attention to the president's managerial role has increased the centrality of that office. Claiming that education is in transition, moving from an offensive position to a defensive one, Koltai and Erickson (1979-80) suggested that "while the president's influence is decreasing publicly, it is increasing privately" (p. 9). Without exception, these authors, regardless of differing views on presidential power and influence, suggested that the president take a stronger, more central role in the shaping of the institution.

In the foregoing paragraphs, some of the ambiguities and complexities of the college and university chief executive's job have been pointed out. Perceptions of the presidential role are conflicting and confusing. It has been suggested by some authors that much of the confusion surrounding the presidential role stems from the context within which the president works. Walker (1977), for example, claimed:

Presidential survival operates relatively independently from presidential competence and is nothing more than an accurate reflection of the political nature of the office and sometimes the institution (p. 53).

The following section will examine the nature of higher education organizations.
The Context of the President's Job

The work of the college and university chief executive does not exist in a vacuum. Rather, the executive's work is influenced by the constituencies, constraints and contingencies extant in the presidential office. To gain additional insight into these contextual factors, we must know more about the nature of the things that the leader is leading and the manager is managing (Vaill, 1978). According to Stoke (1959), ...

... no one will understand the college president in America, his services and his responsibilities, without understanding the nature of colleges and universities themselves (p. 3).

Many of today's public colleges and universities are microcosms of society. Rapid societal changes have produced a more complex set of factors with which college presidents must deal. These leaders are being pulled from all sides by a variety of constituents which may include students, faculty, governmental agencies, legal institutions, labor groups, partisan political groups, and the general public. The chief executive is at the point of convergence (in the organization) where all the forces which shape the organization intersect (Stoke, 1959), much like Dahl's (1961) characterization of the mayor of New Haven. Influential individuals and groups may have differing
expectations of the presidential role, as illustrated by Kerr (1963):

The university president in the United States is expected to be a friend of the students, a colleague of the faculty, a good fellow with the alumni, a sound administrator with the trustees, a good speaker with the public, an astute bargainer ... a politician ... a spokesman ... a diplomat ... a scholar ... a public servant ... a decent human being, a good husband and father, an active member of the church ... (p. 29).

Multiple constituencies, coupled with paradoxical demands, place the president in a variety of dilemmas to which Hesburgh (1979) has spoken:

If he is always home, he is a nobody; if he is often away, he is neglecting his homework. If he spends little time with the faculty, he is aloof; if he spends much time with them, he is interfering in their proper business. If he balances the budget, he is stingy; if he cannot balance the budget, he is irresponsible and incompetent (p. 46).

Ness (1971), reflecting on his own career as a college president, stated that this is the first time in academic history when the chief executive officer cannot please anyone.

A number of constraints which inhibit the president's ability to lead the organization effectively were cited by Bennis (1978): (1) loss of autonomy, (2) external relationships, (3) internal constituencies, (4) litigation, and (5) labor intensiveness of the organization. Societal changes in the last 20 years have had a significant impact on
higher education organizations. Civil Rights legislation mandated the admission to academe of a more heterogeneous and diverse group of students—new age groups, ethnic groups, and economic groups. The "knowledge explosion" which followed Sputnik created unprecedented growth in student enrollments. Student activism in the 1960s and early 1970s, as well as the concern for a more direct relationship between academe and the world of work, contributed to an erosion of public confidence in higher education. Increased reliance on state and federal governments for funding made the organization more open to government and court intervention. Finally, a downturn in the economy in the last few years has forced many institutions to retrench. Thus, increased organizational complexity, coupled with increased dependency on external agencies for resources, has made higher education organizations more vulnerable to outside pressures. "Anonymous, faceless leaders," such as accrediting agencies, federal agencies, state coordinating/governing boards, courts, and others, are taking over public post-secondary institutions (Mundt, 1978; Glenny, 1979).

As institutional autonomy has been eroded by constituent groups both inside and outside the organization, the task of the chief executive has become more ambiguous. The "captains of erudition" of
Thorsten Veblen's time have become captains of a "foundering ship on which the passengers, crew, and officers play out a polite game of Robert's Rules of Order below deck, debating over who is to be in charge" (Bonham, 1979, p. 12). When there is no one in charge, there is no one to be held accountable.

The changes in post-secondary education cited above have not affected all higher education organizations in the same way, or at the same time. There are a variety of types of public higher education organizations, from two-year technical colleges to comprehensive community colleges, from four-year liberal arts colleges to multiversities. It is probable that there are many contextual differences between the two-year technical college and the multiversity because of the type of institution (as reflected in their mission), and the demands placed upon them by the external environment. Moreover, it is probable that institutions with similar missions, organizational structures, and external environments will make similar demands on their institutional leaders (Stoke, 1959). As institutions go through various stages of development, the needs of the institution may change, calling for changes in the images of institutional leadership (Prator, 1963; Spector, 1971). A president who has led an institution
through a phenomenal growth period, for example, may not fare as well during periods of decline (McIntosh and Maier, 1976).

Some who have studied the organizational structures of colleges and universities have characterized these institutions as complex, loosely structured organizations with ambiguous goals and conflicting self-interests of multiple constituencies. Can this be true for all higher education organizations? Conventional logic would suggest this is not the case. There are bound to be many colleges and universities that function with clearly defined goals, in a fairly stable environment. This suggests that the requirements for institutional leadership, and thus the institutional leader, may differ accordingly. The following section will examine the personal characteristics of those who occupy the position of chief executive officer.

Personal Characteristics of the College President

Bennis (1978, p. 146) has asked: "Are leaders an endangered species?" In a review and analysis of the "great man" theory of leadership, Jennings (1960) concluded that the quality of persons in leadership roles has changed over the years; "princes" and "heroes" are concepts of the past. The following is a profile of the person who occupies the chief executive office in higher education.
**Personal Background.** The "average" college president in 1968 was a white, protestant male in his early 50s who had a doctorate in the humanities and was in his first college presidency. He came from an agrarian family, had achieved the rank of professor, and had worked his way through the administrative ranks (department chair, dean) in the institution he headed (Ferrari, 1970).

Through a normal evolutionary process, there has been a slight change in the presidential profile since Ferrari's study. There are, for example, more women and minority presidents. In 1981, there were 231 women college presidents in the United States; only 72 of those were presidents of public institutions (American Council on Education, 1982). There has also been a slight shift in geographic origin, from rural to urban, and an increase in educational level of the president's family. More chief executives have doctorates today (many with specialized training in administration), and they are more mobile, having changed institutions at least three times before assuming the presidency (Barr, 1981). When looking at the "average" college president today, however, the profile has not changed significantly since 1968.

**Training and Experience.** Traditionally, most public college presidents have "come through the
chair—moving from faculty member, to department chairperson, to dean or provost before being "tapped" for a presidency. Most have had scholarly expertise in a subject-matter discipline; relatively few have had formal training in administration. Their credentials may impress those who feel the college needs a scholarly image, but become less impressive when it is realized they may be ill-equipped to deal with the kinds of problems that confront college presidents today. The traditions of the past served the problems of those decades well, because the problems were largely educational. The problems faced by the chief executive today, however, are much like those found in private sector organizations—more political and entrepreneurial than educational (Ansoff, 1973; Cohen and March, 1974; Koltai and Erickson, 1979-80).

Solutions to these problems require a variety of cognitive as well as affective skills. The executive needs a repertoire which includes a wide range of strategies and sensing devices which can be activated when appropriate.

There is some question that chief executives in public postsecondary institutions gain the necessary skills for their jobs through experience. One of the requisite skills needed by an executive, for example, is to understand the gestalt of his/her organization.
Yet, their previous jobs (faculty member, dean, vice president) have had a rather narrow disciplinary or departmental focus. Such foci have, in many cases, prevented them from viewing the organization as a whole. In a study of two-year college presidents, Young (1981) found that neither experience nor training provided adequate skills which the presidents felt they needed for lobbying, collective bargaining, trustee relations, and relations with accrediting agencies. Moore (1971) emphasized the need for such skills a decade earlier, when college presidents were facing different but equally volatile situations. Hesburgh attributed the presidential turnover during that time (late 1960s early 1970s) to the practice of "seat-of-the-pants" leadership (MacEoin, 1976). The specific circumstances are different today, but many of the same administrative uncertainties exist. In addition to the questions raised about the adequacy of leadership training and experience of college presidents, the selection of these leaders has also come under scrutiny.

Selection. The most important job of the board of trustees of a college is the selection of their chief executive officer (Moore, 1973). Yet, Ness (1971) claimed that the selection of a college president was one of the most "capricious, disorganized,
unprofessional operations in human society" (p. 60).

More recently, the literature has described elaborate models designed to conduct presidential searches, but there is no evidence that these models result in the best match of leader to institution. Members of search committees do not always understand the organization, or the tasks of the chief executive well enough to know what skills a candidate should have. Moreover, the politics of the search process often overshadow the fundamental purpose—to find the best person for the job. What results from the combination of these factors is undue reliance on a candidate's past successes. As Ness (1971) pointed out,

... the tradition in the United States has all too often encouraged trustees to give long-term presidential appointments to retired generals and admirals, prospective bishops, exhausted business executives, and the like, men with no presumptive affection for academic administration. Although some of these have been brilliant successes, others have been so unfamiliar with the even unsympathetic toward academia that their administrations have had disastrous consequences (p. 7).

Since the complex contextual factors which surround the job of many chief executives vary widely from one college to another, a president who is successful at one institution holds no guarantee that he/she would succeed at another. How is the effectiveness of those who head our colleges and universities measured?
Evaluation. Some critics have argued that there is no single body competent to judge the effectiveness of a college president. Tucker and Mautz (1979) claimed that

few members of the university community are able to render an informed judgment about the president's total performance . . . the position is such that some dissatisfaction with the president's performance is inevitable, be he saint or sinner (p. 256).

Yet constituents both inside and outside the academic community claim a right to participate in the evaluation process. Their input into the evaluation process, however, is often narrow in scope, and based on subjective rather than objective criteria. Faculty judgments, for example, tend to be based on opinions of the executive's style or on how well he/she responded to faculty self-interests. Students seldom know much about the administrative process, and tend to base their judgments of the chief executive on images supplied by others. Alumni and others who are viewing the chief executive from a distance tend to base their judgments on isolated incidents, e.g., the win-loss record of the football team, termination of a faculty member, an increase in tuition, or the acquisition of funds for a new facility (Tucker and Mautz, 1979). Rarely is there consensus among these constituents regarding the criteria for presidential evaluation.
Thus, while the judgments of these groups may be relevant, they are by no means decisive (Nason, 1979).

While many individuals and groups make judgments about the chief executive, usually his or her competence is determined by the boss—the board of trustees. Yet formal evaluations, against measurable criteria, are of recent vintage. Most boards tend to conduct continuous informal assessments of the president's performance. Evaluations are often based on the president's past successes rather than the job to be performed. Since the context within which the president works has changed over time, and since board members have come and gone during that period, there is little corporate memory on which to base a sound judgment of past successes (Tucker and Mautz, 1979). Thus, the president ends up walking the proverbial tight-rope, trying to please everyone some of the time, pleasing no one all of the time. And perhaps too often the task of presidential evaluation becomes one of self-assessment, having to be one's own judge of one's own competency.

Summary

Some insight into the prevailing images of college presidents has been gleaned from this review of the literature. The presidential image portrayed is that of a fairly ineffectual chief executive who is
controlled by his/her organization and its environment, and lacks the will, the training, and experience to change these conditions. There have been few studies which have challenged the so-called "pathologies" of leadership. Rather, the focus of attention has been on those presidents who have "dropped out," "burned out," or have been "pushed out" of their positions by factors not always within their control. Much of what has been reported in the literature is anecdotal and speculative rather than empirical in nature, and there is no clear evidence that the factors discussed in the previous pages (job, context, person), in isolation, have caused presidential exits, or have diminished the quality of leadership in higher education.

Yet colleges continue to operate; many of them flourish. What about those college presidents who survive? Very little attention has been given to those who have successfully guided their institutions through changing environmental stimuli. Buxton, et al (1976) polled 125 public college and university presidents and found that 87 percent of the respondents were "moderately satisfied" to "satisfied" with their jobs. They cited professional autonomy, participation in policy formulation, relationships with various constituencies, and goal attainment as prominent reasons for their
satisfaction. The authors summarized their findings as follows:

Although many presidents admit that their work is exhausting and frequently frustrating, they still regard it as the capstone of the educational profession. Most find the job challenging and very rewarding (p. 33).

In a similar study of California community college presidents, Walsvick (1981) concluded:

the motivations to remain as president of the community college indicated a high degree of satisfaction, a commitment to the office of the presidency, and a degree of idealism that would not be found in a self-centered, disillusioned group of individuals (p. ii).

Walsvick's conclusions are in direct contrast to the images of the college and university chief executive portrayed by the majority of the literature. More is known about the factors which come into play when a president is removed from office, perhaps because the removal of a college president engenders more publicity and speculation. Little is known about the factors which make it possible for a president to remain on the job for an indefinite length of time.

It may be that today many of the large public colleges and universities are too complex for the heroes, and too egalitarian for the princes whom Jennings (1960) described. Perhaps educational leaders are endangered species. More plausible, however, is the possibility that the environment in which these leaders work has contributed to a mutation in the
office of chief executive. The literature has provided clues to some of the factors which may have helped shape the negative presidential image. Examination of the literature revealed, for example, that the president's job is not well understood by others. It has been suggested that the rights and responsibilities of the office are not prescribed in standard operating procedures; nor are they articulated well by the incumbent or agreed upon by those who interact most with the president. In addition, little is known about the president's constituencies or their impact on his/her job performance, or the extent to which factors in the organization and the environment shape the presidential role. Finally, and most obvious, is the fact that the interrelationships or dynamics of all of these factors are not fully understood. It is safe to say, for example, that the way in which presidents carry out their roles differs from institution to institution, and that the president's role has changed over the years. The reasons offered for the variation, however, have been speculative at best.

Perhaps it is these factors which have contributed to Carbone's (1981) notion that there are a lot of illusions about presidential leadership. He ended his book, Presidential Passages, which was based on the results of a national survey of immediate ex-presidents.
about "life after the college presidency," with a series of myths about the college presidency (Figure 1). His observations about the "realities" led him to conclude that much of what has been written on the presidency has little application to the present. . . . This means that there is a genuine need for studies of the presidency of postsecondary institutions as it has developed in recent years (pp. xi-xii).

This is the challenge to which the present study was directed—to discover the realities of the college president's job.

**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of this study was to gain a greater understanding of the nature and scope of high-level leadership in public organizations by focusing on the position of chief executive officer of public two-year colleges. The aim of the inquiry was to determine the dynamics of the chief executive's job; the issues, problems, acts and activities which shape the nature and direction of the job. Executive behavior *per se* was not the primary emphasis of this study; rather, the study was focused on the antecedents to executive behavior—the work relationships, the technology involved in the job, and the individual and organizational characteristics that impacted the executive's work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MYTHS</th>
<th>REALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- there is some singular, definable office called a presidency.</td>
<td>- the job of president differs widely from campus to campus and, in large measure, is defined by the size, type, tradition, and control of each institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the president's job is clearly defined and understood.</td>
<td>- the president's job is what the president makes it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- presidents have a plan of action and provide leadership for their institution.</td>
<td>- few presidents are proactive; most react to circumstances and pressures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- presidents are in charge of their institutions.</td>
<td>- presidents are external agents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- boards make policy; presidents administer it.</td>
<td>- policy is usually vague, and a board often does not understand its role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- shared governance prevents a president from exercising authority.</td>
<td>- presidents have power and some know how to use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- presidents have impact.</td>
<td>- few presidents leave their mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the president's team works together to support his/her efforts.</td>
<td>- presidential staffs are not always carefully built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the job seeks the person.</td>
<td>- it is all right to aspire to be president.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- old presidents return to teaching.</td>
<td>- most presidents who leave office enjoy active professional lives in the nonacademic world.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: "Illusions of Presidential Leadership" (Adapted from Carbone, 1981, pp. 79-86).
The preceding pages pointed to the relatively limited amount of information which presently exists about the contingencies that shape the president's job. Thus, the inquiry was guided by three broad questions:

(1) What are the elements that comprise the chief executive's job?

(2) What are the factors that shape the chief executive's job?

(3) How do these factors interrelate?

Considerable speculation has been found in the literature on chief executives about behavioral outcomes, particularly leader effectiveness. Yet little empirical data were found which described the requirements of top level leadership, or the basis upon which effectiveness should be determined. In the same vein, most of the research on chief executives has been at the micro-level, concentrating only on a single variable, or a single set of variables. Seldom has an attempt been made to study leadership from a macro-level perspective or to use a multivariate approach to study the work activities of a chief executive officer. Even less attention has been given to the interaction of variables as they impact the everyday work activities of the executive.

Although there was considerable information about college and university presidents, there have only been a few attempts to describe aspects of the president's
job. Even those attempts have been limited in scope. Ferrari (1970) and Barr (1981) conducted rather comprehensive studies of the personal characteristics of college presidents; Foresi (1974) and Kauffman (1980) investigated the role and functions of college presidents. Cohen and March (1974) and Baldridge, et al (1978) concentrated primarily on the study of the organizational context within which college and university presidents worked. One research effort (Morgan, 1970) did attempt to address a greater range of variables, but by the author's own admission, it was a study which evolved in a somewhat haphazard way as he attempted to learn what he would be expected to do as a newly elected college president.

Collectively, all of these studies involved a variety of methods and a diverse population. When considered separately, however, they did not provide a definitive statement regarding the chief executive's job. Thus, it was necessary for this investigator to synthesize and analyze the literature in order to gain a broader view of the dynamics of the job of college presidents.

Two primary methods were employed to reach the objectives of this research. First, a thorough examination of related literature was made in order to synthesize what is already known and add greater depth
to the study. Second, those who hold positions as chief executive officers of public two-year colleges were studied to find out how they interpret the dynamics of their jobs.

**Definition of Terms**

At the outset, some terms needed to be defined as they were used in this study. Additional terms were given more explicit definition from the review and synthesis of the literature.

Organizations, which are comprised of individuals and groups, have dynamic as well as static elements. The dynamics of personality and the dynamics of groups, both inside and outside the organization, make up a complex system of interactions that drive the organization. Within the organizational setting, a job is a post of employment and includes all tasks to be performed in that position. The dynamics of a job, therefore, are the factors and forces in interaction which shape the nature and direction of that job.

A college or university chief executive officer is "the principal administrative official responsible for the direction of all operations of an institution of higher education; he or she usually reports to a governing board" (Educational Directory, p. 529). Common synonyms for the term "chief executive officer" are "president," "chancellor," "chief administrative
officer," and "institutional leader." These terms are used interchangeably throughout this study.

For purposes of this study, dynamics of the chief executive's job is defined as the driving forces (acts, actors, activities/events in interaction) that shape what the institutional leader does or does not do in relation to his/her job. The term institutional leader is used here only as a positional designation for one who heads (principal administrative responsibility) the organization.

Public two-year colleges are postsecondary educational institutions (junior college, community college, technical college or institute, branch campus or extension center) which provide course work leading to college transfer and/or to terminal certificates or associate degrees. These colleges receive the majority of their operational funds from public taxes, either at the state or local jurisdiction (or both), and are chartered by the state in which they are located.

Assumptions

Some authors have taken the position that a chief executive's job cannot be understood through traditional research techniques (Barnard, 1938; Argyris, 1976). Similar claims were made regarding college presidents (Stoke, 1959), making it necessary to base the research on the following assumptions:
(1) That is is possible for college presidents to describe to a third party what they do;
(2) That the descriptions they provide are an accurate reflection of what they actually do; and
(3) That from these descriptions, some broader generalizations can be made about high-level leadership.

The position has been taken in assumption #2 that the presidents' descriptions of what they do will be their perceptual definitions of reality. A number of authors contended that one's perceptual definition of reality may be no less accurate than an observer's interpretation of the situation as observed (Thomas, 1928; Lewin, 1936; Rogers, 1951; Goffman, 1974). In other words, if people have defined situations as real, they are real in their consequences.

**Significance of the Research**

Mintzberg (1981) claimed that the primary outcome of leadership research should be to "help Bill and Barbara do their jobs better." The findings of this inquiry serve that purpose, as well as contribute in a significant way to the construction of a theory of high-level leadership.

The implications drawn from the findings have significance for the selection, training/development, and evaluation of top-level leaders, both current and potential. As more training programs are being
developed for executives, there is increasing concern that they are not addressing the real needs of the administrators. By learning more about the nature of the college president's job, the needs of the president as well as the organization can more adequately be addressed.

There have been few systematic attempts to find out what chief executives of public organizations do. Thus, the findings provide a foundation upon which to build a theory of high-level leadership. Since an integrated model for the study of institutional leadership was used to conduct this research, it is also possible to speculate regarding the leadership or management roles of chief executives in other education organizations as well as their counterparts in other sectors of society (e.g., corporation presidents, mayors, church leaders, chiefs of police).

The findings also serve as a foundation for further research on other aspects of the conceptual model. A better understanding of the dynamics of the president's job provides some parameters for investigating how executives enact their responsibilities and what outcomes and effects are achieved by their behavioral responses to situations.

Finally, an important aspect of this research was the involvement of practitioners in every stage. Their
full participation added greater depth and legitimacy to the findings.

Chapter Summary

The leadership image of today's college and university presidents, as reflected in the literature, is not positive. This may be the result of a combination of factors. First, there is a paucity of empirical data on top-level leadership; that which does exist is rather narrow in focus. Second, a significant portion of the literature on college chief executives is in the form of cathartic exposes written by former presidents. Third, times have changed and organizations have matured, but the images of top-level leadership have not changed accordingly. Finally, little has been written about the dynamic aspects of a chief executive's job. In combination, these factors have led to the thesis that the images of top-level leadership are out of synchronization with reality.

The purpose of this study was to explore the dynamics of the job of chief executives of public two-year colleges in Ohio. Chapter II contains a review and synthesis of related literature on the chief executive's job. The method of inquiry is outlined in Chapter III, and the research findings are presented in Chapters IV and V. Conclusions drawn from the research
as well as practical and theoretical implications and recommendations for further study are reported in Chapter VI.
... we seldom examine leadership at high levels in the organization—the level of leadership where organizational impact is most likely ... we have little data on the leadership behavior of corporate presidents, chief executives, boards of directors, cabinets, or the like (McCall and Lombardo, 1978, p. 152).

This statement regarding the future of leadership research is no less true for public postsecondary education executives than it is for their counterparts in business and industry. The literature on chief executives is largely biographical or autobiographical, dominated by the personal accounts of practicing or former executives, whether corporation president, political leader, school superintendent, or college president.

The preceding chapter emphasized that the leadership image of today's college and university presidents, as reflected in the literature, may be out of synchronization with reality. A number of plausible explanations were given for this thesis, including the fact that little has been written about the dynamic aspects of a chief executive's job. An initial review of related literature confirmed the fact that empirically tested models for analyzing the dynamics of the
chief executive's job were virtually nonexistent. Thus, it was necessary to synthesize existing normative and empirical work in order to (1) understand the chief executive's job in its broadest context, and (2) to begin categorizing and classifying variables, dimensions, and indicators that could be used in a conceptual framework for the study of the dynamics of a chief executive's job.

This chapter develops a conceptual understanding of the chief executive's job through an exploration of theoretical and empirical considerations. Summary observations are made about the variables, dimensions and indicators deemed important for the study of the dynamics of the chief executive's job. Interrelationships within and among variables are also explored.

**The Dynamics of a Chief Executive's Job:**

**Theoretical and Empirical Considerations**

Perhaps one of the most widely referenced studies of the work activities of chief executive officers is Henry Mintzberg's (1973) *The Nature of Managerial Work*. Mintzberg observed and recorded the daily work activities of five chief executive officers: the chairman and chief executive of a major consulting firm, the president of a high technology research and development firm, the general director of a large urban hospital, the president of a firm producing consumer
goods, and the superintendent of a large suburban school system. An analysis of the work activities of these five executives, based on chronological records compiled from five weeks of observation (one week each), yielded patterns of similarity and variation in the content and characteristics of the chief executives' jobs.

One of several conclusions Mintzberg reached about the work activities of chief executives was that not enough is known about the contingencies that shape the executive's job. Although Mintzberg was concerned primarily with invariant characteristics, he proposed that both the similarities and differences in managers' jobs needed to be identified. After analyzing the differences in the work activities of the five executives, he concluded that "the work of a particular manager at a particular point in time is determined by the influence that four 'nested' sets of variables have on the basic role requirements and work characteristics" (p. 102). He then proposed a contingency theory of management work (see Figure 2) comprising four sets of variables:

- environmental variables, including characteristics of the milieu, the industry, and the organization;
- job variables, including the level in the organization and the function supervised;
- person variables, including the personality and style of the incumbent; and
- situational variables, including a host of time-related factors (p. 130).
Environmental Variables: Characteristics of the milieu, the industry, the organization

Job Variables: The level of the job and the function supervised

Person Variables: Personality and style characteristics of the incumbent in the job

Situational Variables: Temporal features of an individual job

Basic Managerial Role Requirements

Basic Characteristics of Managerial Work

One Manager's Work

Figure 2: Mintzberg's Contingency View of Managerial Work (1973).
Attempts to replicate Mintzberg's study with specific subsets of chief executives included Choran's (1969) study of small company executives; Pitner's (1978) study of school superintendents; Kingstone's (1980) study of the president of a polytechnic institute; and Scott's (1981) comparison of school superintendents and chief executives in business organizations. The findings of these studies tended to confirm the notion (although not always explicitly stated) that variant characteristics of the chief executive's work (e.g., contextual, positional, personal, and situational characteristics) shape the nature and content of the executive's job.

Each of the sets of variables cited by Mintzberg will be examined in the following pages with regard to their theoretical and empirical implications for this study. The sets of variables include: (1) Environmental Variables, (2) Positional Variables, (3) Personal Variables, and (4) Situational Variables. In addition, the dynamic relationships of variables are explored.

ENVIRONMENTAL VARIABLES

The first variables Mintzberg (1973) referred to in his contingency view of managerial work were environmental factors that may influence the manager's job. Among these were: (1) characteristics of the
organization, and (2) characteristics of the organizational context. Mintzberg claimed that very little is known about the influence of these factors on the manager's job. Thus, a detailed review and synthesis of the literature was conducted to determine what organizational and contextual factors might be considered in a study of the dynamics of a chief executive's job.

Organizational Characteristics

Synthesizing the variety of definitions of organization, Porter, Lawler and Hackman (1975) described organizations as

social entities in which people take part and to which they react . . . social instruments set up to do something . . . [they] accomplish objectives . . . [through] the differentiation of functions and positions, and the deliberate, conscious, intendedly rational planful attempts to coordinate and direct activities . . . [with] continuity through time of the activities and relationships within organizations (pp. 69-71).

This view is consistent with the model of organizations provided by Leavitt (1965), which serves as a useful guide in synthesizing pertinent theory or research that would enhance the general understanding of organizational behavior. As depicted in Figure 3, Leavitt viewed organizations as systems composed of four interacting variables (task, technology, structure, actors), such that a change in one organizational component impacts the other components. Although not

Figure 3: The Components of Organization.
explicitly stated in Leavitt's model, each of the organizational components may be vulnerable to environmental pressures.

In summary fashion, definitions and prevailing conceptualizations are provided for each of the components of Leavitt's model. In addition, the processes which serve to tie the components together, as well as the contextual factors which impact the organization, are discussed.

**Task/Goal.** An organizational goal is a "desired state of affairs which the organization attempts to realize" (Etzioni, 1964, p. 6). Goals have both cathetic (emotional) and cognitive properties which serve to bind the individual and the organization (Dornbush and Scott, 1975), or, as Cartwright and Zander (1953) have suggested, goals are both private (individual desires for one's self) and organizational (what the individual desires for the organization as a whole). A problem one faces in defining goals is that there are several constituencies which could desire a "particular state of affairs." Thus, the conceptualization of organizational goals has taken a variety of forms, such as:

- a system of linkages between several subsystems as input into a larger system (Thompson and McEwen, 1958; Parsons, 1960);
value premises or constraints on the decision-making process (Simon, 1964); and intended future domains (Thompson, 1967).

Because of the ambiguity and complexity of organizational goals, a number of authors have attempted to classify goals more discretely. Blau (1955) and Perrow (1961), for example, drew distinctions between official organizational goals (general purposes for the organization as described in charters, reports, and other public statements), and operative goals (goals reflected in actual operating policies and procedures of the organization). Refining the concept even further, Perrow (1970) distinguished five types or levels of goals, classified by referents to whom the goal was directed, such as:

- **societal goals**—broader, more abstract statements addressed to societal concerns (e.g., egalitarian education, maintenance of law and order);

- **output goals**—statements concerning types of organizational outputs addressed to others within the organization's domain;

- **system goals**—the operational statements of the organization independent of output or derived goals, addressed primarily to organizational members;

- **product goals**—statements regarding quality of output addressed to those inside and outside the organization; and

- **derived goals**—statements regarding unplanned or serendipitous activities/events (e.g., investment of excess resources).
These are similar to the classification scheme (output, adaptation, management, motivational, positional) that Gross and Grambsch (1968) derived from their study of university goals.

Perspectives on the derivation of goals have changed over time. In classical theory, organizational goals were the goals of the entrepreneur. The human relations approach introduced the notion that individual and organizational goals were not necessarily congruent, and that greater integration of the individual into the organization could be achieved by allowing organizational members to participate in goal setting. Open systems and behavioral theories have introduced the notion that organizational goals are shaped by the environment (Thompson, 1967; Cohen and March, 1974), and the individuals who make up the organization (Georgiou, 1973).

Technology. Technology was defined by Perrow (1967) as "the actions that an individual performs upon an object, with or without the aid of tools or mechanical devices, in order to make some change in that object. The object or 'raw material,' may be a living being, human or otherwise, a symbol or an innate object" (p. 195). Technology has most often been conceptualized as direct problem-solving inventions (Leavitt, 1965), or functions that an organizational
unit performs to accomplish a task (Thompson, 1967). Child (1972) noted, however, that "the term technology is employed in almost as many different senses as there are writers on the subject" (p. 14).

Woodward (1962), in a study of British manufacturing firms, was able to identify three types of technologies: unit production (including small-batch) systems, e.g., shipbuilding or aircraft manufacturing firms; mass production (including large-batch) systems, e.g., automobile manufacturing firms; and continuous production systems, e.g., chemical or petroleum manufacturing firms. Technology was found by Woodward and her colleagues to be linked to structure; the nature of the technology affected the number of levels in the management hierarchy, the span of control of first-line supervisors, and the ratio of managers and supervisors to other personnel in the company. Woodward concluded that organizational effectiveness was based on the match between technology and structure.

Based on the work of Woodward and others, Thompson (1967) attempted to classify technologies in a way which would be applicable to all types of organizations. His classification scheme included the following technologies:

mediating—matching suppliers of inputs with users of outputs;
long-linked—performing serially arranged tasks; and

intensive—using a variety of techniques with feedback coming from the object itself.

These typologies were applied to organizations in general, to subunits within organizations, or to smaller task groups. In Thompson's model, the choice of technology was related to interdependencies with the organization's environment, which in turn impacted the way the organization was structured. Thompson claimed that most organizations have both sequential and pooled interdependencies, necessitating both long-linked and mediating technologies; complex organizations usually had all three types of interdependencies— and all three technologies.

**Actors.** Mary Parker Follett (1924), a social worker/scholar, was the first to proclaim that interpersonal relations were an important aspect of organizational commitment, coordination and control. The work of Mayo (1933), and Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939), added credence to this concept. The human dimension of organizations was found to limit the level of rationality espoused in the classical theories of organization.

The people-component of the organization has been considered perhaps the most important, and at the same time most problematic. It is through people that
organizational tasks are accomplished. Yet, each individual comes to the organization with his/her own set of values, beliefs, attitudes, needs, personal goals, skills and abilities, and motivations to work (Maslow, 1954; Herzberg, 1966; Argyris, 1975). Each person must somehow be integrated into the organization such that their overall behavior contributes positively toward the achievement of organizational goals. Formal integration strategies may involve assignment to specific tasks and task groups, prescriptions for expected behavior through rules and regulations, and provision of rewards/sanctions for appropriate or inappropriate behavior. Or, they may involve strategies which engage the worker in the planning and development of his/her own job, work group, or organization. For the most part these strategies have been developed on the assumption that people are rational and economically motivated (Taylor, 1947; Fayol, 1949; Davis, 1949), or intrinsically motivated toward self-actualization (Herzberg, et al., 1959; Argyris, 1960; McGregor, 1960). Such is not always the case, however, as the myriad examples of incompetence, rate busting, strikes, theft, violence, and sabotage would suggest.

Within task groups, individuals establish status positions through compliance to group norms. Task group norms may or may not be consistent with
organizational policies and goals. In many cases, a separate system of communication, rules, rewards and sanctions evolves from the task group. These informal (e.g., not written) systems juxtaposed against the formal system produce stress and conflict for some group members and for the organization as a whole. Thus, the integration of individuals into the organization is a complex and often time consuming problem.

**Structure.** Structure was defined by Blau (1974) as "the distribution, along various lines, of people among social positions that influence the role relations among these people" (p. 12). Organizational structures are designed to regulate variations in the organization introduced by individuals and the environment, and determine the parameters for organizational activities.

It has been generally accepted that organizations have both formal and informal structures. The elements of formal structure most often referred to in research are:

- **specialization**—division of labor; distribution of tasks;
- **standardization**—extent to which common procedures are designed to cover all circumstances and are applied invariably;
- **formalization**—extent to which rules, procedures, communication, instructions, are written;
- **centralization**—locus of decision-making authority; and
complexity—nature and extent of horizontal and vertical differentiation and spatial distance of subunits from the core of the organization.

The informal structure is based upon the patterns of behavior of individuals and groups within the organization. The elements of informal structure are a bit more elusive to the researcher because they are not specified by the organization. The informal structure is a complex network of social relations and status positions which may include a separate set of goals and norms which the workers have agreed upon regarding production rates (e.g., the concept of rate busting), compliance to organizational rules and regulations, and communication nets (e.g., grapevines). Informal structure functions to:

- specify required behavior in terms of norms;
- define patterns of interpersonal behavior;
- provide members a means of evaluating themselves; and
- protect individuals from perceived threats in the environment. (Dubin, 1958, pp. 67-70)

Informal structure can enhance or constrain organizational performance.

In some cases, what begins as informal structure evolves into yet another formal structure with well defined tasks and prescribed rules. Such has been the case with unionized organizations where employee behavior is prescribed by both the union hierarchy and
management, in the form of a negotiated contract. This has also been illustrated in Etzioni's (1964) description of the dual authority structure prevalent in many colleges and universities, whether it is a faculty senate or a faculty union that provides the additional hierarchical structure.

A more integrated view of organizational structure has been offered by Haas and Drabek (1973). They treated the overall performance structure of the organization as "patterns in interaction sequences," which can be explained behaviorally "through characteristics of and fluctuations in the normative, interpersonal, and resource structures" (p. 109). The normative structure includes prescribed behavior in specified situations; the interpersonal structure includes the person-to-person understandings and orientations; and the resource structure includes both the physical and ideational resources available for use by the organization. These authors have suggested that because of the complexities in performance structure, research be aimed at "mapping" patterns of interaction sequences by focusing on organizational processes rather than on the traditionally used concepts of formal and informal structure.

Processes. Organizational processes are sequences of "interactions with common content that recur over
time" (Haas and Drabek, 1973, p. 98). They are patterned events, measurable in behavioral terms, which determine the overall performance structure of the organization. Examples of organizational processes described by Haas and Drabek are:

- **Task processes**—including all activities specifically related to central organizational tasks, both within the organization and between the organization and its environment;

- **Maintenance processes**—including activities which serve to maintain organizational performance such as recruitment and socialization of organizational members;

- **Communication processes**—including activities related to formal and informal, vertical and horizontal communication;

- **Decision-making processes**—including activities related to the identification of problems, the search for alternatives, and the choice and implementation of decisions;

- **Coordination/integration processes**—including activities related to the maintenance of organizational equilibrium (both vertical and horizontal);

- **Control processes**—including activities related to the amount and type of discretion job incumbents have;

- **Adaptation processes**—including activities related to modifying organizational elements given certain environmental conditions; and

- **Conflict processes**—including activities related to internal and external disagreements and efforts at resolution.

The process of "leadership," "management," or "administration," would be important additions to this list. There are also a number of subprocesses such as
budgeting, planning, goal-setting, evaluation, and others which would be important to consider.

**Contextual Characteristics**

The type of organization, its size, age, location, history/culture, stages of development, and environmental stimuli are important elements to consider, especially when viewing changes in an organization over time.

**Type.** Organizations have been classified on the basis of compliance structure (Etzioni, 1961), beneficiaries of organizational activities (Blau and Scott, 1962), technology used (Woodward, 1962; Thompson, 1967), information processes used (Galbraith, 1977), and structural characteristics (Pugh, et al, 1969; Mitzberg, 1979). Hall, et al (1967) found that the Etzioni and Blau-Scott typologies had limited utility in the analysis of the total organization, but that some organizational structural characteristics (e.g., goal specificity, status, interdependence) tended to differ with type of organization. More recently the work of Pugh, et al, Thompson, Galbraith, and Mintzberg has demonstrated that type of organization may be only one contingency among many in the analysis of complex organizations.

One of the conclusions Mintzberg (1973) drew from his research on chief executives was that a number of
dissimilarities in executive job characteristics existed between types of organizations. He found, for example, patterns in job characteristics among the executives of business organizations that differed from those of the executives of the two public service organizations in his sample. The executives of business organizations tended to place more emphasis on strategy and negotiation, spend more time in large meetings, and had more informal meetings. He also found that these executives spent more time in verbal communications, received more information than they sent, and devoted less time to ceremonial duties. Mintzberg speculated that because business executives had fewer external influences on their everyday decision making, they could dispense with a lot of formalities. In contrast, Mintzberg found that executives of public service organizations were more involved in formalities. They had more scheduled meetings, participated in more ceremonial duties and had strategy making sessions. They also had more frequent contacts with their organizational directors, and were more involved in internal political activity.

Location. The setting in which an organization is located (e.g., rural, urban, suburban) is one factor related to environmental vulnerability. Location determines the culture from which organizational
members are drawn as well as the nature of the organizational domain (e.g., the availability of resources, markets, and the number and nature of competitors).

History/Culture. The predominant culture surrounding the organization shapes the values, beliefs, and attitudes of organizational members. In addition, societal trends (e.g., technical, political, and economic conditions) at the time an organization is founded have an impact on the present capacity of an organization to meet its goals, according to Stinchcombe (1965). The availability of certain resources and technologies, for example, makes it possible for an organization to emerge, and these same conditions prescribe the type of organizational structure and the organization's ability to maintain certain traditions and vested interests.

Age. The age of an organization has an impact on its rate of growth and subsequently on the way in which it is structured. Stinchcombe (1965) found that the age of an organization was related to its rate of growth, claiming that some types of organizations originated and grew rapidly during certain historical periods, and then grew and changed slowly as that historical era passed. In addition, he found that the structure of the organization tended to become more
formalized as the organization aged. Starbuck (1965) described this process:

New organizations tend to have vague definitions of their tasks. They are not sure which tasks or segments are important or necessary, and they are not sure how the overall tasks should be factored ... As an organization gets older, it learns more and more about coping with its environment and with its internal problems of communication and coordination. ... the normal organization tries to perpetuate the fruits of its learning by formalizing them. It sets up standard operating procedures; it routinizes reports on organizational performance ... (p. 480).

The age of an organization also figured significantly into Mintzberg's scheme of managerial job types. He stated, for example, that the "New Manager," and "Entrepreneur" job types which involved building contacts and data bases and seeking opportunities, may be more prominent in new organizations. It was Mintzberg's contention that once the organization matured, the managerial job type would likely shift.

Size. Organizational size, especially as it relates to structure, has been a much researched topic. Conclusions drawn from the research of Udy (1965), Kimberly (1976), Blau, et al (1976), Pugh, et al (1968), Hall (1972), and Reimann (1973) served as a basis for the following observations:

- the larger the organization, the larger the size of the work unit;
- the larger the organization, the more formalized the behavior of its members; and
the larger the organization, the more emphasis is placed on coordination.

Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1967), in a review of studies of the relationship of organization subunit size to job attitudes and job behaviors, found that absenteeism, turnover, accidents, and labor disputes were found to be more frequent as subunit size increased. It should be pointed out, however, that all of the studies reviewed were conducted in work groups and departments of business and industrial organizations.

Steiglitz (1970) and Choran (1973) both found in their studies of company presidents that chief executives of small firms were more involved in short-term, internal operational problems, most often seeing themselves as "entrepreneurs." Choran concluded that there was less formality in smaller organizations, and that the executive was a "generalist" able to perform any tasks needed.

**Stages of Organizational Development.**

Organizations, like butterflies, experience metamorphosis according to Starbuck (1965). The historical evolution of large American corporations was described by Chandler (1962) as including four stages:

- the initial expansion and accumulation of resources;
- the rationalization of the use of resources;
the expansion into new markets and lines to help assure the continuing full use of resources; and

the development of a new structure to make possible continuing effective mobilization of resources to meet both changing short-term market demands and long-term market trends (p. 385).

Based on the work of Chandler and others, Mintzberg (1979) concluded that each stage in organizational development was marked by a discernible change in organizational structure. He claimed, for example, that a simplified, non-elaborate organic structure (e.g., craft or entrepreneurial structure) could be identified in the first stage of organizational development. As the organization began to rationalize the use of resources (Stage 2), he claimed the structure became more formalized and standardized (e.g., more bureaucratic). Expansion into new markets (Stage 3) necessitated the use of a divisionalized structure for the coordination of work, and finally, to continue effective operation in a rapidly changing environment (Stage 4), the organization became more flexible in order to meet both short- and long-term environmental demands. This resulted, according to Mintzberg, in a reversion back to a more organic structure. These transitions in structure marked distinct, fundamental changes in the distribution and coordination of work.
Environment. As a system, the organization has a dynamic relationship to everything around it. But some parts of the broader universe in which organizations exist are more relevant to the organization than others. The relevant environment has been defined by Bobbitt, et al (1978) as "the set of objects external to the system that are related to one or more objects in the system" (p. 500).

The organizational environment has been conceptualized rather broadly in terms of societal institutions or conditions, or more narrowly as points of organizational dependence or interdependence. Etzioni (1964) and Hall (1972) have shed some light on environmental conditions which impact organizations, such as:

- **Technological conditions**—availability of raw materials, new ideas and techniques, technological shifts in society;

- **Legal conditions**—body of laws, statutes, executive orders;

- **Economic conditions**—changing economic conditions (e.g., unemployment, tax structure, inflation, affluence, interest rates, energy costs);

- **Demographic conditions**—general characteristics of the market or service area (age, sex, in- and out-migration, urban/rural, rich/poor);

- **Ecological conditions**—number and types of organizations in interdependent system and resultant problems (e.g., pollution, waste, density of organizations, climate, geography, distance from market); and
cultural conditions—values, norms and behaviors indigenous to the population; changes in consumer tastes, worker habits and attitudes, worker preparation.

The broader environment has also been categorized in terms of value categories such as power, enlightenment, wealth, retitude well-being, skill, affection, respect (Lasswell, 1971). Associated with each of these value categories or sectors of society are specific types of organizations or constituents to whom the focal organization is spatially and temporally related. These organizations make up the environmental "field" of potentially relevant organizations, within which one finds the organization "set," composed of organizations in direct interaction with the focal organization (Caplow, 1964; Evan, 1966). Interorganizational relationships can increase dependencies which in turn may enhance or reduce the focal organization's power (Levine and White, 1961). The "domain," or points at which the focal organization is dependent upon other organizations, is determined by strategic choices of products/services to be provided, customers/clients to be served, technology to be utilized, and the location at which the work is to be performed (Levine and White, 1961; Thompson, 1967; Galbraith, 1977). The concept of domain was refined further by Dill (1958) and Thompson (1967), who claimed that the most important parts of the environment are those which directly impact goal
setting or goal attainment. This task-relevant environment includes customers, suppliers of material, labor, equipment, capital and work space, competitors, and regulatory groups. Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) contended that the organization as a whole relates to its environment through boundary-spanning positions that link subparts of the environment directly to related subunits within an organization (e.g., the sales department of Company A exports goods to buyers of Company B, to be used in production of goods).

The attributes of the environment, measured in terms of problems and opportunities (Emery and Trist, 1965), have most often been expressed in organizational research in bipolar terms such as:

homogeneity/heterogeneity—all elements the same or all elements different (Dill, 1958; Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Thompson, 1967);

rich/lean—availability of resources (Thompson, 1967; Aiken and Hage, 1968);

stability/instability—degree of turnover in the elements of the environment (Emery and Trist, 1965);

concentration/dispersion—degree to which resources are evenly distributed over the environmental range or are concentrated in particular locations (Aldrich, 1975);

domain consensus/dissensus—degree to which an organization's claim to a specific domain is disputed or recognized by other organizations (Levine and White, 1961; Thompson, 1967);

routine/non-routine—time rate of change, including frequency and magnitude of shifts in environment (Emery and Trist, 1965);
simple/complex—size and variability of components of the environment (Terreberry, 1968); and
certain/uncertain—degree of knowledge regarding cause and effect (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Thompson, 1967; Galbraith, 1977).

It is these attributes, according to Thompson (1967) that have provided the constraints, contingencies, and controls from outside the organization to which structure must be addressed. Burns and Stalker (1961) asserted that organizations respond to their environments with mechanistic or organic structures. If, for example, the environment is unstable, concentrated and turbulent, the organization will tend to respond with centralized authority and more formalized and standardized procedures in order to move toward rationality.

The organic response, which is more loosely structured and adaptable, is made to environmental stimuli that are more stable and concentrated.

Environmental uncertainty and its effects on the chief executive's perception of a situation has been the focus of a number of studies. The following characteristics of the environment influence the amount of uncertainty perceived by the executive:

- number and diversity of environmental factors and components (as they increase, they limit the cognitive ability of the chief executive to grasp and comprehend the interrelationships, thus increasing the amount of uncertainty perceived) (Simon, 1960; Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; LaPorte, 1971; Duncan, 1972; Downey and Slocum, 1975);
change rate dimension (influences amount of uncertainty perceived) (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Thompson, 1967; LaPorte, 1971; Duncan, 1972; Downey and Slocum, 1975); and

variability and analyzability (where variability is low and stimuli analyzable, amount of uncertainty perceived is reduced) (Perrow, 1970).

Other factors such as degree of tolerance for ambiguity, and locus of control, also influence the chief executive's perception of environmental uncertainty (Duncan, 1972; Anderson and Paine, 1975; Downey and Slocum, 1975). The executive's perception of the environment, in turn, shapes his/her response with respect to time-frame, structure, and policy changes.

Summary

Four component parts of the organization have been included in this literature review, each with a number of subelements and dimensions, processes that behaviorally tie the component parts of the organization together, and contextual elements which contribute to the shaping and reshaping of organizations. Breaking the organization down into its component parts through a synthesis of relevant literature provided a number of elements to consider when making judgments about the impact of organizational and contextual factors on the chief executive's job. Examination of the elements in isolation, however, would not necessarily contribute to
a full understanding of the context within which the executive works. Thus, interactions between and among organizational components must also be considered.

Some evidence has been provided in the literature that chief executives' jobs differ according to type, age, and size of organization. In addition, it has been shown that some characteristics of the organization's environment shape the chief executive's responses to that environment. This suggests that when considering the dynamics of the chief executive's job, one must consider fully the dynamics of organizational context and the interactive impact that organizational context has upon the work activities of the chief executive.

A second factor to consider with regard to the dynamics of the chief executive's job is the actual job characteristics themselves. The influence of these factors on the work of the chief executive are explored in the following section.

POSITIONAL VARIABLES

The second set of variables Mintzberg (1973) referred to in his contingency view of managerial work included factors about the job itself. Mintzberg found preliminary evidence that the incumbent's level in the organization's hierarchy and functions that he/she supervised accounted for more variations among
managers' work than any other factors (p. 105). He pointed out three discernible properties to the chief executive's job:

What he is **supposed** to do;

What he **thinks** he does; and

What he **actually** does.

Research which has been done on the chief executive's job falls into all three of Mintzberg's categories, although the majority of the studies only tap what the executive thinks he does. Consideration is given in this review of the literature to (1) the executive role(s), (2) the nature and scope of the executive's job, and (3) the positional level in the organization.

**The Executive Role(s)**

An executive is a "person responsible for the performance of a total organization or for important segments or activities of it" (Shartle, 1956, p. 3).

The chief executive officer occupies a formal position in an organization which carries certain rights, privileges, and responsibilities of office. A position, according to Hemphill (1960), is a fairly well-defined set of expectations which apply to a person's assigned task within an organization, and include expected behavior with consequent outcomes and effects, as well as restrictions, constraints, and motivating factors which impact the fulfillment of
expectations. A role is a set of activities (tasks, functions, responsibilities) to be performed by a person holding an office (Kahn, et al, 1964).

Normative theories of executive work provided by Barnard (1938) and Davis (1949) set the stage for early empirical research on the chief executive's job. Barnard defined organization as a "system of consciously coordinated activities." The functions of organizational executives, in turn, relate to all the work essential to maintaining a vital, enduring organization. With regard to the complexities of executive work, Barnard made two important observations:

All work of executives is not executive work; and

Not all executive work is done by executives.

In other words, the essence of executive work is coordinating the activities of others, but an executive is often required to settle disputes, or speak to an external group on behalf of the organization. At the same time, other organizational personnel, particularly specialized administrative staff and secretaries, often perform organizational maintenance tasks. Collectively, the activities of these persons constitute an "executive organization," whose purpose is to coordinate the efforts of the entire organization. The executive process involves (1) the integration of the
whole system and (2) the maintenance of an equilibrium of activities. In Barnard's conceptualization, the positional leader of the organization provided the means for communication and, through the use of structure, designed a system of communication. The organizational leader also has the most general and most loosely defined position in the organization, requiring skills and abilities such as analyzing and interpreting strategic factors, formulating, defining and redefining broad goals, and delegating responsibility to others for specific tasks. Rather than being the total responsibility of a single individual, the performance of executive functions is often the result of cooperative efforts on the part of staff who comprise the executive organization. Cooperation is enhanced by leadership, which Barnard defined as:

.. the indispensable social essence that gives common meaning to common purpose, that creates the incentive that makes other incentives effective, that infuses the subjective aspect of the countless decisions with consistency in a changing environment, that inspires the personal conviction that produces the vital cohesiveness without which cooperation is possible (p. 283).

The organizational leader, then, is an important creative force in shaping the present and future of the organization.

Barnard delineated three essential executive functions:
maintenance of organizational communication by providing an organizational scheme (division of labor); by providing inducements to secure loyalty, compliance and commitment from employees; and by maintaining a balance between the formal and informal systems;

securing of essential services from individuals by recruiting and selecting qualified and compatible persons to bring into the organization, and eliciting their services through various inducements once they have joined the organization; and

formulation of the purposes, goals and objectives of the organization.

These functions were clustered and simplified by Davis (1949) to include the following:

planning (what, how, where and who responsible);
organizing (creating and maintaining effectiveness and efficiency); and
controlling (regulating organizational activities).

Research which followed that of Barnard and Davis focused on both the content and the characteristics of the chief executive's job.

Selznick (1957), building upon the work of Barnard, conceptualized large public organizations more broadly as "institutions," or systems of internal and external forces (needs and pressures) requiring a responsive, adaptive organism. He equated "administrative management" to the maintenance of "organizations" (Barnard's consciously coordinated system), and claimed that "institutional leadership" is the "kind of work done to meet the needs of a social
situation" (p. 22). It is the institutional leader who holds the system perspective, and "sees" the organization as a whole. The distinctive quality of institutional leadership is found in the realm of policy—including the areas where policy-formation and organization-building meet. Thus, the organizational leader is concerned with policy, with people, with process, and with content, and tries to adapt the organization to its goals and to pressures from the outside. He/she becomes a "statesman" as institutional leadership is transcended from administrative management. But in order to make that transition, the leader must fully understand the context within which he/she works.

One of the first observational studies was done in a large American corporation by Sayles (1964). After observing and interviewing managers at lower and middle levels in the corporation, Sayles concluded that the administrator's primary purpose was maintenance of the workflow (to maintain equilibrium). He described three aspects of the manager's work related to horizontal and vertical positions in the organizational hierarchy. They were:

the manager as participant in external workflows (the relationships with others just outside his area of responsibility);

the manager as leader (his hierarchically determined relationships with subordinates); and
the manager as monitor (his appraisal of internal and external relationships in search of choice options).

Sayles claimed that the manager, in the quest to maintain balance or stability in the workflow, engaged in relationships with those just outside his area of responsibility which required negotiation rather than the use of the manager's formal authority. With regard to the manager's vertical, or hierarchical, duties, his use of leadership took three forms, according to Sayles:

leadership as direction (ability to get subordinates to respond to the actions of the manager);

leadership as response (ability to respond when subordinates initiate requests for support or assistance); and

leadership as representation (ability to represent subordinates or to intervene on behalf of subordinates in contacts with other parts of the organization).

Sayles' study, although not a rigorous scientific inquiry by his own admission, provided some insight into the dynamic aspects of the executive's job.

The activities of chief executive officers which Mintzberg (1973) observed clustered into three groups: interpersonal relations, transfer of information, and decision-making. From these clusters, Mintzberg derived the following role sets which constituted the gestalt of the executive role:
(1) **Interpersonal roles:** interactions with others inside and outside the organization from formal authority and status.

(a) **Figurehead** - represents the organization in all matters of formality;

(b) **Liaison** - interacts with others to gain favors and information for the organization; and

(c) **Leader** - interacts with subordinates (e.g., motivating, staffing);

(2) **Informational roles:** interactions with others inside and outside the organization from the "nerve center" of the organization.

(a) **Monitor** - receives and collects information;

(b) **Disseminator** - sorts and transmits information into the organization; and

(c) **Spokesman** - disseminates information into the environment;

(3) **Decisional roles:** interactions with others inside and outside the organization from the strategic center of the organization.

(a) **Entrepreneur** - initiates change;

(b) **Disturbance Handler** - takes charge when the organization is threatened; and

(c) **Negotiator** - enters negotiations on behalf of the organization.

Mintzberg claimed that leadership permeates all managerial activities in the sense that the chief executive effects integration of parts into a whole.

There have been several attempts to replicate Mintzberg's findings, controlling for organizational size and/or type. Choran (1969), for example, studied chief executives of small companies and contrasted his
findings to Mintzberg's data on managers of large companies. Choran concluded that the executive of a small company is a generalist, and that there is a decrease in formality in the smaller organization. His observations of the increased internal work prompted him to add two roles to Mintzberg's list: specialist (feeling on the part of the executive that he is the most capable to perform certain operations); and substitute operator (steps into another's job if necessary, which is indicative of an organization without slack resources).

A study conducted by Pitner (1978) attempted to identify the invariant aspects of everyday activities of three school superintendents in Ohio. Pitner documented verbal and written communication and patterns of interaction to discern a fit between the activities of school superintendents and Mintzberg's study of other chief executives. Pitner concluded that the school superintendent was not much different than the top-level executives in Mintzberg's study, but that the main role of the superintendent was manager of information (interpreter of organizational history; contemporary interpreter of events; manager of meaning; manager of myths). She found that many of the superintendents' activities were mundane and, in her works, "hardly leadership" (p. 169). Superintendents,
according to Pitner, differentiated their behavior to different groups.

Kingstone (1980) used Mintzberg's observational strategies to study the work activities of the chief executive officer of a polytechnic institute, recording the president's activities over ten consecutive days. He found that the president's activities resembled those of the chief executives in Mintzberg's study: maintaining stability, controlling strategy-making systems, linking the organization and its external environment. Moreover, he found that image-building and integration-type activities predominated for the institute president, suggesting that the most significant role for this individual was Leader.

In a fourth study based on Mintzberg's work, thirty school superintendents and thirty chief executives in business were compared on the basis of time spent in selected roles (Scott, 1981). Scott constructed a survey instrument, asking respondents to state percentage of time spent in each of the ten subroles identified by Mintzberg and to rank the subroles from most to least important. Rankings were then correlated with percentages of time spent in each role. The findings revealed that superintendents spent more time in the Figurehead role than industry chief executives. No significant difference existed between
the two groups on time spent on other roles. The rankings of roles, in order of importance and time spent in the roles correlated significantly for the following roles: Figurehead, Liaison, Monitor, Disturbance Handler, Negotiator, and Resource Allocator. Although this study had some methodological limitations, it does signal the significance of organizational image-building and image maintenance as a more unique function of educational organization executives.

In comparing the findings of these studies, two important observations emerged. First, the attempts to replicate Mintzberg's work have revealed an important limitation to short-term observation, which may have confounded the research results of Pitner and Kingstone in particular. Namely, a one-week or ten-day observation does not provide an opportunity to tap the nuances of large-scale, complex problems faced by the chief executive, or provide an opportunity to examine the spontaneous and less formal activities of executive work. It would only be by chance that a complex problem would occur during the time of observation, and with limited knowledge of the organizational context, most researchers would be unable to make inferences from their observations unless the situation were translated by a participant in the particular activity.
Second, the attempts to replicate Mintzberg's work have revealed some difficulties in using his classification scheme for executive roles. One can speculate that one reason for this difficulty relates to Mintzberg's assumption that the position of chief executive officer is basically one of manager, which is contrary to Barnard's (1938) and Selznick's (1957) notions that the position of chief executive officer is primarily one of leader. The lack of distinction between these two roles is a problem found throughout the literature on chief executive officers.

The foundation for Mintzberg's (1973) role classification scheme emerged from the clusters of everyday work activities he had observed in five chief executives. The everyday work activities provide clues to the nature and scope of the executive's job.

The Nature and Scope of the Executive's Job

A number of methods have been used to study the work activities of chief executives, including self-report, diary, and observational methods. Building on normative theories put forth by Barnard (1938) and Davis (1949), Shartle (1956) conducted personal interviews of executives to determine the range of activities they performed. He found that the work activities tended to cluster into the following categories:
inspection of the organization;
investigation and research;
planning;
preparation of procedures and methods;
coordination; and
evaluation.

The information gleaned from Shartle's study marked the beginning of the Ohio State University Leadership Studies, a ten-year effort on the part of a number of researchers to study "Leadership in Democracy." Reference is made to several of these studies throughout this literature review.

Steiglitz (1969) administered a questionnaire to 280 chief executive officers in companies around the world, probing them for their views on their primary responsibilities and on what activities they would reserve exclusively for themselves. Steiglitz' findings revealed several duties which chief executives reserved to their offices, such as:

determining overall objectives and plans;
establishing priorities and allocating resources;
formulating policy;
selecting key executives and developing the organization;
developing and designating a successor;
maintaining good relationships with the board of directors;
relating with persons/groups external to the organization; and
controlling the organization.

Organizational leadership, Steiglitz concluded, was related more to the person than to the job itself.

Diary studies of executive work activities were conducted in an attempt to match actual duties with the executives' perceptions of their duties gained through self-reporting techniques. Sune Carlson's (1951) diary study of the managerial work of nine company presidents in Sweden was one of the first field studies of the work activities of top-level executives. Executives were asked to keep a diary of their daily activities recording place, contact, techniques, nature of problem/question, and kind of action taken. Carlson was able to categorize the findings into three areas: work time, communication, and work content. He found that executives had little control over the design of their workdays, that their workloads were heavy, and that they had very little uninterrupted time. The executives spent almost one-third of their day with visitors, and received more letters per day than they initiated. The closeness in proximity to their office appeared to influence the amount of contact the executive had with others. Carlson's findings on work content were inconclusive; basically, he found that the executives defined and classified the issues with which
they dealt according to their own interpretation of the "field" of activity (e.g., finance, production, personnel), and "policy." He concluded that neither the concepts nor the recording techniques used were adequate to measure work content.

Diary studies led to the development of observational techniques for the study of executive work activities. The structured observations of the work activities of five chief executive officers conducted by Mintzberg (1973), yielded considerable data on the nature and scope of the executive's job. Mintzberg observed and recorded the daily work activities of three chief executives in business and industrial organizations and two executives in public service organizations. Each of the men was observed for one week, and a chronology record was made documenting the nature and duration of each activity, the location, subject, and the persons involved. All incoming and outgoing mail and telephone calls as well as formal (scheduled) and informal (unscheduled) meetings were recorded. Analysis of the work activities of the five chief executives resulted in traceable patterns of similarity in the content and characteristics of the chief executive's jobs.

The research findings indicated that on the average these executives spent the largest portion of
their time in scheduled activities lasting an average of 68 minutes' duration. In terms of the number of activities in an average day, desk work and telephone calls headed the list, but were of short duration. Mintzberg concluded that "half of the observed activities were completed in less than 9 minutes, and only 1/10 took more than an hour" (p. 33). Other job characteristics derived from Mintzberg's data base were the following:

- the executive's job had an unrelenting pace;
- the executive's activities were characterized by brevity, variety, and fragmentation;
- the executives preferred verbal media over written communications;
- the executive was "the man in the middle," maintaining communication with the board, outsiders, and subordinates; and
- the job contained a blend of rights and responsibilities; executives had the freedom to make long-term commitments and could take advantage of their obligations.

Mintzberg's observations did not yield any particular daily or weekly cycles of activity, although he speculated that chief executives had five different kinds of days: catch-up days, crisis days, free days, heavily scheduled days, and normal days.

Mintzberg and others have claimed that the nature and scope of the chief executive's job differs from the work activities of executives at other levels within
the organizational hierarchy. This notion is probed in more detail in the following section.

The Positional Level in the Organization

One of Mintzberg's propositions about variations in managers' work related directly to the position in the organizational hierarchy. He claimed, for example, that:

the higher the level of the manager in the hierarchy, the more unstructured, unspecialized, and long-range the job, the more complex, intertwined, and extended in time the issues handled, the less focused the work.

Evidence in the literature substantiated this claim.

As early as 1960, Hemphill used self-reporting techniques to generate a list of 1500 descriptive statements regarding the executive's position, which were subsequently reduced to 575 questionnaire items. To discern the applicability of items on the instrument, the questionnaire was administered in five companies to administrators at three organizational levels (upper, middle, and beginning management), and five functional levels (research and development, sales, manufacturing, general administration, and industrial relations), for a total of 93 positions. Hemphill found that the applicability of the items on the questionnaire for describing the executive's job depended upon the type of company, level in the company, and functional area. He concluded that there
were similarities in descriptions of positions in the same functional area, but there were dissimilarities between positions at different levels in an organization.

A diary study by Copeman, Luijk, and Hanika (1963) contrasted the work of 29 chief executives with a like number of department heads, and found that chief executives spent more time writing and planning (but less time drafting reports), and spent more time on the job, had fewer contacts with superiors, and had more contacts with their colleagues than did the department heads. Both groups had about the same frequency of contacts with subordinates.

In a two-week diary study of eight American managers, Dubin and Spray (1964) concluded that "top executives and those employed in client-centered industries will be engaged more frequently in contacts with people outside the organization than will their subordinates" (p. 105). They also found that the concentration of time on a single activity was less for high-level managers.

Katz and Kahn (1966) posited that the use of structure to carry out one's positional responsibility depended upon the resources (money, information, power, expertise, authority) one had at his/her disposal. In a similar vein, they claimed there were leadership
skills and personality traits more appropriate to one level of the organization than to another (see Figure 4). The top echelon leader, for example, may have had the resources, skills and personality traits to originate, interpolate and administer the existing structure, but the reverse was not necessarily true. The lower or middle level leader may not have had the necessary resources and abilities to use the higher level strategies. Problems sometimes occurred when leaders at one level of the organization became too involved in trying to use strategies characteristic of another level. The use of structure, these authors claimed, should reflect the relationship of the organization to its environment as well as the historical development of the organization (e.g., modification and origination of structure may be more appropriate strategies for developing organizations and/or organizations trying to adapt to a rapidly changing environment).

Summary

In the preceding section, evidence has been provided that substantiates Mintzberg's claim that job variables themselves account for some of the variance in the work activities of chief executives. The role requirements of the chief executive officer appear to be shaped by several factors: (1) position in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Considerations</th>
<th>Levels in the Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Structure</td>
<td>Top Echelon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Origination</strong></td>
<td>origination (change,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>creation, elimination) of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>development of policy/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conceptualization,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>integration, coordina-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tion, control of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>forecasting environ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mental demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Needed</td>
<td>system perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>internal perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>external perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Style</td>
<td>subordination of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>structure (use structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rather than being used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintain psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>distance from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Characteristics</td>
<td>charisma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Basis</td>
<td>legitimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>legitimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>legitimate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4:** Summary of Katz and Kahn's (1966) Patterns of Leadership Behavior at Three Levels of the Organization.
organizational hierarchy, (2) differences in types of organizations they head, and (3) stages in the organization's development. This suggests that the chief executive's job is multi-role in nature, and that the predominance of one role over another may be temporally related to specific tasks that need to be accomplished.

Evidence in the literature also suggested that the chief executive's emphasis on specific tasks is related to the skills he/she possesses, the knowledge needed and/or available for task accomplishment, the power base or resources available to the executive, and temporally related events. Whether the chief executive delegates specific tasks to subordinates, or maintains them for himself/herself, may also be related to these factors.

In conclusion, it is apparent from this review that there is an interdependent relationship between the functions or tasks required of the chief executives and the roles they assume. It is also important to note the interdependencies between job variables and factors related to the organization and its context, and to the personal characteristics of the chief executive. The personal characteristics which the chief executive brings to the job are explored in the following section.
PERSONAL VARIABLES

The third set of variables Mintzberg (1973) referred to in his contingency view of managerial work included factors about the job incumbent that influenced the job. Mintzberg found preliminary evidence that the incumbent's values, personality, and style shaped his/her work.

Chief executive officers, like other members of the organization, bring to the job their own sets of values, beliefs, attitudes, needs, personal goals, skills and abilities, and motivations to work. The personal characteristics of chief executives, much of which has been drawn from the leadership literature on personal traits and behavioral characteristics, are examined in this section.

Personal Traits

A significant portion of the leadership research has focused on the individual—looking for stable qualities of the leader over a variety of situations. Biographies of "great men" were searched for common physiological and psychological traits that distinguished them from their followers. Two assumptions prevailed: (1) that leaders were born, not made, and (2) that "great men" shaped the events of history.

In a review of 52 studies of personal traits, Stogdill (1948) found a cluster of personal
characteristics such as intelligence, self-confidence, dominance, energy level, and task-relevant knowledge, that distinguished leaders from non-leaders and higher-echelon from lower-echelon leaders. Gibb (1954) was also able to insolate a number of physical and personality traits characteristic of perceived leaders, such as:

- height
- weight
- physique
- health
- energy level
- appearance
- intelligence
- self-confidence
- sociability
- ambitiousness
- persistence
- dominance
- extroversion

He concluded, however, that a consistent pattern of traits which characterized leaders did not exist. Jennings (1960) reached conclusions similar to Gibb, based on a review of trait theory literature; namely, that a common set of physical characteristics could not be found that distinguished leaders from nonleaders or that applied to all "great men".

Focusing more pointedly on personality traits, in a review of studies done between 1900 and 1957, Mann (1959) found that leaders tended to be better adjusted, more dominant, more extroverted, more masculine, more conservative, and had greater interpersonal sensitivity than non-leaders. Killian (1979) found that effective leaders were reliable, confident, enthusiastic, ambitious, poised, persuasive, competitive; they had
good judgment, moral courage, a will to win, and a willingness to work harder and longer than most followers. In addition, he found that successful leaders worked effectively with people, responding to the needs and desires of others, utilizing every resource, and capitalizing on the organizational environment and leadership of others.

Skills and competencies are other important personal characteristics of leaders according to Katz (1966) and Mann (1965). Katz identified three basic kinds of skills required by leaders as: (1) technical skill -- an understanding of, and proficiency in a specific kind of activity, particularly one involving methods, processes, and techniques; (2) human relations skill -- the ability to work as a group member and to build cooperative efforts within the team one leads; and (3) conceptual skill -- the ability to see the enterprise as a whole. He claimed that one of the dilemmas facing organizational leaders is the balancing of maintenance and development activities, and that these activities call for different skills and competencies on the part of leaders. Maintenance activities, according to Katz, require technical and human relations skills; development activities require the addition of conceptual skills.
Mann (1965) identified three sets of competencies and their related skills for leaders at different levels of an organization (see Figure 5). Conclusions based on studies of supervisors at different organizational levels revealed that the appropriate mixture of these three sets of skills varied somewhat by organizational type, organizational level, and the historical stage of development of the organization. Leaders at the top of the organization, for example, were more removed from the production process and had participated in the setting of objectives, so they were less apt to need the mix of technical and human relations skills required of the production supervisor. It was also found that administrative and technical skills were needed in the first stages of organizational change, and in setting up new organizations in order to reduce uncertainty and clarify objectives. Human relations skills were found to be more important in later stages of development when employee commitment and integration became issues of concern. In like manner, the "skill mix" needed for integrating employee needs and organizational goals varied from one type of organization to another.

Some of the skills and competencies identified by Stogdill (1974) as being associated with leadership were: social and interpersonal skills, technical
### Types of Skills and Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Human Relations</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary focus:</strong></td>
<td>organization</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of management:</strong></td>
<td>top level</td>
<td>middle level</td>
<td>lower level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills required:</strong></td>
<td>planning, program­ ming, organizing work; assigning right tasks to right people; delegating authority &amp; responsibility; inspecting &amp; following up on work; coordinating activities of diff. groups, individuals, departments, levels</td>
<td>identifying personnel needs; getting people to work together; motivating individuals to do the best they can; giving recognition for work done; letting people know where they stand</td>
<td>concrete motor skills &amp; theoretical understanding to be proficient in tasks to be performed; operation &amp; maintenance of equipment for which he is responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competencies required:</strong></td>
<td>ability to think &amp; act in organization­ al terms; ability to conceptualize and comprehend organizational system as whole</td>
<td>ability to work effectively with &amp; through others; to use pertinent knowledge/tech. re principles of human behavior; represent member needs &amp; goals integrate org. &amp; ind goals</td>
<td>ability to use pertinent knowledge, methods, techniques, equipment necessary to perform or supervise performance of specific tasks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Mann's Skill-Mix Configuration (Adapted from Mann, 1965).
skills, administrative skills, leader effectiveness and achievement, social nearness and friendliness, and intellectual skills. He noted, in addition, that those personality characteristics that were considered leadership traits depended on the situation and the requirements of the group.

To summarize, personal traits of leaders have been identified in terms of physiological and psychological characteristics, and skills and competencies, which are in turn shaped by the individual's background and life experiences. Collectively, personal traits are the building blocks upon which behavior is based.

**Behavioral Characteristics**

Behavior, as defined by Lewin (1935), is a function of the interaction of personality and environment. In the 1940's a group of researchers at The Ohio State University\(^1\) launched an extensive study of leadership behaviors, trying to identify ways in which one individual influenced others toward a commonly shared goal. Through empirical tests and successive refinement of their conceptualizations and measurement techniques, they were able to identify a number of patterns of leadership behavior. A myriad of studies conducted at differing supervisory levels of

\(^1\)See particularly Hemphill (1949, 1960); Shartle (1956); and Stogdill (1974).
several types of organizations resulted in the isolation of two dimensions of leadership behavior — task-related behavior or *initiation of structure*, and socioemotional behavior or *consideration*. Initiation of structure is the degree to which the leader defines and structures his/her own activities and those of the subordinates toward goal achievement (characterized by planning, communicating, and scheduling behavior). Consideration is the degree to which a leader attends to the needs of followers (characterized by behaviors which display trust, respect, and consideration of subordinates' feelings). Judgments of leader effectiveness have been based on causal relationships of leader behaviors and group or organizational outcomes of productivity (performance) and subordinate satisfaction.

Perceptions of immediate subordinates about their superior's behavior, were gleaned from studies of corporation presidents (Stogdill, Goode and Day, 1963), labor union presidents (Stogdill, Goode and Day, 1964), university presidents (Stogdill, Goode, and Day, 1965), and U.S. Senators (Stogdill, Goode and Day, 1977). Through factor analysis, nine dominant subscales of behavior were identified by these authors:

representation (speaks and acts as the representative of the group);
tolerance of uncertainty (is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset);

persuasiveness (uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions);

initiation of structure (clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected);

tolerance of freedom of action (allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action);

role retention (actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others);

production emphasis (applies pressure for productive output);

consideration (regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers); and

demand reconciliation (reconciles conflicting organizational demands and reduces disorder to system).

Comparing the four types of organizational leaders, Stogdill (1974) could not find consistent patterns which distinguished one type of leader from the others, although there were some differences in emphasis. He found, for example, that Representation, Consideration, and Demand Reconciliation behaviors were more descriptive of corporation presidents than any of the others; Role Retention and Initiation of Structure were more characteristic of college presidents; and Persuasiveness was more descriptive of senators. Presidents of colleges and corporations were less tolerant of subordinate freedom to act than senators or union presidents. At the same time, Role Retention and
Initiation of Structure behaviors were less characteristic of senators and union presidents. Production Emphasis and Tolerance for Uncertainty were equally relevant for all four types of leaders.

One problem in interpreting these results very broadly is the fact that subordinate perceptions of their leader's behavior is shaped by (1) their images of leadership, and (2) their own personal relationship to the leader. It is also unclear whether these results would still hold today when some of the contextual differences which at one time clearly separated the four types of organizations represented by these leaders are no longer as sharp as they once were.

An important contention of Swope (1970) was that personality, temperament, and background of a chief executive officer had a basic effect on the organization. "Reasonable compatibility of personality, temperament, and style between the top executive and his subordinate group is essential to morale and productivity" (p. 24), claimed Swope. He found that chief executives tended to be:

- action oriented--master in the art of persuasion;
- knows subordinates well;
- egoistic and strong-willed--not afraid to make difficult decisions;
human—can balance individual needs and organizational demands; is sensitive to others' perceptions of his/her actions;

versatile—is a generalist; sees the organization as a whole;

resilient and bouyant—can bounce back from defeat;

motivated—high aspirations to achieve; service oriented; sense of obligation; and

epicurean—enjoys the good life; has a wide range of interests.

Swope concluded that geographic, family, and educational background, as well as work experience, were important influences on executive behavior, influencing mannerisms, values, attitudes, attention to tasks, and overall style of interpersonal relations. He distinguished between two types of chief executives: founders and administrators. Founders were characterized as organization creators and builders, very involved in the daily activities of the organization. They were generally bold, impetuous, decisive, risk takers, and practical dreamers. Administrators, who often succeeded founders in the organization, were more reflective, conservative, deliberate, and engaged in more long-range planning. "Professional" administrators (as opposed to family members who inherited a leadership position) made changes in the organization but were cognizant of tradition. They often had a strong personality.
In addition to task-related and socioemotional behaviors, participative leader behaviors have been identified in recent years. Participative behavior is characterized by the leader's efforts to insure that all parties for whom a decision is relevant have had an opportunity to influence the final decision. Behaviors of effective participative leaders were identified by Maier (1970) as: sharing information; soliciting opinions, facts, and feelings; insuring fairness and impartiality; communicating openly; and guiding the decision-making process.

A number of studies of leadership or management styles have evolved from behavioral research. Likert (1967, 1971) and others at the University of Michigan, studying managers and supervisors in industrial organizations, examined the effectiveness of initiating structure and consideration as perceived by subordinates. They were able to generate a number of different leadership styles which could be classified into two basic categories: job-centered styles and employee-centered styles. The managers most successful in achievement of group productivity, cost effectiveness, high levels of motivation and satisfaction, and low absentee rates, scored high on both initiating structure and consideration. The most successful supervisors, as perceived by subordinates, were
supportive, considerate and sensitive to the needs of subordinates, while at the same time planning and structuring the work flow of subordinates. Likert concluded that the more effective supervisors or "leaders" were employee-centered and the less effective supervisors were job-centered.

Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973) conceptualized a continuum of leadership behaviors from boss-centered (authoritarian style) on the one end and employee-centered (democratic style) on the other, and posited that selection of an appropriate leadership style depended on the situation (immediate problem or decision point). Appropriate leadership style as perceived by subordinates depended upon interdependent forces on the leader, forces on the subordinate, and characteristics of the situation (organizational context, effectiveness of the group, specific task, pressures of time) and forces from outside the organization. The mix of these forces determined the degree of authority of the leader (boss-centered) and the amount of authority delegated to subordinates (employee-centered).

Mitchell (1973) claimed that participative leadership style would have an impact on subordinate attitudes and performance in terms of productivity, quality, emotional orientation toward the work setting,
and acceptance of decisions. Review of participative leadership studies, however, indicated there was limited evidence that this is the case, and that intervening variables such as follower characteristics, and situational and contextual variables must be taken into account (Filley, House, and Kerr, 1976).

A "profile questionnaire" was used by Bass and others (1957) to measure the following management styles: direction, negotiation, consultation, participation, and delegation. It was concluded from these studies that managerial style varied with factors related to the organization, task and interpersonal relations. A lack of routine tasks, for example, was found to be a determinant of delegation; direction was associated with situations of high structure and clarity. It became evident to these researchers that each manager had at least two or three styles in their behavioral repertoires.

Maccoby (1976) studied 250 top management personnel in twelve high-technology multinational corporations in the U.S. to determine leadership style. Using interviews, questionnaires, and psychological tests, he was able to classify leadership styles into four basic types: (1) craftsman—concern for quality and thrift (scientific type); (2) jungle fighter—concern for power (political type); (3) company
man—concern for human relations (cooperative type); and (4) gamesman—concern for challenge, competition, winning (risk-taker type). He concluded that the style of the leader in today's complex organizations encompassed all four types, but there was a much stronger combination of Company Man and Gamesman. This suggested a concern for human relations within the context of the organizational gestalt. Regarding educational leaders, Maccoby stated that "the conservative tempo of the times has slowed down many educational gamesmen" (p. 376), and he suggested that more risk takers were needed in the schools.

Many of the criticisms lodged against trait and behavioral research have been addressed to (1) the lack of attention to contextual and follower characteristics, and (2) the assumption of linearity (e.g., leader behavior determines follower response). Pfeffer and Salancik (1975, 1977) have demonstrated that leader behavior is determined by individual characteristics in interaction with variables in the environment, such as cultural and historical factors of the organizational setting, the demands of the social system, and patterns of expectations and social pressures of other organizational members with whom the leader is interdependent. This notion has been carried a step further by Kerr (1976) and Pfeffer (1978), who
have claimed that there are factors in the environment that may replace the need for leadership or advance leadership to a higher level in the organization (or to another organization), neutralizing the leader's influence on subordinates and making leader behavior irrelevant to the satisfaction and performance of subordinates.

**Summary**

A number of patterns have evolved from this review of the literature on the personal characteristics of leaders. First, there were a number of descriptors of leader/executive personality found throughout the studies, such as: persuasive, dominant, resilient, ambitious/highly motivated, self-confident, energetic, sociable/considerate/outgoing. It was also apparent that executive behavior has been shaped by physical and personality traits, personal background and experience, geographical and family origin, and skills and abilities. These factors, in combination, have impacted the way in which the chief executive has interpreted his/her job and the way in which he/she has responded to the demands of the job.

A second pattern which has emerged from the literature indicates that skills, behaviors, and leadership styles are closely interrelated through task-related and socioemotional dimensions. Evidence
suggests, for example, that task-related behavior, technical skills, and job-centered style appear more dominant in organizational maintenance tasks. In like manner, socioemotional behavior, interpersonal skills, and employee-centered style appear more dominant in organizational development or change-related tasks.

Third, the literature revealed a two-way relationship between the personal characteristics of the executive and the organizational context within which he/she works. Research has shown that the mix of skills, behaviors, and styles necessary to perform executive functions varied with job emphasis (e.g., maintenance or development functions), types of organization, level of position in organization, and stage of organizational development. It has also been shown that chief executives possess a variety of skills, behaviors, and styles, and that their choice of action is contingent upon organizational demands. In like manner, the personal characteristics of the chief executive have contributed to the shaping of the organization. Thus, the chief executive is able to take either a reactive or proactive posture in shaping his/her environment.

In conclusion, it is apparent from this review that there is a dynamic relationship among the elements which comprise the personal characteristics of the
chief executive officer. There is also a dynamic relationship between the person and his/her position, and between the person and the context within which he/she works.

SITUATIONAL VARIABLES

The fourth set of variables Mintzberg (1973) referred to in his contingency view of managerial work included situationally specific factors. The term "situational" emerges throughout the literature as a disclaimer to the predictability of certain phenomena. It is one of those terms which many researchers use as though the reader understands its meaning. For this reason, the concept of situation was examined more fully.

Temporal and Social Dimensions

"Situations" have been variously defined as:

complex stimulus configurations that serve as determinants of behavior (Thomas, 1928);

the set of values and attitudes with which the individual or the group has to deal in a process of activity and with regard to which this activity is planned and its results appreciated. (e.g., every concrete activity is the solution of a situation) (Znaniecki, 1947, p. 76); and

a type of social encounter with which members of a culture or subculture are familiar (Argyle, et al, 1981, p. 4).

The study of situations as determinants of behavior has its roots in early Stimulus-Response theory, as well as
Lewin's behavioral theory (Behavior = function of interaction of individual and environment), role theory, and Goffman's notion of "front stage" and "back stage" behavior.

As a unit of analysis, situations have been conceptualized as specific problems, events, or issues which serve as stimuli (occasions for action) for a behavioral response (action) (Mischel, 1968). With reference to group dynamics, Mills (1967) referred to situation in temporal terms as follows:

a momentary situation is comprised of all factors, circumstances, and forces (elements), whatever their nature or location, which have a determined effect upon what events do or do not occur, or are likely or not likely to occur, in a group (p. 93).

Thus, a given event is seen as a function of personality, group, and context, in interaction (Eg = f (P x G x C)). In these terms, a situation becomes a cross-sectional view, at a moment in time, of the complexities of a social phenomenon.

A social situation, according to Sherif (1976), is a complicated phenomenon which he described as follows:

The participants define the situation, themselves and each other in terms that reflect their cultural backgrounds, their roles and positions. . . each participant is affected by the physical and social character of the location where the encounter occurs including that of other people who happen to also be there. The activity under way or the problem posed by the situation to the participants also affects the actions of each individual. His or her actions in turn become part of the situation for other participants.
Such interaction among persons in activities in socio-physical locations is the earmark of any social situation (pp. 26-27).

Argyle and his colleagues (1981) viewed situations as social systems with interdependent parts, such that:

if one feature is altered, other features will have to change as well. So any of the features can be considered as a possible independent variable, though some of them, especially sequences, skills and difficulties, are more naturally dependent variables (p. 10).

According to Gibb (1969), social situations have the following features:

the structure of interpersonal relations within a group, e.g., roles and rules;

characteristics of the group as group and taken as a unit;

the characteristics of the larger culture in which group members have been drawn;

the physical conditions within which the group finds itself constrained to act; and

the perceptual representation, within the group and among its members, of these elements and the attitudes and values engendered by them.

Additional features cited by Argyle, et al (1981) were:

goal and goal structure;

repertoire of elements; acts that are permitted and count as meaningful moves;

sequences of behavior—subtasks that need to be done in certain order require patterned behavior; and

difficulties and skills, e.g., stress results, job skills.

These features suggest that situations have two major dimensions: (1) a "given" cultural or objective
dimension; and (2) a perceptual or subjective dimension (Thomas, 1928; Getzels, et al (1968). This is very similar to the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions of social systems described by Guba and Getzels (1957) and Getzels, et al (1968), which in dynamic interaction produce social behavior. Cultural definitions of the situation would not necessarily be the same for each individual participant because of variations in individual perceptions of reality. Thus, if one were to use the Social Process Model developed by Getzels, et al, to analyze a social situation, the model would need to be activated for each individual participant. The difficulty of achieving this end would increase geometrically with the complexities of the social situation. The range of social situations, for example, includes but is not limited to, intimate encounters with friends or relatives, casual encounters with acquaintances, formal social events, formal encounters in shops or offices, asymmetrical social-skills occasions (e.g., teaching, interviewing, supervising), negotiation and conflict, and group discussion (Argyle, et al, 1981). To complicate matters, "people also choose, avoid, and change situations while acting in them" (Argyle, 1976).
Situational Perspectives of Organization

The contingency or situational model of organization, a widely accepted view today, is based on the following assumptions:

- There is no one best way to design structure and process;
- Different parts of the organization vary; and
- Not all ways of operating are equally effective.

Contingency theory specifies how the structure and processes of an organization should vary depending on the contingencies of the situation (Bobbitt, et al., 1978). Contingency factors may include, among others, the availability of resources, the nature and scope of interdependencies with its environment (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Thompson, 1967), or the nature and scope of information processing needs (Galbraith, 1977).

The individual (within structural constraints) is seen as the mechanism through which environmental and organizational characteristics are shaped. Individual perceptions of the environment are translated into action and inaction, but individual perceptions vary. To move the organization toward rationality, organizational response to the environment is made through a series of strategic choices which are in turn influenced by internal politics and power structures. But choices are often limited by time, resources, information, conflicting goals, existing structure, and
environmental constraints, so maximization of rationality is not always possible. Design of structure and processes becomes contingent upon the situation and requires strategic choices that will best "fit" the perceived environment. Organizational flexibility is needed so that resources may be temporarily shifted depending on the strength of perceived environmental threats.

From a design perspective, Mintzberg (1979) conceptualized organizations as systems of formal and informal flows of authority, work material, information, and decision processes. He maintained that the shape of an organization's structure may vary from a "simple hierarchy" to an "adhocracy" (Figure 6). Structures change over time in response to contingencies.

Success of the organization, to contingency theorists, may involve a combination of appropriate structural devices rather than just a single device. The challenge to management is to (1) identify what it is that determines effectiveness for their organization, and (2) choose a structural design that fits the value of the contingency variable (Bobbitt, et al, 1978, pp. 353-360).

Organizational survival, according to Hedberg, Nystrom and Starbuck (1976), depends on its ability to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime Coordinating Mechanism</th>
<th>Key Part of the Organization</th>
<th>Main Design Parameters</th>
<th>Contingency Factors</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct supervision</td>
<td>Strategic Apex</td>
<td>Centralization,</td>
<td>Young, small, old,</td>
<td>Automobile dealership with flamboyant owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>organic structure</td>
<td>non-sophisticated technical system, simple, dynamic environment, possible extreme hostility or strong power needs of top manager, not fashionable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Behavior formalization, vertical and horizontal job specialization, usually functional groupings, large operating unit, vertical centralization and limited horizontal decentralization, action planning</td>
<td>Old, large, regulating, non-automated technical system, complex, stable environment, national control, not fashionable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training, horizontal job specialization, vertical and horizontal decentralization</td>
<td>Complex, stable environment, non-sophisticated technical system, fashionable</td>
<td>University, general hospital, school system, social work agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Market grouping, performance control system, limited vertical decentralization</td>
<td>Diversified markets (particularly products or services), old, large, power needs of middle managers, fashionable</td>
<td>Fortune 500 companies, multiversities, aerospace agency, managed company, manufacturer, petrochemicals company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Structural Variations (Adapted from Mintzberg, 1979).
maintain dynamic homeostasis. As reflected in the following statement, they advocated using moderation in the pursuit of rationality to keep internal and external forces in equilibrium:

Although the complex interaction among processes makes designers' forecasts unreliable, serious future problems can be avoided by keeping processes dynamically balanced. The desired balance can be caricatured with six aphorisms:

- Cooperation requires minimal consensus;
- Satisfaction rests upon minimal contentment;
- Wealth arises from minimal affluence;
- Goals merit minimal faith;
- Improvement depends on minimum consistency; and
- Wisdom demands minimum rationality. (p. 41)

It is the strategic decision-makers who, through forecasting, planning, and manipulating, design and redesign the organization to maintain equilibrium. To achieve balance, however, they must fully understand the context of their decisions in terms of past, present, and future.

Situational Perspectives of Organizational Leadership

The most highly developed models of leadership that focus on leader-situation interaction are the "Contingency," "Path-Goal," and "Rational Decision-Making" perspectives. These contingency perspectives for the most part prescribe the effects of the leader on subordinates under certain conditions.

Leader-situation interaction has been the focus of Fiedler's (1967, 1971) contingency theory of
leadership. The thesis of this perspective is that certain leadership styles (task- or relation-orientation) are more effective in relation to subordinate performance in some situations than others. Situational favorability was determined by (1) the degree of task structure, (2) the leader's position power, and (3) leader-member relations. Very favorable situations were characterized by structured task, high position power, and good leader-member relations, while very unfavorable situations were characterized by unstructured task, low position power, and poor leader-member relations. Fiedler and his colleagues have generally found that when low situational favorability existed the task-oriented leader was more effective. Similarly, when high situational favorability existed, the task-oriented leader was more effective. In situations of medium favorability, however, relation-oriented leaders were more effective. These findings have resulted in the conclusion reflected in Fiedler's Leader MATCH program that a leader's repertoire of behaviors is limited, so he/she must attempt to alter the situation to "match" his/her leadership style.

While tests of Fiedler's model by others have had mixed results, there appears to be substantial evidence which refutes the model. Much of the criticism has to
do with methodological errors. First, there is concern that the measures were ambiguously defined and interpreted. Second, tests of the model are task and population bound, reducing the model's generalizability (e.g., most of Fiedler's work has been done in military-type organizations which are highly structured). Third, causes for the relationship between leader effectiveness and situational favorability have not been sufficiently explored. Finally, the lack of attention to intervening variables leads to questions such as whether task-related behaviors are redundant in very favorable situations.

The Path-Goal model of leadership (Evans, 1970; House, 1971) focuses on the degree to which leader behavior is motivating and satisfying to subordinates in different work situations. More specifically, it emphasizes how the leader influences subordinates' perceptions of work, personal goals and paths to goal attainment. This model was derived from "expectancy theory" of motivation, and the underlying assumptions include:

1. Leader behavior is acceptable and satisfying to subordinates if they see it as a source of immediate or future satisfaction;

2. Leader behavior will be motivational if
   a. it makes satisfaction of subordinate needs contingent upon performance; and
(b) it complements environment by providing inducements otherwise lacking in subordinates or environment (Filley, House, and Kerr, 1976)

The goals of the leader are to enhance subordinate motivation to perform, enhance subordinate acceptance of the leader, and enhance subordinate satisfaction with the job. According to this model, however, the effects of leader behavior on subordinate motivation and performance are contingent upon (moderated by) the following situational variables:

- personal characteristics of subordinates (e.g., personal needs, abilities, skills); and
- environmental factors (e.g., task structure, position power, conflict).

Subordinate characteristics influence personal perceptions of the subordinates, while environmental factors influence the motivational stimuli, constraints and rewards associated with subordinate performance.

Initially, the model prescribed only task-oriented (directive) and relation-oriented (supportive) behaviors, but has since been expanded to include participative behaviors (involving consultation with subordinates and consideration of their input into the decision-making process), and achievement-oriented behaviors (setting challenging goals, displaying confidence in subordinate's ability to achieve higher levels of excellence) (House and Dessler, 1974).
While this model is still rather tentative, there have been a number of studies which support the logic of the model. The major limitation is reliance on motivation theory, and the array of contingencies upon which motivation is based. Nevertheless, the model does provide an added dimension to the conceptualization of leadership, that of the personality characteristics of subordinates. It also provides some direct contradictions to Fiedler's model (e.g., redundancy of directive leadership in favorable situations).

Another rather tentative model, Vroom and Yetton's (1973) Rational Decision-Making theory, contains an assertion that there are situational determinants to the degree of participation by subordinates in decision-making. The model was deductively derived from self-reported decision-making approaches used by managers, and prescribes conditions under which leader decision behavior affects decision quality, subordinate acceptance, and subsequently, subordinate performance. Based on the assumption that concepts such as task- and relation-oriented behavior were too imprecise to operationalize, Vroom and Yetton constructed a taxonomy of decision processes or approaches used to solve group and individual problems, and to specify leader behavior precisely enough so it would be useful to the practitioner.
The components of the model include a taxonomy of decision processes, a set of decision methods (e.g., autocratic, consultative, group, and delegated methods), classes of outcomes desired (e.g., quality/rationality, acceptance and commitment by subordinates, amount of time required to make decision), a set of problem attributes, and finally, rules for choosing a particular decision method. The effectiveness of a decision procedure, according to Vroom and Yetton, depends on various attributes of the situation which they have operationalized as a particular problem to be solved and the context in which the problem occurs. The rules serve as guides to determine which procedures should be used in a given situation at the risk of compromising decision quality or subordinate acceptance.

Vroom and Yetton's model is considered to be one of the most advanced applications of leadership theory, although it is just in the formative testing stages. Some shortcomings of the model have been identified by Filley, House, and Kerr (1976). One concern, for example, is the model's utility for prescribing behavior as opposed to explaining behavior. In addition, relative inattention to delegation methods as well as the model's complexity and lack of decision rules for subordinate characteristics, provides some
future limitations to the practical application of the model.

One of the premises of "situational" research has been that leadership (conceptualized as leader behavior) is a determinant of group effectiveness, in terms of output, morale, and group member satisfaction, indicating a one-way relationship. This approach assumes (1) that variables on both sides of the equation (e.g., leadership style and "situational favorableness" as used by Fiedler, 1967) can be simplified to just a few dimensions, (2) that the variables are constant, and (3) that there are no contextual variables which inhibit leadership effectiveness. These assumptions have produced some limitations in leadership research. First, the research is constrained in its ability to model reality because the dimensions are not broad enough to account for the complexities, ambiguities and contradictions of the leadership phenomenon. Second, the pursuit of statistical validity and reliability necessary for quantitative research has prompted the use of small, single-task groups in laboratory settings. Even much of the field research has been done with work groups involved in highly structured tasks. Third, lack of attention to contextual variables narrows the view of leadership effectiveness. Organizations, individuals
and situations are subject to change induced or inhibited by the broader context within which they exist (Vaill, 1978). Finally, judgments of leadership effectiveness are perhaps a little premature without improved conceptual and operational definitions of group outcomes, and the requirements of leadership. Further research is needed to identify situational determinants of competence requirements (including intellectual, interpersonal, administrative, and technological competencies) associated with leadership (House and Baetz, 1979). Leadership effectiveness is not a unitary phenomenon; rather, as Guba (1973) put it leadership effectiveness is a mix of behaviors that vary with situation and setting.

Situational Perspectives of Position

Mintzberg (1973) speculated that there were variations in job characteristics which could be tied to patterned temporal and societal events, such as:

- activities which recurred systematically (e.g., budget, annual report, monthly board meetings);
- cyclical activities which recurred periodically and changed the amount of attention the chief executive devoted to a specific task (e.g., legislation may require greater concentration with external environment at one time; program evaluation report may require concentration on internal matters at another time);
- activities which recur less frequently or change in scope with the length of tenure on the job;
one-time crises or periods of threat which temporarily alter the chief executive's normal pattern of activities; and

activities which change in scope with shifts in societal values and norms that shape the organization and its relationship to the external environment.

Temporal or societal changes, according to Mintzberg, impacted the amount of time devoted to specific activities and subsequently influenced shifts in roles.

In his research on the work activities of five chief executives, Mintzberg concluded that there were a number of dissimilarities in the work activities of executives of different types of organizations. The most noticeable differences were found among the executives in the business and public service sectors. Mintzberg classified the variations in executive behavior into eight managerial job types which are illustrated in Figure 7. He found that the activities of the two public-sector executives were more often in the decisional roles—entrepreneur (initiator of change), disturbance handler (conflict resolution), resource allocator, and negotiator. The public-sector executives also had more frequent contact with their organizations' directors than did executives from the business sector.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial Job Type</th>
<th>Primary Roles</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Contact Man</td>
<td>Liaison, Figurehead</td>
<td>Bartering with externals; developing reputation for self and organization</td>
<td>CEO in service industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Political Manager</td>
<td>Spokesman, Negotiator</td>
<td>Reconciles political forces on organization, negotiates internal/external environments</td>
<td>CEO in hospital, university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Entrepreneur</td>
<td>Entrepreneur, Negotiator</td>
<td>Seeks opportunities and implements changes in organization—oriented to organizational survival</td>
<td>CEO of small, young org. or rapidly changing large organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Insider</td>
<td>Resource Allocator, Leader</td>
<td>Maintenance of smooth running internal operations, dev. &amp; train subordinates, oversees operations, builds structure</td>
<td>CEO rebuilding org. after a crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Real-Time Manager</td>
<td>Disturbance Handler</td>
<td>Personally involved in day-to-day operations</td>
<td>CEO (owner) of small org.; large org. in extreme crisis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Team Manager</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Preoccupied with creation of a team</td>
<td>CEO of research and development org.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Expert Manager</td>
<td>Monitor, Spokesman</td>
<td>Center of specialized information, adviser, counselor; collection &amp; dissemination of information to outside</td>
<td>Superintendent of Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Manager</td>
<td>Liaison, Monitor</td>
<td>Building contacts and data base</td>
<td>CEO new to org. or CEO of new organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Managerial Job Types (Adapted from Mintzberg, 1979).
Summary

Situations have been broadly defined as "occasions for action." As such, the specific events, problems or issues that serve as stimuli for a behavioral response provide a cross-sectional view of activities that occur within a specific timeframe.

The literature on situational perspectives of organization and leadership has revealed that organizational or leadership behavior is contingent upon a variety of contextual factors which impact the organization or leader at a particular point in time. In like manner, the work activities of a chief executive are shaped by temporal interdependencies between contextual, personal, and task-related variables. Thus, the following elements of situation are important to consider in a study of the dynamics of a chief executive's job: setting, timing, task or activity (problem, issue, event), actors (including personal characteristics, position, behavior, and perceptions), and the broader context within which the situation occurs.

Dynamic Relationship of Variables

A review of theoretical and empirical perspectives on the chief executive's job has elicited four broad sets of variables that shape the work activities of the
chief executive: (1) environmental variables, (2) job variables, (3) person variables, and (4) situational variables. Throughout the literature, however, were indications that these sets of variables are interdependent. The forces that shape these interdependencies are examined here in terms of the relationships within and among the variable sets.

"Dynamics" is a term often used but seldom defined. In some contexts in which the term is used the implication is that something is moving, shifting, or changing. In other contexts, the term implies the way something is constructed or how parts are interconnected to make a whole.

Dynamics of Personality

Lewin (1935) employed the concept of "field" in attempting to understand the dynamics of personality and the relationship of personality to the behavior of individuals. The naturally occurring dynamic interaction between an actor's personality and his/her environment comprises the "momentary field," or a cross-sectional view of the multiple causes of behavior at any moment in time. Personality is that part of behavior which is shaped by a variety of factors and forces in interaction which determine who a person is, is not, or is likely to become.
Group Dynamics

Group dynamics is a field of study by itself. In this context, Malcolm and Hulda Knowles (1972) described dynamics as:

the complex forces that are acting upon every group throughout its existence which cause it to behave the way it does . . . it [the group] is always moving, doing something, changing, becoming, interacting, and reacting. And the nature and direction of its movement is determined by forces being exerted on it from within itself and from outside. The interaction of these forces and their resultant effects on a given group constitute its dynamics" (p. 14).

They continued by stating that group dynamics is a phenomenon that occurs naturally. Variables related to group member behavior are assessed in combination with specific group properties such as: historical background, participation patterns, communication pattern, cohesiveness, atmosphere, standards, sociometric pattern, structure/organization, procedures, and goals. As Cartwright and Zander (1968) pointed out, the student of group dynamics is not interested in describing or classifying properties of phenomena, but rather, he/she wants to know how the phenomena "depend on one another and what new phenomena might result from the creation of conditions never before observed . . . he seeks to discover general principles concerning what conditions produce what effects" (pp. 5-6).
Organizational Dynamics

Fundamental to the understanding of organizational dynamics is the concept of an ordered "system" of interdependent parts where the balance among the component parts is self-maintained (Parsons and Shils, 1951). The concept of organizational dynamics was derived from social systems theory which Talcott Parsons (1951) described as consisting of a plurality of individual actors interacting with each other in a situation which has at least a physical or environmental aspect, actors who are motivated in terms of a tendency to the "optimization of gratification" and whose relation to their situations, including each other, is defined and mediated in terms of a system of culturally structured and shared symbols (pp. 5-6).

Reducing the broad cultural definition of social system to a more manageable concept, Carr (1955) stated:

... by local social system we refer to an "assemblage" or aggregation of individuals and institutional organizations located in an identifiable geographical locality and functioning in various degrees of interdependence as a permanent organized unit of the social order (p. 167).

This suggests that a dynamic view of organizations would consider the interrelationship of organizational components, including the nature, direction and magnitude of change over time.

Dynamics of Administration

One of the concerns of Getzels, et al (1968) was that much of the organizational research prior to the
mid-1960's focused on rigid systems rather than flexible systems, and on structural (static) rather than procedural (dynamic) considerations. They claimed that:

statics may be regarded as a particular case of dynamics, but not vice versa. We may with some confidence infer the structure of an organization by studying its dynamics, but we cannot so confidently infer the dynamics of a social system by describing its structure (p. 400).

This view served as the basis for the model these authors constructed on the dynamics of administration. Conceptualizing administration as a social process, they claimed that in order to understand observed behavior and be able to predict and control it, one first needed to understand the character and interaction of the elements of the social system. In this social process model, the context within which social behavior occurs is the social system, or the network of interpersonal or "social" relationships characterized by an interdependence of parts, integration of the parts into a whole, and the intrinsic presence of both individual and institution. As illustrated in Figure 8, the social system involves two classes of phenomena: normative and individual. The normative, or nomothetic, dimension of the model views the individual as "actor," and includes the following components: institution, role, and role expectations. Although not prescribed in this model, the
Figure 2: Major Dimensions of Social Process Model of Administration.

sequencing of these components can be viewed in two ways. First, each component can be viewed as the analytic unit for the one preceding it (e.g., role expectations prescribe role, which in turn provides the basis for institution building). Second, the components could be examined in reverse order (e.g., institution shapes role—patterns of observed behavior, which in turn shapes role expectations—prescriptions of behavior).

The personal or idiographic dimension of the model views the individual as a "person", with physiological and psychological properties which shape his/her need dispositions and personality. Claiming that much of the psychological research was based on personality theories that were passive/reactive or stimulus reducing (static) rather than active/proactive or stimulus seeking (dynamic), Getzels, et al (1968) proposed that:

... there are numerous human activities ... which seem to give pleasure through encountering problems, raising the level of stimulation, and asserting individuality (p. 401).

Thus, they defined personality as "the dynamic organization within the individual of those need-dispositions and capacities that determine his unique interaction with the environment" (p. 69). Personality (defined by need-disposition) and role (defined by expectations of others) are central to the
interaction of normative and individual phenomena. Social behavior, or the product of the interaction of role and personality ($B = f (R \times P)$), is the outcome of this social process model.

**Dynamics of Leadership**

Gibb (1969) viewed leadership as a "function of personality and social system in dynamic interaction" (p. 95). Similarly, Hollander (1978) viewed the dynamics of leadership as a transactional process where"... there is a dynamic relationship with followers who perceive and evaluate the leader in the context of situational demands" (p. 38). Central to this view are the following assumptions:

- Leader traits are dynamic and impact the interpersonal context (situation);
- The leader comes to a situation with a set of dispositions which are a part of his/her style;
- The leader has multiple styles available;
- The leader functions with followers in a particular time and place (none of these elements are fixed);
- The leader may gain his/her authority from various validators (including followers or constituents and higher authorities);
- Leadership involves a variety of tasks to be accomplished in varying roles; and
- The leader's high office does not necessarily ensure follower responsiveness--personal qualities still matter.
Hollander's model, illustrated in Figure 9, suggests that leadership (defined as a relational influence process) occurs at the point of intersection between leader, followers, and situation. The purposes of leadership are achieved through a fair and orderly social process of mutual influence involving transactions (giving and receiving) between leaders and followers for certain benefits.

Summary

In summary, examination of the literature revealed that the identification of components or elements of a phenomenon only provides a partial view of reality. A more complete understanding is achieved through the examination of the dynamics or the interactive properties of a phenomenon. The preceding discussion pointed out that behavior is a function of personality and context in dynamic interaction; that there are dynamic relationships between the components of an organization; and that the dynamics of a phenomenon are shaped by forces both within and outside that phenomenon. Common characteristics of all of the models discussed were: interaction patterns and the nature, direction and magnitude of change in interaction patterns; and temporal and situational dimensions. These are elements to be considered in the development of a conceptual framework of the dynamics.
Figure 9: Model of the Dynamics of Leadership.
of the chief executive's job. Thus, it is important to assess those factors which shape a chief executive's job in terms of the interactive or dynamic qualities of the relationship within and between the elements identified.

Chapter Summary

Mintzberg's (1973) contingency view of managerial work was used as a foundation on which to build a conceptual understanding of the factors that shape the chief executive's job. Mintzberg posited four sets of contingency variables: (1) environmental variables, (2) positional variables, (3) personal variables, and (4) situational variables. Each of these variable sets was explored in terms of the prevailing theoretical and empirical perspectives which would support Mintzberg's view. From the review and synthesis of the literature, the following contingencies were elicited:

Environmental Variables -- organizational elements (task/goal, technology, actors, structure, processes); contextual elements (type, location, history/culture, age, size, stages of organizational development, environment);

Positional Variables -- task requirements; role requirements; available knowledge and resources; expectations of others;

Personal Variables -- personal traits (physical characteristics, personality characteristics, skills and abilities, education, experience, family origin and background); behavioral characteristics (initiation, consideration, and participative behavior; style); and
Situational Variables — timing; setting; task or activity (events, problems, issues); actors; context within which the situation occurs.

Many of the studies reviewed indicated interrelationships between contingencies within variable sets (e.g., interaction between contextual and organizational elements; interaction between task and role; interaction between personal background characteristics and behavior). In addition, many of the studies revealed dynamic interactions between and among variable sets (e.g., interaction between environmental and person variable sets; interaction among all of the variable sets on a particular occasion). These contingencies and the relationships within and among variable sets elicited from the literature will be used to construct a conceptual framework for the study of the dynamics of the job of two-year college presidents, which will be presented in Chapter III.
Chapter III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The executive process transcends the capacity of merely intellectual methods, and the techniques of discriminating the factors of the situation. The terms pertinent to it are "feeling," "judging," "sense," "proportion," "balance," "appropriateness." It is a matter of art rather than science, and is aesthetic rather than logical. For this reason it is recognized rather than described and is known by its effects rather than by analysis. (Barnard, 1938, p. 235)

The purpose of this study was to gain a greater understanding of the nature and scope of high-level leadership in public organizations by focusing on the position of chief executive officer of public two-year colleges. Of primary interest was what chief executives do, not what they ought to do or how well they do it. The exploratory nature of the research required the use of both deductive and inductive methods of inquiry. A multi-method approach was used to gather data and report the findings. Thus, the data were both objective and subjective in nature.

Heeding the caution advanced by Barnard, this study was designed in a way that provided maximum participation of practicing two-year colleges presidents. The research subjects played a major role
in each phase of the study including the conceptualization and refinement of the research problem, collection and analysis of data, and in the evaluation of the research findings. The research methodology is presented in two parts: (1) design of the study, and (2) conduct of the study.

Design of the Study

The first section of this chapter includes the initial design of the study. A rationale is presented for the method of inquiry and the research design selected.

METHOD OF INQUIRY

From the outset, the study was intended to be exploratory rather than a rigorous scientific inquiry. Exploratory research seeks what is rather than predicts relationships to be found, and is used to discover significant variables and relationships among variables (Katz, 1953). The findings of exploratory research are then used as a foundation for the testing of hypotheses (Kerlinger, 1973). The complex nature of the research problem dictated the selection of methods of inquiry that would achieve the following aims:

- to explore the phenomenon in its broadest context;
- to acquire data that would reflect the dynamics of the phenomenon; and
to involve practitioners in each stage of the process.

Thus, qualitative research techniques were employed to gain a better understanding of what two-year college presidents do.

The intent of qualitative research is to "compose phenomena upward" (Mitroff, 1978). Qualitative research is an umbrella term "covering an array of interpretive techniques which seek to describe, decode, translate, and otherwise come to terms with the meaning, not the frequency, of certain more or less naturally occurring phenomena in the social world" (Van Maanen, 1979, p. 520).

One of the criticisms launched against social science research by Mitroff (1978) was that most of the methodology used has been designed for working on "well-structured" problems, where the data are clear, the problems well defined, and the decisions founded on consensus. Mitroff continued by proposing that the work of an organizational leader may involve solving "ill-structured problems" in "ill-structured situations," and that in order to understand the executive's behavior, the researcher should apply tools suitable to the phenomenon under study (e.g., complex, multi-method techniques for data gathering and analysis). In a similar vein, McCall and Lombardo (1978) claimed that research on the phenomenon of
"leadership" has "prematurely focused on the deductive, hypothesis-testing model before conceptualization of the phenomenon has been adequately explored" (p. 153).

RESEARCH DESIGN

The aim of this inquiry was to determine the dynamics of the job of two-year college presidents—the issues, problems, acts and activities which shape the nature and direction of the job. Exploratory research on complex, multi-dimensional problems such as this involves a process of successive refinement using both deductive and inductive reasoning.

As illustrated in Figure 10, a multi-method approach was used. The design parameters included (1) the conceptualization and refinement of the research problem; (2) the development of a conceptual framework to guide the collection and analysis of data; (3) the collection and analysis of data, and (4) the report of findings. As indicated, an important part of the research design was the involvement of practicing two-year college presidents in each phase of the study. Since very limited information existed in the literature about the two-year college president's job or the contingencies that shape the president's job, this study was guided by three broad questions:

(1) What are the elements that constitute the chief executive's job?
Image is a problem

Why?

Job not understood in context

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

What information is needed to understand president's job?

(literature review)

(observations at a distance)

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF PROBLEM

SUCCESSIVE REFINEMENT OF PROBLEM

(group sessions)

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

CHECK AGAINST REALITY

(Data collection and analysis)

FINDINGS

Figure 10: Design of the Study.
(2) What are the factors that shape the chief executive's job?

(3) How do these factors interrelate?

In order to understand the research problem in its broadest context, extensive use was made of existing literature, and of the information provided by the research subjects themselves. This was done in two phases: (1) conceptualization of the problem, and (2) refinement of the research problem.

The conceptualization phase was designed to synthesize data from a comprehensive review of the literature on the work activities of chief executive officers in a variety of organizations. The focus here was intentionally broader than the chief executive officers in educational organizations because the literature on the work activities of college presidents was limited in scope. The results of this literature review were presented in Chapter II.

A design feature which coincided with the literature review, was a system set in place to provide cross-checks for relevance of the literature to the chief executive officers of educational organizations, particularly presidents of two-year colleges. Observations were made of the research subjects, at a distance, in both formal and informal settings, in order for the investigator to gain a qualitative understanding of the major parameters of the research
problem as perceived by the practitioners. This approach was used to gain the broadest understanding possible of the chief executive's job, the factors that shape his/her job, and the interrelationships among the factors.

The initial design also included sessions with the presidents as a collectivity, to gain their assistance in refinement of the research problem and construction of the conceptual framework. Pooled judgments were sought, through the use of a modified Nominal Group technique, that would (1) clarify the meanings of terms used by the practitioners, (2) provide insight into critical dimensions of the problem, and (3) focus more sharply on questions to be asked and data to be collected. A conceptual framework and data collection instruments were to be the products of these group sessions.

Finally, the design included two additional check points involving the research subjects: (1) analysis of data, and (2) report of findings. Once the investigator had completed both of these tasks, the practitioners were again contacted for their perceptions of the accuracy of the findings.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

There are unresolved philosophical issues regarding the use of a conceptual framework for
qualitative research. Lofland (1976), for example, advocated conducting qualitative research with no preconceived notions about the social situation one is studying. On the other hand, Mintzberg (1979) stated, "no matter how small our sample or what our interest, we have always tried to go into organizations with a well-defined focus—to collect specific kinds of data systematically" (p. 585). Others believe that at least an initial conceptual framework should be in place before an investigator begins to study a complex phenomenon. McClintock, et al (1979), criticizing Lofland's argument, claimed that without a preliminary framework, there is no generalizable basis for intercase comparisons; thus, one "cannot get a sense of the relative frequency of events" (p. 616). In a similar vein, Milés (1979) posited that "the risk is not that of 'imposing' a self-binding framework, but that an incoherent, bulky, irrelevant, meaningless set of observations may be produced, which no one can (or even wants to) make sense of" (p. 591). In other words, an investigator needs to understand what is happening as well as what is not happening.

This continuing philosophical debate among qualitative researchers is without a definitive answer. There are, however, several points to be made for using a conceptual framework for research on complex
phenomena. First, conventional logic suggests it is unrealistic for an investigator to claim that he/she had no preconceived notions about the phenomenon to be studied. By virtue of one's everyday participation in and observation of social phenomena, one structures a set of notions (whether conscious or not) about the phenomena in question. Thus, personal biases may be reflected in some way in the study. The contention of this investigator is that biases should be readily admitted and dealt with appropriately. Second, a conceptual framework defines the broad parameters of the inquiry. It allows the researcher to focus attention in a systematic way on specific kinds of data. This is especially true when the researcher does not have the opportunity to observe a phenomenon in all its complexity. The process of making sense out of the observations of complex phenomena involves the investigator's interpretation based on any initial understandings of the phenomena he/she may have.

It is for the reasons cited above that a broad conceptual framework was developed to guide this inquiry. The conceptual framework is presented in greater detail later in this chapter.

The rationale for the design of this study was just presented. What follows is a description of the way in which the research was conducted.
Conduct of the Research

The design parameters just presented are amplified in the following description of the way in which the study was conducted. Included in this description are the following: (1) selection of the research population; (2) conceptualization and refinement of the problem; (3) development of a conceptual framework; (4) data collection; (5) data analysis; and (6) report of the findings.

SELECTION OF THE RESEARCH POPULATION

Twenty-four chief executive officers of state-assisted two-year colleges in Ohio (as defined by the Ohio Board of Regents) comprised the research population. In multi-campus college systems, only the chief executive officer of the institution was included.

Several criteria were used in the selection of this population. The first criterion of selection was similarity. It was determined that by confining the study to public two-year college presidents within the boundaries of a single state some of the variance could be controlled. While each two-year college is an autonomous organization with a local board of trustees, they are all governed at the state level by a common set of statutes, rules, regulations and procedures. They are all coordinated by the Ohio Board of Regents.
and are subject to legislation by the Ohio General Assembly. These factors control some of the variance that would exist if the population included college presidents outside the state's boundaries.

The second criterion was diversity. The Ohio two-year college system includes three types of institutions: community colleges, state community colleges, and technical colleges. The system includes both new and old, large and small, urban and rural, and single- and multi-campus institutions. In like manner, the presidents of these institutions vary in age, race, geographic origin, educational background, experience, and length of tenure. This diversity is representative of two-year colleges in the nation, adding to the generalizability of the findings.

The third criterion was access to the research subjects. This criterion was met in two important ways by the selection of this population. First, the investigator was located in Columbus, Ohio, which is at the center of the state and is within driving distance of each of the state's two-year colleges. In addition, the presidents often travel to Columbus for a variety of meetings. Second, the investigator, through an unpaid administrative internship at the Ohio Board of Regents, had the opportunity to work with the presidents as a collectivity. From this vantage point,
the investigator was able to observe the presidents in a variety of situations, both formal and informal; learn the history and broader culture of the institutions they headed; have access to written documents and communication; learn of the general problems and issues which confronted the presidents; and visit the campuses. This kind of access made it possible for the investigator to establish a rapport with the research subjects, and gain insights into areas where there might be variance between presidential perceptions and reality.

The fourth consideration involved group structure, or some means by which data could be collected from the presidents as a group. There were two existing group structures from which to choose. One was the monthly meetings of the two-year campus leadership held by the Vice Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. This group included university branch campus administrators as well as two-year college presidents. The other existing group structure was the Ohio Technical and Community College Association (OTCCA) whose monthly meetings were limited to two-year college presidents in Ohio.

The latter group was selected for several reasons. First, the OTCCA is an intact group which meets to discuss issues and resolve problems of mutual concern.
It was felt that this group would be less inhibited in dealing with controversial issues than the group chaired by the Vice Chancellor. Second, this group has been meeting since 1978 and has developed a level of cohesiveness which allows members to share ideas and seek mutual support. Finally, these meetings were thought to afford the investigator an opportunity to gain maximum participation of all 24 subjects in all phases of the research. In addition, the chairman and vice-chairman of the OTCCA were willing to serve as special advisors to the investigation.

The final consideration involved the investigator's familiarity with the context within which the presidents worked. The investigator had worked in a community college outside the state of Ohio from 1965 through 1971. Two of those years were spent as administrative assistant to the college president. This type of background was deemed useful in interpreting patterns which would emerge from the investigation.

Permission was granted to the investigator by the membership of OTCCA to attend the monthly OTCCA meetings as an observer, and to solicit the participation of the presidents in group exercises to be used in the conceptualization and refinement of the
research problem. A discussion of the procedures used in that process follows.

CONCEPTUALIZATION AND REFINEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Simultaneous to the literature review, the investigator observed the two-year college presidents in order to gain an understanding of the college president's job in relation to the general literature on chief executive officers of a variety of organizations. From February 1, 1981 to January 1, 1982, observations at a distance were made of as many of the presidents as possible in formal meetings (both small and large groups), and at informal luncheon and dinner gatherings. Notes were kept by the investigator of pertinent factors which were indicative of environmental, positional, personal, and situational variables which emerged from the literature. These notes were also used as part of the data base from which the findings of this research were drawn.

The research subjects also participated in the refinement of the research problem, and in establishing the broad conceptual framework used in the study. The initial research design included a series of four group sessions with the membership of OTCCA, to explore the variable sets drawn from the literature and to add and/or delete variables and indicators they felt were
not germane to a study of the dynamics of the job of two-year college presidents. For a variety of reasons, the initial design of the group sessions had to be altered.

The group sessions were initially scheduled on the regular agenda of four successive monthly meetings of the Ohio Technical and Community College Association (OTCCA) for two hours each meeting. The sessions were to explore the "situational," "positional," "environmental," and "personal" variable sets drawn from the literature, in that order. The start-up of the group sessions was carefully planned for a time when the OTCCA agenda was relatively free from the consideration of critical problems. The first session was purposefully set to begin in January, 1982, after the Ohio General Assembly had passed an appropriations bill and state subsidies were allocated—issues which dominated the OTCCA agenda until that time.

The first group session was scheduled on the regular agenda of the OTCCA meeting of January 13, 1982, from 4-6 p.m., between their regular business session and dinner. The research design called for the use of a modified Nominal Group technique as well as open interaction, to develop pooled judgments regarding the situation variables. During the first hour, through the Nominal Group Technique, the presidents
were to respond to one broad question: What are the problems/issues you confront as president of a two-year college in Ohio? The second hour was to be spent in open discussion of the elements and dimensions of a situation.

The first session did not transpire as planned due to the following set of events:

- Inclement weather resulted in postponement of the OTCCA meeting from January 13 to January 14, 1982;

- The original agenda of the OTCCA meeting had to be changed to accommodate a previously scheduled meeting with the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents at 1:30 p.m. on January 14, 1982;

- An emergency press conference was called at 3:00 p.m. on January 14, 1982 by the Director of the state Office of Budget and Management, which revealed that a $1 billion shortfall had just been calculated in the state's budget;

- The announcement at the press conference, that college budgets would have to be reduced substantially, produced an issue for discussion that superceded all other items on the OTCCA agenda when the presidents returned to their meeting; and

- The seriousness of the issue prompted many of the presidents to return immediately to their campuses.

Thus, as it turned out, the investigator was left with only 30 minutes to gather data from eight remaining presidents. Faced with this time constraint and a relatively small group with which to work, an open interaction format was used rather than the Nominal Group technique. The focus of discussion remained the same as originally planned. Much usable data were
generated, but were somewhat limited in scope because of the hurried nature of the discussion.

Some important observations were made at the first group session, and upon evaluation it was determined that the feasibility of the original design of the group sessions should be reassessed. The following factors were considered in that reassessment:

1. It became obvious early in the session that the participants were approaching the problem from differing levels of abstraction. It was concluded that some time would be needed in each subsequent session to bring the group to a common level of abstraction.

2. The participants appeared to be impatient with the task of conceptualizing—they seemed to find it much easier to generate lists of items.

3. There appeared to be a reticence on the part of some presidents to expose their ideas to others in the group.

4. A comparison was made between the list of items generated by the presidents and a list of items the investigator had compiled from the literature, and considerable similarity was found.
5. Earlier observations of the presidents' behavior during OTCCA meetings indicated they may have preferred delegating this responsibility to a subgroup and then responded to their recommendations, rather than meeting as a collectivity.

6. The scope and critical nature of events which had shaped the agendas of OTCCA meetings for the previous three months, as well as the January meeting, raised questions about the advisability of using those meetings as a forum for the refinement of the research problem under investigation.

These observations were discussed with the Chairman of the OTCCA, and with his consultation, the investigator revised the research strategy as follows:

1. The investigator would compile a list of elements and dimensions of each of the variable sets to be considered.

2. An advisory committee of presidents would review the list and add or delete items they perceived relevant.

3. An interview protocol would be constructed by the investigator and reviewed by the advisory group.
This is the format that guided the remainder of the conceptualization and refinement phase of the study. The presidents' advisory committee met for two hours on February 4, 1982 to review and discuss the variables and indicators compiled by the investigator from the literature review and observations of the presidents. From the results of that meetings, the investigator developed the conceptual framework that would guide the data collection and analysis phases of the research.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework used in this investigation was adapted from the models developed by Allison (1971) to analyze and describe the Cuban Missile Crisis. Allison's three models (rational, bureaucratic, political) represented different approaches to the analysis of a complex phenomenon. In Model I (rational), Allison viewed national government as a black box within which were unknown goals, options, consequences, and choice, and he viewed governmental action as a choice of a national actor. Model II (bureaucratic) depicted national government as a constellation of several organizations, and governmental action as output of a variety of organizational leaders largely determined through standard operating procedures. Finally, Model III (political) viewed national government as a composite
of a variety of actors, goals, rules, and action channels, and governmental action as a political resultant of bargaining.

Allison's models can be viewed as additive in the sense that each one builds on the other by providing a more in-depth analysis of the phenomenon under investigation. Thus, the application of all three models contributes to a fuller understanding of multi-dimensional phenomena.

The adaptation of Allison's models to the study of the dynamics of a chief executive's job resulted in a three-part conceptual framework: (1) discerning properties or elements within variable sets; (2) seeking relationships within variable sets; and (3) seeking relationships between and among variable sets. Each of the three components of the conceptual framework is developed more fully in the following discussion.

**Part I.** The first component, like Allison's Model I, treated the research problem as a black box containing a mix of unknown properties. The properties of the phenomenon under investigation were constructed from a comprehensive review of the literature on chief executive officers. These properties were then presented to the research subjects who were asked to review and critique them from their own perspectives.
This component of the conceptual framework included four clusters of variables selected from the literature. The variable sets considered are briefly summarized below.

1. **Environmental Variables.**

   The work of a chief executive officer does not occur in a vacuum. It was, therefore, necessary to understand the context in which the executive works. Organizational and environmental factors such as size, age, complexity, technology, structure, and stage in overall development were considered to be among the indicators of the work environment. In addition, constituencies, constraints, and contingencies both inside and outside the organization which impact the way in which the president allocates his/her time, the way problems are resolved, and the administrative style used by the executive, were investigated.

2. **Positional Variables.**

   Examination of the literature revealed that the executive's position may or may not be defined in explicit terms by the governing board. Thus, it was important to know how the chief executive defined his/her position as well as the way it was formally defined by the governing board. Also of interest was the executive's perception of the
role expectations that others (e.g., governing board, faculty, and other constituent groups) had of the college president.

3. **Personal Variables.**

It was determined from the literature that the role incumbent (chief executive) brings to the job a variety of personal characteristics, skills, and experiences which influence the way in which he/she defines and discharges the executive role. In addition to demographic data (age, sex, family background, education), data on career patterns, administrative style, job-related skills, and presidential selection and evaluation were considered to be important indicators of the role incumbent's personal characteristics.

4. **Situational Variables.**

As a unit of analysis, situations were conceptualized as specific problems, events, or issues which serve as stimuli (occasions for action) for a behavioral response (action). Organizational problems, as defined by the chief executives, provided the entree to the research. Within these four variables sets, a list of subvariables and their dimensions and indicators was created. The list in Table 1 was used to guide the first stage of the collection and analysis of data, and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Variables:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Organizational Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task/Goal</td>
<td>Societal, output, system, product, derived</td>
<td>formalisation, goal clarity, task autonomy, cause-effect knowledge</td>
<td>Formal interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Mediating, long-linked, intensive</td>
<td>task interdependence, routinisation, mechanisation</td>
<td>Formal interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors</td>
<td>Theory X, Theory Y</td>
<td>values, attitudes, rewards sought, racial and ethnic mix</td>
<td>Formal interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Specialisation, formalisation, standardisation, centralisation, complexity</td>
<td>flow of authority, communication, material and decision-making, number of departments; number of levels in hierarchy</td>
<td>Formal interview, College catalog, Communication Flow Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>Task, maintenance, communication, decision-making, coordination/integration, control, adaptation, conflict</td>
<td>formal/informal; actors involved</td>
<td>Formal interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Contextual Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Organisation</td>
<td>Community college, state community college, technical college</td>
<td>charter</td>
<td>Ohio Revised Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Urban, rural, suburban</td>
<td>nature of service area; site</td>
<td>Campus visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Culture</td>
<td>Patterns of stability/change</td>
<td>recorded events over time; date founded</td>
<td>College catalog, Formal interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Length of time in operation</td>
<td>date chartered as two-year college</td>
<td>Formal interview, College catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Sources of Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cont'd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Small, large</td>
<td>number of students (headcount, FTE); number of faculty; number of admin-</td>
<td>Formal interview; Basic Data Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>istrators; size of budget</td>
<td>(ODR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stages of Organisational</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial, bureaucratic,</td>
<td>marked shifts in standard operating procedures; patterns of growth and</td>
<td>Formal interview; Informal conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>divisionalized</td>
<td>decline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Social, political, economic,</td>
<td>constituencies, constraints, contingencies, demands</td>
<td>Formal interview; Secondary documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>legal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple/complex; homogeneous/heteroge-</td>
<td>characteristics of service area; setting &amp; population to college;</td>
<td>Formal interview; Informal conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ogeneous; stable/shifting; stat-</td>
<td>industrial base; demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ic/dynamic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positional Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Task</td>
<td>Routineness, complexity, auton-</td>
<td>length of time on job; formal responsibilities; allocation of time;</td>
<td>Formal interview; Job description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>omy, ambiguity</td>
<td>skills/abilities required</td>
<td>Informal conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Role</td>
<td>Informational, decisional, in-</td>
<td>task clusters; expectations of others; role relationships</td>
<td>Formal interview; Informal conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>terpersonal; maintenance, de-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Background</td>
<td>demographic information, educa-</td>
<td>age, race, marital status; geographical origin; family background; previ-</td>
<td>Formal interview; Informal conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tion, career paths</td>
<td>ous work experience; college degrees and subject matter; efforts at self-</td>
<td>Resume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Personal Traits</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>renewal</td>
<td>Formal interview; Informal conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Sources of Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Personal Traits (cont'd)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situational Variables:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Problem/Issue</td>
<td>Routine, critical</td>
<td>cause-effect knowledge; significance</td>
<td>Personal interview, informal observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Timing</td>
<td>Problematic, opportunistic</td>
<td>what else was occurring at same time</td>
<td>Informal conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Actors</td>
<td>Consensual, adversarial</td>
<td>amount and nature of influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Setting</td>
<td>Strategic, non-strategic</td>
<td>physical location and surroundings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familiar, unfamiliar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
provided the basis for the more in-depth search of the second part of the conceptual framework.

**Part II.** Viewed in isolation, the variables identified in Part I were predominantly static rather than dynamic indicators of the factors that shape a chief executive's job. To gain a fuller understanding of the dynamics of the chief executive's job, it was necessary to examine the relationships between and among the variables within each variable set. Thus, Part II of the conceptual framework was structured such that the dynamic relationships within the environmental variable set were considered by examining the ways in which organizational and contextual variables were linked. In like manner, linkages between the characteristics of task and role were sought within the positional variable set, and the relationships of personal background, traits and behavior within the personal variable set were examined. Finally, within the situational variable set, interrelationships among timing, setting, task, actors, and context were examined. With a broader understanding of the relationships of variables within the variable sets, it was possible through the third part of the conceptual framework to seek relationships between and among the variable sets themselves.
Part III. The final component of the conceptual framework included a broad scheme for examining the dynamics between and among variable sets, which is graphically represented in Figure 11. As depicted, the investigation was designed to examine the following relationships between variable sets:

- Environmental $\rightarrow$ Personal
- Environmental $\rightarrow$ Situational
- Environmental $\rightarrow$ Positional
- Personal $\rightarrow$ Situational
- Personal $\rightarrow$ Positional
- Situational $\rightarrow$ Positional

The final step involved a search for patterns which would emerge from the data regarding dynamic relationships among the variable sets.

Collectively, these three components of the conceptual framework represented a way in which variables could first be isolated and examined as fully as possible, and then be merged to present a description of the dynamics of a chief executive's job. This framework guided the collection and analysis of data as well as the way in which the findings were reported.

DATA COLLECTION

The conceptual framework just described served as a guide for data collection. Because of the comprehensive nature of the problem under investigation, data were collected from: (1) observations of the research
Figure 11: Conceptual Mapping of Interrelationships Between Variable Sets.
subjects, (2) written documents, and (3) formal interview. Once the parameters of the research problem had been established through the literature review and observations of and discussions with the research subjects, an interview schedule was constructed. A description of these data collection techniques follows.

**Observation.** The investigator observed the research subjects in both formal and informal settings from February 1981 through March 1982. Written notes were made of comments the presidents made about their jobs and certain behaviors that were displayed in formal and informal settings. The notes from these observations were used in both the design of the conceptual framework and as part of the data base on the dynamics of the president's job.

**Formal Interview.** An interview schedule was constructed from the list of variables included in the conceptual framework and presented to the advisory committee of presidents for review. After suggesting a few minor revisions, they approved the interview schedule and encouraged the investigator to move ahead with the interviews during the month of March 1982. Letters were sent to each of the 24 two-year college presidents in Ohio requesting an appointed time for the interview (see Appendix A). One president responded
that due to an institutional policy he had regarding
response to questionnaires or requests for interviews,
he would not participate in the study. The remaining
23 presidents agreed to participate. Interviews were
subsequently scheduled during the period March 15
through March 31, 1982. They were purposely scheduled
within this block of time to guard against critical
events which might impact their responses to questions
on the interview schedule, and to come before the
myriad of conferences that take the presidents away
from campus during the month of April. Two of the
presidents were unable to meet with the investigator
within this time period; thus, they were not included
in the sample.

Two-hour interviews were held with 21 of the
two-year college presidents, in their offices. All but
four of the sessions were tape-recorded with the
subject's permission. The decision not to tape-record
four sessions was based on one of two factors: the
physical setting prevented the use of a portable
recorder, or it was determined by the investigator that
a recorder would inhibit or otherwise obstruct the
interview session. A copy of the interview guide is
included in Appendix B.

At the time of the interview, the investigator
collected the following documents from the presidents:
position description of the president, organizational chart, college catalog, personal resumé of the president, and other documents the presidents had volunteered to provide (e.g., personal statement on leadership philosophy).

Written Documentation. In addition to the written documents collected from the presidents at the formal interview, state historical, legal, and statistical records were examined for details regarding the development of two-year colleges in Ohio. The following written materials provided such information:

- President's position description
- College catalog
- College organizational chart
- President's resume
- College annual report
- College policy manuals
- Ohio Revised Code
- Basic Data Series (Ohio Board of Regents)
- Master Plans (Ohio Board of Regents)
- other historical documents/memoranda

Thus, the combination of observational data, written documentation, and data collected from the formal interviews provided a comprehensive data base for the examination of the factors which shape the jobs of two-year college presidents in Ohio.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data were analyzed in three stages consistent with the three components of the conceptual framework. The first stage involved compiling an aggregate profile
of the factors within the four variable sets that shaped the presidents' jobs. To accomplish this task, data from the tape recordings and/or the investigator's notes of the interview, as well as previous notes of general observations and informal discussions were coded onto 4 by 8 foot grids. There were four grids, one for each of the variables clusters (environment, position, person, situation). Columns were made for each institution/president, identified by a code number, and each of the indicators from the conceptual framework. (A sample format used for the grid is included in Appendix C). Then each of the documents the investigator had collected were content analyzed and information was transcribed to the grid. The end result was a composite profile for each president/institution (vertical axis) and data that could be aggregated (horizontal axis). Aggregate data were subsequently compiled from the grids, which is the basis for the composite profile of the factors which shape the jobs of the two-year college presidents in Ohio. This also allowed for a comparison of presidents of technical colleges and community colleges.

The second stage of the data analysis involved an in-depth examination of each grid to determine patterns of interrelationship within the variable sets.
Patterns were recorded for each institution/president and a composite was drawn from the aggregate data.

The final stage of the data analysis focused on the dynamic relationships between and among variable sets. This was accomplished by controlling for each variable set and determining patterns that emerged from the data. When controlling for the environmental variable set, for example, relationships were mapped with positional variables (e.g., length of time on the job; responsibilities; skills/abilities required; role relationships), personal variables (e.g., education; career paths; personality; behaviors), and situational variables (e.g., problem/issue; timing). The same procedure was used for each of the remaining three variable sets. Finally, patterns of similarity and variance were examined between community college and technical college presidents, the context within which they worked, and the impact of the forces which shaped their jobs. Conclusions were then drawn about the dynamics of the job of two-year college presidents in Ohio.

REPORT OF THE FINDINGS

Because of the study's exploratory nature, the findings are reported in narrative form, presenting ranges when it was possible to determine them.
Examples drawn from the presidents as well as personal quotes are interspersed throughout the findings to clarify meanings.

The findings are reported in two parts. Part I, found in Chapter IV, is a presentation of a composite sketch of the elements that shape a chief executive's job and includes some discussion of the relationships between and among factors within variable sets. Part II, which is reported in Chapter V, includes a discussion of the dynamic relationships between and among the environmental, positional, personal, and situational variable sets, and draws some distinctions between community college presidents and technical college presidents, the context within which they work, and the impact of forces which shape their jobs. Conclusions are drawn and implications for theory and practice are cited in Chapter VI.

Limitations of the Study

Some of the limitations in the original research design have been discussed. Had the timing of this investigation been different (e.g., at a time when the presidents were not facing some critical problems which required considerable time and attention to consensual strategies), the group process approach would have been a feasible and desirable method of data collection and analysis.
Reliance on perceptions of the presidents as a data base was a potential limitation, although steps were taken to incorporate other types of data as a check against presidential perceptions. An alternative strategy would have been the use of structured observations such as the technique used by Mintzberg (1973) and others. He observed his subjects each day for one week, recording their contacts and their activities. After preliminary review of the literature, as well as informal conversations with several college presidents, it was concluded that for maximum utility, an observation would have had to extend over a period of months in order to capture the full meaning of the executive's work. Faced with limitations of time and resources, the investigator concluded that it was not possible to conduct an appropriate observational study.

Some caution may be warranted on the generalizability of the findings of this research. Data were collected from a population of one type of higher education institution (two-year public colleges) within the boundaries of a single state. Variation in types of organizations as well as state-level governance patterns would change the context within which the chief executives work. The exploratory nature of the research, however, made it possible to speculate about similarities and differences among
chief executives of colleges and universities, and of public and private organizations.

Chapter Summary

The rationale for the design of the study and a discussion of the way in which the investigation was conducted were presented in this chapter. In addition, some limitations of the design were cited. The complex nature of the phenomenon under investigation necessitated the use of both deductive and inductive processes in refining the research problem, developing a conceptual framework, and collecting and analyzing data. The research subjects participated in each phase of the study and through their participation, the investigator was able to gain an understanding of the research problem in its broadest context.

Part I of the research findings, which includes a composite sketch of the elements that shape the jobs of the two-year college presidents is presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V, the second part of the research findings, is focused on the dynamic relationships between and among the forces which shape the presidents' jobs. Finally, conclusions and implications are presented in Chapter VI.
Chapter IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS – PART I

He manages several businesses at once: an educational enterprise, a hotel and restaurant, research laboratories, and a library, among others. Budgets must be established and adhered to or adjusted. Plans must be made and implemented. The president must delegate authority to, and evaluate the performance of, those in charge of faculty members, students, and administrative staff. He is responsible for people, for services, for real estate, for money, and for the fulfillment of an educational mission. On all of that—and more—he must answer to a board of trustees (Hall, 1980, p. 48).

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the dynamics of the job of chief executive officers of public two-year colleges in Ohio. The strategies used to achieve the research objectives were outlined in Chapter III. Research findings were drawn from composite profiles of the presidents, their positions and the context within which they work based on analyses of written documents, informal observations, informal conversations, and formal interviews. Three of the 24 presidents in the population were not available for interviews, thus, the findings were based on 21 (87 percent) completed profiles.

It should be remembered that the bulk of the research focused on perceptions of the presidents as
well as those of the investigator. The findings of other studies related to two-year college presidents and their institutions are integrated throughout this chapter as a means of cross-checking the generalizability and reliability of information provided by the presidents in this sample.

A composite profile of the elements of the job of two-year college presidents in the state of Ohio is presented in this chapter. Included in the discussion are the environmental, positional, personal and situational factors which shape the presidents' jobs. Findings related to the dynamic relationships of the factors that shape the presidents' jobs are presented in Chapter V.

Composite Profile of the Elements of the Job of Two-Year College Presidents in Ohio

Analysis of the data resulted in a general profile for each of the 21 presidents who were interviewed and the colleges within which they work. From the individual profiles, a composite of general characteristics was derived, which illustrated some of the similarities and differences among Ohio's two-year college presidents. General findings are presented on the personal characteristics of the presidents, the position they hold, specific situations they face, and the environment within which the presidents work.
THE ENVIRONMENT

Two-year colleges in Ohio have been shaped by the interactions and interdependencies within and between the organizations (colleges) and their environments. At the same time, the colleges have helped to weave the social, political, and economic fabric of a global society. Characteristics of the local, state, national, and global environment have both enhanced and constrained the activities of the two-year colleges sampled. An overview of environmental characteristics places the colleges within a broader context.

Contextual Characteristics of Two-year Colleges

Contextual characteristics such as organizational type, history, age, size, location, stages of development, and environment are considered in this section.

Type of Organization. Ohio's public two-year colleges are chartered as political subdivisions and bodies corporate subject to the provisions of the Ohio Revised Code. There are three types of two-year colleges among the sample studied: technical colleges, community colleges, and state community colleges.

Technical colleges were defined as postsecondary education institutions organized for the purpose of providing "technical college" and "adult technical education" programs up to two years in duration,
leading to a certificate, diploma, or associate degree. They are operated by a 7 or 9 member board of trustees, depending on the size and location of the technical college district. One-third of the trustees for these institutions are appointed by the state Governor, two-thirds are appointed by a caucus of county, city, and/or exempted village school boards (rf. Chapter 3357, Ohio Revised Code).

Community colleges are defined as postsecondary institutions organized for the purpose of providing "arts and sciences," "technical," and "adult education" programs not to exceed two years in duration, leading to a certificate, diploma, or associate degree. They are operated by a 9 member board of trustees (three appointed by the Governor; six appointed by the county commissioner(s) of the community college district). Community college districts can be established in one or more contiguous counties with a total population of 75,000 or more persons (rf. Chapter 3354, Ohio Revised Code).

State community college districts include one or more contiguous counties with a total population of 150,000 or more persons. State community colleges cannot be established in an area where technical colleges or university branch campuses already exist and may not take the place of existing colleges without
the consent of the boards of trustees of such institutions. These colleges may offer the same programs as community colleges (arts and sciences, technical, and adult education). The nine members of the board of trustees of these institutions are appointed by the Governor of the state (rf. Chapter 3358, Ohio Revised Code).

All of the public two-year colleges in Ohio receive a major portion of their capital and operational funds from state legislative appropriations. In addition, community colleges may seek additional funding through taxes levied in their local districts. The balance of their funding is secured through student tuition and fees, private donations, and federal grants.

History. The most rapid growth in numbers of two-year colleges in America came in the decade of the 1960's (Monroe, 1972). Such was the case in Ohio. A brief summary of the development of these colleges sets the stage for a discussion of the contextual characteristics of the president's job.

John Millett, the first chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, recorded the early development of two-year colleges in Ohio in Politics of Higher Education (1974). Planning for two-year colleges in Ohio began as early as 1952 when the Superintendent of
the Cleveland Schools proposed the development of a community college in that area. A group of consultants brought in during 1952-53 to consider the feasibility of the proposal recommended that there was no need for an additional higher education institution at that time, but that the proposal should be reviewed again at the end of the 1950's. In 1958, the Baker Commission again reviewed the proposal and recommended the establishment of a public community college in Cleveland. Authorizing legislation was drafted by the Ohio Interim Commission and introduced into the Ohio General Assembly in 1961. As a result, the Ohio General Assembly in 1961 enacted the following pieces of legislation: (1) authorized county governments to create community colleges subject to the approval of a new state agency (Community College Board); (2) authorized school boards to create technical institutes offering a postsecondary program in technical education, and (3) authorized counties to establish university branch districts to help finance facilities for state university branch campuses.

In 1963, legislation was authorized by the Ohio General Assembly and signed by the Governor, creating the Ohio Board of Regents, the state's coordinating agency for higher education. (The community college board established in 1961 legislation was abolished and
authority was transferred to the new board.) The nine Regents were immediately appointed and began work with a skeleton staff and a consulting team to develop a Master Plan for higher education. The first chancellor, John Millett, former president of Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, was appointed in June of 1964.

By 1963 two new community colleges (Cuyahoga and Lorain) had been developed. In addition, 12 technical institutes had been authorized by the State Board of Education to operate in conjunction with vocational high schools, to be funded entirely by federal grants and school district funds. The impetus for the development of these institutions was federal money provided to the states to expand vocational/technical education. The funds came from the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

At the request of the directors of the technical institutes, Millett met with them in the spring of 1964 to discuss the need for new and adequate facilities, and the desire to move their institutions into the higher education sector. Technical institutes were subsequently reorganized under Chapter 3357 of the Ohio Revised Code and in 1969 the Ohio General Assembly enacted legislation which provided that all post-secondary technical education programs operate within an institution of higher education. Capital funds were
later appropriated for development of new facilities, and by 1971, all of the technical colleges which presently exist had been chartered.

Legislation which created state community colleges (previously known as state general and technical colleges) provided a mechanism for merging technical colleges and university branch campuses, although this has only occurred in one instance. It also provided an alternative form of higher education organization for contiguous rural counties which were not presently included in a technical or community college district, or did not have a university branch campus.

For purposes of this study, the three state community colleges and five community colleges were grouped together. Both of these types of institutions are similar in mission and programming. Thus, the findings are based on a sample which includes 13 technical colleges and 8 community colleges.

Age. Within this broader history of the development of two-year colleges in Ohio, each college has its own history. One college, for example, was originally founded in 1887 as a YMCA college and through the years has changed form until becoming a community college in 1966. Thus, the original founding date of many of the colleges is not the same as their official data of charter which established their
present operating base. As illustrated in Table 2, the oldest two-year college, from date of charter, has been in existence for 20 years; the youngest has been in operation for 8 years.

Size. In terms of size, measured by student headcount, the largest community college enrolled 27,005 students, and the largest technical college enrolled 9,279 students in the Fall of 1982. In the same year, the smallest community college enrolled 1,075 students; the smallest technical college enrolled 837 students (Ohio Board of Regents, Basic Data Series, 1983). Staffing patterns at the colleges varied, although the community colleges tended to have almost as many administrative and support staff (in full-time equivalents) as full-time faculty. The average technical college had just over half as many administrative and support staff as full-time faculty. Total operating income for community colleges varied from a high of $56.5 million to a low of $2.2 million, and from a high of $16.8 million to a low of $1.7 million for technical colleges in fiscal year 1983 (Ohio Board of Regents, Basic Data Series, 1983).

Location. Ohio's two-year colleges were geographically dispersed across the state as shown in Figure 12. Their service areas rearranged from one to five counties; some having a more dense population than
TABLE 2
PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES IN OHIO: OFFICIAL DATE OF CHARTER, OPERATING INCOME, AND NUMBER OF FULL-TIME STUDENTS, FACULTY, AND ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Date of Charter</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Operating Income (thousands)</th>
<th>Fall 1982 Enrollments (Headcount)</th>
<th>FTE* Faculty</th>
<th>FTE* Admin.</th>
<th>Total FTE* Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Cuyahoga Community College</td>
<td>$56,580</td>
<td>27,005</td>
<td>737.9</td>
<td>594.9</td>
<td>1,371.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Lorain County Community College</td>
<td>13,199</td>
<td>6,691</td>
<td>197.0</td>
<td>157.2</td>
<td>369.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Lakeland Community College</td>
<td>13,580</td>
<td>9,234</td>
<td>208.9</td>
<td>156.5</td>
<td>365.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sinclair Community College</td>
<td>25,680</td>
<td>18,615</td>
<td>507.7</td>
<td>292.8</td>
<td>800.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus Technical Institute</td>
<td>16,811</td>
<td>9,279</td>
<td>306.1</td>
<td>167.5</td>
<td>473.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jefferson Technical College</td>
<td>3,446</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>122.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>North Central Technical College</td>
<td>4,036</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>114.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northwest Technical College</td>
<td>2,041</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terra Technical College</td>
<td>5,187</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>152.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Muskingum Area Technical College</td>
<td>3,592</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>102.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stark Technical College</td>
<td>6,126</td>
<td>3,123</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>157.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Cincinnati Technical College</td>
<td>8,773</td>
<td>3,547</td>
<td>162.5</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>240.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lima Technical College</td>
<td>4,575</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>121.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delmont Technical College</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington Technical College</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Hocking Technical College</td>
<td>7,611</td>
<td>3,579</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>231.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marion Technical College</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Edison State Community College</td>
<td>3,172</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>116.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Rio Grande Community College</td>
<td>2,234</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern State Community College</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Shawnee State Community College</td>
<td>5,182</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>162.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not included in the sample:

1966 Clark Technical College 5,667 2,786 87.3 82.6 173.9
1968 Owens Technical College 9,634 4,348 169.7 113.5 294.2
1971 Central Ohio Technical College 2,784 1,230 55.6 27.8 84.4

*Full-Time Equivalent.
Figure 12: Official Districts of the Public Two-Year Colleges in Ohio.
others. Attempts to classify colleges in terms of urban and rural locations were met with several problems. In terms of physical location of facilities, for example, many campuses were in suburban settings, although seven were physically located in urban population centers. Two of the colleges located in suburban settings serviced densely populated areas. In contrast, some of the colleges were located near the city center of small and mid-sized cities.

A number of the technical colleges were located in close proximity to joint vocational schools or university branch campuses. Three technical colleges and two state community colleges were within one or two blocks of a joint vocational school, and two technical colleges shared the same property with a joint vocational school. A similar arrangement existed for five of the technical colleges which shared the same property with university branch campuses. Two of the technical colleges were housed in facilities that once were joint vocational schools.

Stages of Development. Several of the presidents were able to identify distinct transitions in the development of their colleges. The first stage was described as the developmental or entrepreneurial stage, where the presidents began with a very small staff (in one case, the president and his wife), and
concentrated on recruitment of students and faculty, and on building facilities and designing curricular programs. The second stage was described as one of "settling in," where faculty, staff and programs were in place. The emphasis was on the establishment of sound management practices and systematic policies and procedures. A third stage of development was identified by one president as "institutional growth through investment in strategic opportunities." Less emphasis was placed in this stage on managerial control while greater emphasis was placed on quality and effectiveness. This stage was also marked by a heightened concern with the external environment and being able to determine and respond in a flexible manner to environmental shifts, and searching for and capitalizing on environmental opportunities. Not all colleges have passed through all of these stages. Nor have all of the presidents experienced the same sequence of events. In fact, some of the newer presidents who have taken the helm of an "under-developed" institution were at the same time concerned with growth and development, establishing sound managerial practices, and searching for strategic opportunities.
Organizational Environment. At the local level, the colleges have been shaped in part by dependencies on others for resources—people, money and materials. In- and out-migrations of people, employment trends, age group changes, the quality of education in elementary and secondary schools, and general attitudes toward postsecondary education have impacted both the quantity and quality of potential students and their training needs. At the same time, per capita income, community development efforts, and local capital investments in roads, housing and other public services have had both a fiscal and programmatic impact on the colleges.

Whether the colleges were located in densely populated urban centers or small rural communities, they have been encased in a larger state environment which is not without some impact. Ohio has been politically and economically conservative and has had a long tradition of low taxes and underfunding of education. The state's economy has depended for the most part on heavy manufacturing and agriculture. Factory obsolescence, increased cost of utilities, labor-management problems, high rates of unemployment, and the lack of a statewide, long-range economic development plan have contributed to a rapidly declining economy.
Nationally, "New Federalism" and "Reaganomics" have in recent years had an impact on local colleges, not only in terms of available funding, but also in terms of attitudes toward education and the shaping of educational policy. Much of the slack created by these shifts in attitudes and responsibilities has had to be absorbed by public organizations at state and local levels. Federal legislation and resulting policies and procedural guidelines have had a direct impact on academic institutions as have Executive Orders and the laws which have prescribed individual freedoms, equal opportunity, and due process. Evidence of compliance with federal regulations and accountability for use of federal dollars has in many cases added to the complexities of institutional record keeping and information retrieval and reporting systems. In addition, a downturn in the nation's economy has affected local colleges both fiscally and programmatically.

In the broadest perspective, there has been an interactive relationship between the cultures and traditions of people from other parts of the world and the local academic community. These diverse cultures and traditions have been reflected by many of the students as well as community residents.
Environmental impact has been more intense for some colleges than for others, which is related to the rapidity of shifts in attitudes, industry needs, and competition with other educational institutions and agencies. The ability of college personnel to "read" and respond to environmental trends has also varied. In some institutions, personnel have simply responded to environmental stimuli; in others, personnel have actively searched for environmental opportunities.

In summary, it is apparent from the preceding discussion that the contextual characteristics of two-year colleges in Ohio varied from institution to institution, although similarities in organizational context have been pointed out. Organizational characteristics of two-year colleges in Ohio will be the focus of the following section.

Organizational Characteristics of Two-Year Colleges in Ohio

Organizational characteristics which included goals, structure, people, technology, and processes of the two-year colleges were analyzed. It should be pointed out that only a cursory examination of these characteristics was possible. The data examined were secured primarily from written documents and presidential perceptions, not from an in-depth observation of organizational behavior.
Goals. Formal organizational goals appeared in several forms in the college catalogs. Analysis revealed that some goals were stated in terms of the philosophy, mission or purpose of the organization; some were stated more explicitly as goals and/or objectives. Goal statements clustered in two ways: according to referent, and according to specificity to the organization. As illustrated in Figure 13, institutional goals were statements defining the purpose of the organization in relation to society, to its consumers, and to the broader community. Operational goals were statements reflecting how institutional goals would be achieved. Although stated in different ways, goals and objectives were comparable across the two-year college system. Technical colleges, which have been limited in mission by their legal charter, did not include reference to baccalaureate preparation among their goals. In addition, more of the larger colleges, and particularly the community colleges, included greater emphasis in their goal statements on the community referent.

Structure. In general, the formal structure of Ohio's two-year colleges was found to be less dense (fewer hierarchical levels) than other educational organizations. Examination of formal organizational charts revealed that most of the colleges had only two
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Institutional Goals</strong></th>
<th><strong>Operational Goals</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer (student) oriented:</strong></td>
<td>flexible delivery system;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provide equal access to all without regard to race, ethnic origin, religion, handicap, income;</td>
<td>broad range of programs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provide lifelong learning opportunities;</td>
<td>practical orientation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- promote excellence;</td>
<td>counseling and advising;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provide basic skills to insure academic achievement;</td>
<td>job placement;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provide activities to develop social skills;</td>
<td>evaluation of effectiveness;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provide transfer opportunities.</td>
<td>promotion of faculty and staff development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community oriented:</strong></td>
<td>work with technical/professional societies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- respond to lifelong needs of community;</td>
<td>cooperate with other educational institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- respond to technical manpower needs of community;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provide skilled manpower pool;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provide faculty, facilities, counseling services for community— for expansion of academic, social, cultural and recreational opportunities of the community;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- aid in the development of the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Society oriented:</strong></td>
<td>offer credit and noncredit continuing education programs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- enhance the quality of citizenship;</td>
<td>offer broad range of programs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provide foundation for personal development;</td>
<td>provide up-to-date technical/occupational courses;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provide foundation for productive careers;</td>
<td>provide developmental education;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- increase the earning potential of citizens;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- promote positive attitudes toward work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 13:** Examples of Statements Extracted from the Published Goals of Public Two-Year Colleges in Ohio.
administrative levels between the president and the faculty. In most cases, attempts have been made to streamline the communication and decision-making processes. In this way, operational decisions could be made closer to the core faculty and staff, and strategic decisions just one level further up the hierarchy by the executive cabinet. Listed below are some of the position titles found at each of the hierarchical levels in the colleges:

- **First Level:** President
- **Second Level:** Vice Presidents/Deans of Instruction, Student Personnel Services, Business Services, and Administrative Services
- **Third Level:** Directors of special programs; Division/Department Chairpersons
- **Fourth Level:** Faculty

In some of the institutions, the president had a special staff assistant whose function was to coordinate community relations, or to direct institutional planning or mechanized information systems. In addition, most of the presidents had a presidential or institutional advisory committee composed of community leaders.

Examples of the sub-departments that were contained within the realm of responsibility of the Vice Presidents/Deans follow:
This list has been provided as an indication of the diversity of administration functions performed in the two-year colleges. While the larger colleges had all
of these departments—and more—the small institutions had fewer of the auxiliary services.

**Actors.** The presidents reported that for the most part faculty and students represented a cross section of the local community in terms of race, ethnic groups and values. Only in two colleges were there disproportionate numbers of international or out-of-state students.

Full-time college faculty were reported to be stable, many of them having been at the college since it was chartered. According to most of the presidents, adversarial relationships with faculty have diminished over the years. Only three presidents indicated problematic relationships with faculty; all three of these colleges had unionized faculty.

Adversarial relationships with students that existed in many colleges during the late 1960's and early 1970's were reported to be virtually nonexistent today. Only isolated problems involving one or a small group of individuals were reported. Most of these problems had to do with a particular instructor, course, or procedural matter and were usually addressed through institutional due process procedures.

**Technology.** Thompson (1967) identified three general types of technologies: mediating, long-linked, and intensive. Evidence of mediating technologies
(matching suppliers of inputs with users of outputs) were found in all of the colleges, particularly at the administrative level. These types of tasks were most prevalent in the functional areas within student affairs (e.g., financial aids, veterans' affairs, placement), business affairs (e.g., purchasing, shipping/receiving, bookstore), and administrative affairs (e.g., institutional research, data processing, learning resources).

Long-linked technologies (the performance of serially arranged tasks) were more evident in the technical colleges than the community colleges, particularly at the instructional level. This was characterized by the incremental nature of the skill building process used in the training for specific technologies as well as the prevalence of rules, regulations, and standard operating procedures.

Intensive technologies (using a variety of techniques with feedback coming from the object itself) were more evident in the community colleges because of the variety and diversity of programs offered in these colleges. Sequentially arranged tasks were also evident within the technical divisions of instruction.

Some colleges were more mechanized than others in terms of information processing, although they all appeared to have mechanized information systems. More
of the large colleges than small ones used sophisticated, up-to-date equipment in instructional programs as well as administrative functions.

Processes. Haas and Drabek (1973) enumerated the following organizational processes: task, maintenance, communication, decision-making, coordination/integration, control, adaptation, and conflict. Rather limited information about organizational processes was gained from the formal interviews with the subjects of this study.

According to the information supplied by the presidents, central organizational tasks were usually assigned by them to their immediate subordinates. In terms of maintenance processes, the presidents played a major role in recruitment and socialization of their immediate administrative staff. The amount of delegation of organizational maintenance tasks varied among the presidents from very little delegation to almost complete delegation.

Communication processes varied from top-down, vertical communication patterns to a mix of vertical and horizontal communication mechanisms. A variety of communication techniques were described by the presidents. Memoranda and open meetings were used by most presidents to provide information to college faculty, staff, and students. The local news media
were used by most to inform the broader community of college activities, although not all presidents had a favorable relationship with their local press. Two presidents reported using special newsletters or bulletins to share information with board members; others reported the use of informal communication strategies to communicate with board members.

Decision-making processes varied from centralized (president only) to decentralized (wider participation). Eighteen (86 percent) of the presidents reported sharing decision-making with their executive cabinet members, but were quick to point out that final decisions most often rested with the presidents. Many of the presidents have used faculty, staff, student, and community councils or committees to advise the decision-making process. Faculty organizations (predominantly non-union) existed at all of the colleges and some played a stronger role in instructional decision-making than others.

Coordination and integration of organizational activities and members involved both formal and informal processes. Operational manuals and student and faculty handbooks were examples of formal coordination/integration mechanisms. These documents outlined the rules and standard operating procedures established for the college. Informal processes used
for coordination and integration were more difficult to
detect from the data collected, but some presidents did
mention college-wide informal activities such as
athletic events, picnics, and receptions that helped to
informally integrate organizational members.

Processes used for organizational adaptation
identified by the presidents included: (1) the use of
community people on curriculum and presidential
advisory committees; (2) mechanized information
systems, (3) forecasting environmental trends, (4)
president's participation in community organizations,
and (5) participation in professional organizations.
All of these techniques were used to varying degrees to
discern potential environmental changes that would
impact the college. Adaptations to change were usually
made through structural, procedural, or curricular
revisions as a response to potential threats or
opportunities or as a reaction to particular problems.
Opportunities for staff and faculty development were
provided at many of the colleges as a way of keeping
those who worked in the colleges current.

Formal processes used to resolve conflict were
outlined in student and faculty handbooks and college
operational policies. Most colleges had a due process
procedure in place for faculty and student grievances.
The presidents reported that most often they tried to
have the conflict resolved as close to the source of conflict as possible. But they often found themselves mediating conflict which had not been resolved at a lower level in the organization. Several presidents indicated that the number of formal grievances filed within the college or court suits litigated against the college had increased in the last few years. The number of cases which had actually gone to court, however, were negligible.

Summary

The range of responses drawn from the interviews with presidents and written documents has presented a profile of the organizational and contextual characteristics of public two-year colleges in Ohio. It was also evident that interrelationships existed between the organizational and contextual elements. In two urban institutions, for example, environmental factors such as out-migration of the population, quality of education in the public schools, and changes in family structure and per capita income have impacted the number and quality as well as the special needs of students attending the college. In addition, unpredictability of the economic and political climate in Ohio has affected the ability of the colleges to engage effectively in long-range planning. Economic conditions have prodded many of the presidents to more
actively seek opportunities for additional sources of operating revenues, collaborative relations with other organizations, and increased involvement in the shaping of state and national policy.

Economic conditions have also enhanced concerns on the part of faculty in protecting their own self interests. Some presidents have predicted that conflict with faculty would escalate as a result of these concerns, others have predicted that their faculty would not react negatively because they wanted to protect their jobs (e.g., they had no place else to go).

Structural changes have been made in the colleges over the years in response to environmental impact. The most recent staff additions for some colleges were strategic planners, marketing strategists, staff development specialists, and systems analysts. In addition, most of the presidents have acquired sophisticated information and communication technologies to enhance their capability of analyzing trends and responding more rapidly to requests for information and services.

Several factors have tended to constrain college activities. The institutional charter and corresponding mission, for example, have established parameters for the types of programs which the colleges
could offer. In addition, district boundaries established in the college charters have limited the markets from which students can be actively recruited. Programming has also been limited by the state subsidy formula and program approval procedures of the Ohio Board of Regents.

To some presidents these limitations on their authority and autonomy were perceived as constraints to their ability to serve the needs of their immediate community. Some of these "inhibitors" were felt more strongly by new presidents who were attempting to rebuild an organization. It could also be said, however, that some of the factors which have constrained the activities of some presidents have presented opportunities for others. One president, for example, viewed the combination of a stable faculty and impending retrenchment as an opportunity to revise tenure policies and make some adjustments in faculty salaries and fringe benefits. Others viewed positively the impending necessity to collaborate more closely with other higher education organizations and with business and industrial organizations.

Having gained a better understanding of the organizational and contextual environment within which the presidents work, the focus is turned to the president's position. In the following section,
composite findings on the elements of the president's position will be presented.

THE POSITION

In the previous section, information was provided on the environment within which the presidents worked. The focus of this section is the positional characteristics of the presidency, especially the characteristics of tasks and roles.

Tasks

Several factors were examined with regard to presidential tasks. Length of time in the job as well as scope of responsibilities were considered. Constituencies, constraints, complexities and controls which impacted the presidents' responsibilities were also examined. Finally, the way the presidents allocated their time was deemed to be an indicator of the tasks they performed. All of these factors are illuminated more fully in the following discussion.

Length of Time in Position. As illustrated in Table 3, thirteen (61 percent) of the presidents interviewed had held their present positions for six or more years; six (29 percent) of them had been in their positions for 11-12 years (five of them founded their institutions). Of the eight presidents
TABLE 3
LENGTH OF TIME IN OFFICE OF PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS IN OHIO BY TYPE OF COLLEGE
(n = 21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years in Office (1982)</th>
<th>Type of College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(36 percent) who had been in their positions less than six years, five had been there 3-4 years and three for one year or less.

Scope of Responsibilities. All but one of the presidents reported having a written position description. Many of the presidents volunteered that the written position description provided little indication of what they did on a day-to-day basis. Rather, it was a formal document, usually prepared for an operational manual or institutional self-study report, which stated the broad parameters of their legitimate duties and responsibilities. There were a few presidents, however, who operationalized their position descriptions into goals and objectives they intended to meet within a given time period.

Copies of position descriptions were secured from 14 of the 21 presidents interviewed. Content analysis revealed them to be rather similar in content, although they varied in the degree of explicitness. When items on the position descriptions were ranked in frequency of appearance (Table 4), some interesting patterns emerged. Items 12, 15, 21, 23, 25, 29 and 31, for example, established the president's relationship with the Board of Trustees as well as the president's legal rights and responsibilities. Items 3, 4, 16, 22, 23, and 25 established the president's legitimate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recommends to Board employment and dismissal of personnel*</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recommends, interprets, enforces Board policies and regulations*</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develops and maintains college's position externally</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provides leadership for overall organization, governance and progress of college</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develops and maintains plan of organization</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sets criteria for long-range progress and evaluation (including institutional research)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Authorizes expenditures and transfer of funds*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assigns personnel to positions, coordinates, supervises, and evaluates their work</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Establishes and maintains public relations program</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Delegates powers and duties of presidency to subordinates</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Prepares annual budget*</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Issues administrative directives, reports, manuals*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Responsible for maintaining records and issuing reports required by state, federal agencies</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Responsible for direction of building program, use of facilities, maintenance, safety and security*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Assumes other responsibilities as directed by Board</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Formulates, recommends and implements institutional philosophy, goals and objectives*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Recommends instructional programs*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Participates in development of local, state, and national policy</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Develops in-service program for personnel</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Recommends salary and wage schedules*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Sets agenda for Board meetings*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Develops and makes appointments to citizen advisory committees</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Serves as liaison between Board and faculty; Board and community</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Manages resources of the college*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Exercises broad discretionary powers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Creates internal committees to facilitate operations of the college</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Organizes and participates in fundraising efforts</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Assures compliance with local, state, and federal regulations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Serves as ex officio member of the Board</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Obtains legal advice when necessary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Conducts official correspondence for Board</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*in accordance with Board policies.*
relationship to the external and internal environment, and the balance of the items pertained primarily to internal operations.

During the interview, the presidents were asked what they perceived their major responsibilities to be. In the aggregate, their responses were different than their position descriptions indicated. Their statements fell into two categories, as follows:

**Shaping the direction of the college:**
- setting general tone
- changing policy
- analyzing trends and affecting change
- sensing the future
- planting seeds for future activities
- conceptualizing the whole
- creating opportunities
- image building
- providing climate for excellence
- leadership
- long-range planning
- insuring quality education

**Maintenance:**
- maintaining homeostasis
- terminating employees
- setting priorities and guidelines
- keeping peace in the family
- implementing policies
- care and feeding of the Board
- overall operations of the college

While the majority of the items on the formal position descriptions were directed to operations, personal responses reflected just the opposite. Perhaps one of the reasons for this difference is that the presidents perceived their formal position descriptions as their "legal responsibilities." Many of the presidents, for
example, prefaced their responses to the question with "aside from my legal responsibilities . . . ." Another explanation for the difference was suggested by several of the presidents; namely, that much of what they have done to shape their institutions is "behind the scenes," with the use of unobtrusive techniques and affective as opposed to cognitive skills (e.g., "planting seeds," "sensing," "creating").

The presidents were also quick to point out that although they have been charged with all operational responsibilities of the organization, they actually performed very few of the operational tasks themselves. In varying degrees, actual operational responsibilities have been delegated to others. Six (29 percent) of the presidents, for example, claimed to have delegated virtually all operations and thirteen (61 percent) have delegated most operations. Only two (9 percent) presidents reported very little delegation. When asked to cite specific tasks they have not delegated, the range of responses included the following:

- all final decisions;
- image setting;
- budget;
- setting parameters for staff;
- setting institutional priorities and objectives;
- representation at board meetings;
communication to board;

representation at Chancellor's meetings (Ohio Board of Regents);

representation at OTCCA meetings;

representation at meetings with legislators and other policy-making bodies;

legal responsibilities (e.g., signing contracts and checks);

approval of new programs;

setting board agenda;

hiring of administrative staff;

negotiations; and

facility planning.

"Maintaining the final decision" topped the list, followed by "representation at meetings with legislators and other policy-making bodies" and "budget." Reasons cited for not delegating the above tasks included the following:

president felt he had more expertise than others on staff (e.g., facility planning; budget);

president's commitment to shape the institution (e.g., image setting, external relations, goal setting);

president's attempt to protect his relationship with the Board of Trustees (e.g., communicating with board; setting board agenda);

president's feeling of responsibility for quality control (e.g., approval of new programs, hiring administrators);

president's desire to maintain control (e.g., all final decisions; setting priorities); and

president enjoyed the task.
One president, for example, had for several years done all of the course and room scheduling for his campus—not purely for functional reasons, but because he wanted to keep up to date on computer technology.

The presidents, on the whole, were not readily able to identify tasks they disliked. Some mentioned that they found some tasks frustrating (e.g., budget, state and federal reports) and some unpleasant (e.g., terminating employees, politics), but their overall attitudes toward their tasks were more positive. It was much easier, for example, for them to point out tasks they enjoyed doing, such as:

- budget;
- legislative work;
- public relations (including image building, communications, working with state and national organizations);
- instructional activities (including curriculum development and teaching);
- writing reports and correspondence;
- organizational design; and
- beautification of the facilities.

These were not only activities many of the presidents enjoyed, but also were tasks they felt they performed well. For some, these were "organizational hobbies"—activities that added some pleasure to their jobs. Teaching, for example, was an activity that many
of them enjoyed and missed. Several of the presidents mentioned having to sometimes temper their desire to be involved in instructional activities or budget planning because they were tasks technically delegated to staff.

For most presidents, delegation of operational tasks was a learned behavior. Those presidents with long tenure reported that for a long time they tried to do many of the tasks themselves, but the demands on their time as well as the skills required for certain tasks became more than they could manage. They were spending evenings and weekends trying to catch up and often the stress level became very high. Thus, they began to delegate some of their tasks. This led to increased team management, or what some referred to as "shared leadership." All but three presidents reported that they were presently practicing what they considered to be team management. The "team," in most cases included the top administrators in academic, student, and business affairs, with the addition in some cases of the presidential assistant or a specialist in personnel matters or public relations. Under the general leadership and direction of the president, the team shared in the management of the institution.

The patterns just described with regard to the scope of presidential responsibilities were consistent
with the presidential duties and responsibilities
Forese (1974) determined in a study of community
college presidents in California. Forese identified
some 26 separate duties and responsibilities which
tended to cluster as follows:

- policy formulation, recommendation, and implement-
  ation;
- recommendation of budget to board; administration
  of budget when approved;
- organizational design and structure; reward and
  salary structure;
- review, recommendation and modification of instruc-
  tional program;
- recruitment, selection, assignment, evaluation,
  supervision of personnel;
- public relations (internal and external);
- authorization of faculty and advisory committees;
- recommendation for acquisition and maintenance of
  facilities;
- preparation of college manuals, guides and reports
  (for internal use and for external agencies);
- protecting safety and security of persons and
  property;
- delegating tasks to others;
- representing the board and institution at govern-
  mental and professional meetings; and
- any other duties assigned by the board.

The formal duties of two-year college presidents have
not changed significantly from 1974 until 1982,
although some tasks have been delegated more frequently
to subordinates than they once were. What follows is a
discussion of the factors which influenced the way in which presidents carried out their work responsibilities.

Constituencies, Constraints, Complexities, Control. The scope of presidential responsibilities described in the preceding section was further illuminated with the consideration of the 4C's—constituencies, constraints, complexities, and control. These were the factors which added breadth and depth to the presidents' formal position descriptions.

The presidents reported a number of constituent groups both inside and outside the organization with whom they have had to relate (Table 5). Most of the presidents reported relating more on a daily and weekly basis with people inside the organization—administrators, faculty, staff, students, and board members. Relations with groups or individuals outside the college were reported to be more cyclical or sporadic in nature. Some constituents were reported to have taken higher priority over others in terms of the president's strategic response, but the attention paid to constituents varied. Reasons for the variation were as follows: (1) amount of influence the president perceived the constituents to have; (2) the strategic nature of the situation; (3) the amount of influence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td>parents of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty</td>
<td>prospective students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immediate administrative staff</td>
<td>alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deans</td>
<td>legal counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department chairpersons</td>
<td>foundation representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clerical/support staff</td>
<td>community leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>board of trustees</td>
<td>state legislators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty senate representatives</td>
<td>city mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty union representatives</td>
<td>city council members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other college presidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trade union officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community special interest groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community social groups/clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members of the media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>federal grant officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>federal agency representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>state agency representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>state governor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the president perceived he had; and (4) what else was occurring at the same time.

When asked if there were major organizational or environmental constraints that made their jobs more difficult, the majority response was "not really." When probed further it was discovered that most of the things which they perceived to be potential constraints were considered along with other variables in long-range planning, standard operating procedures, and/or mechanized information systems. Some presidents, however, did admit to having had some constraints, such as the following:

- not enough money;
- not enough time;
- state control of programs;
- Ohio Board of Regents;
- state agencies such as the Office of Budget and Management; Division of Vocational Education, State Department of Education;
- budgetary constraints and cash flow problems;
- state funding formula;
- shared campus;
- accrediting agencies;
- the college vice president/dean of academic affairs;
- mission too narrow;
- politics; and
- predecessor.
Outside of financial constraints, which were present to some degree in all of the institutions, the second most common concern was the myriad bureaucratic rules, regulations, forms and requests for information imposed upon the institutions by state and federal agencies. While most institutions had data systems from which information could be fairly readily retrieved, the presidents claimed that the rules and the format in which the information was to be reported changed so often that it was difficult to standardize the information retrieval system.

The third most common constraint reported was "the legacy of their predecessors." For some, the circumstances under which the predecessor left office were so volatile that the new president was immediately faced with a chaotic organization which required more effort than normal in order to establish a base for trust and confidence, especially with faculty and board members. In at least two cases the new presidents had to rebuild completely the organizations internally and reestablish the college's image in the local community and in the state as a viable postsecondary institution.

Having a shared campus was mentioned as a constraint by all those presidents of technical colleges who shared a campus with either a university branch or a joint vocational school. They mentioned
contractual problems with shared library and recre­
ational facilities as well as problems which had
arisen over payment of shared maintenance costs. The
following conditions which exascerbate this constraint
were mentioned:

shared costs were based on full-time equivalent
students; thus, technical colleges often payed
disproportionate shares because of higher enroll­
ments;

limited authority of the branch campus deans to
reach equitable solutions to problems (e.g., dean
reported to director at the central campus;
maintenance personnel reported to separate
divisions on the main campus; faculty reported to
academic departments on the main campus); and

technical college had autonomous board and could
be more flexible and decisive in resolving
problems.

At the time of the interview, two of the technical
college presidents had totally severed relations with
neighboring branch campus deans until the problems
could be resolved. To them, this was a last resort
strategy regarding issues, as opposed to a personality
conflict between to individuals. Two presidents
reported having finally resolved contractual problems
after many years of negotiation. They gave much of the
credit for resolution of the problems to new branch
campus deans who had taken a more cooperative posture
in resolving problems of mutual interest.

Several presidents reported having to ask
top-level administrators to resign because they were
obstructing the smooth operation of the college or the transition in leadership. In some cases, certain faculty or staff members have had to be admonished or removed for similar reasons.

Finally, one technical college president found his biggest constraint to be the narrowness of the college's chartered mission. He explained that this limited his ability to respond to community needs and requests for assistance.

When asked about the complex nature of the job, most of the presidents reported that complexities were considered part of the challenge. One president said "If there weren't problems, there would be no need for a president." Some of the complexities identified by the presidents included:

- accreditation process, especially health programs;
- balancing personalities;
- rules and regulations imposed from outside the organization—keeping up with the changes;
- budget process;
- maintaining the college image;
- changing organizational structure; and
- being a new president—having to learn, restructure the organization, and get involved in external/environmental activities all at once.

"I would rather call them frustrating," said one president, adding that complex problems "can usually be solved—it just may take longer."
A similar response came from the presidents when asked about the "ambiguities" of their jobs. The following represents some of the items they mentioned:

- being the man in the middle;
- balancing individual personalities;
- doing more with less money;
- state politics—constantly changing; and
- trying to be flexible and rational at the same time.

Overwhelmingly, however, the presidents reported they had accepted ambiguities as "givens," and that they were not important in terms of carrying out presidential responsibilities. Ambiguities were referred to by one president as "vaguearies"—outcomes one cannot control. He continued by saying that "the job is to 'fix' whatever is wrong." In general, the presidents reported being flexible enough to deal with most problems.

Power, authority, and autonomy were not problems for most of the presidents. "Power is in the position . . . you don't have to maintain it. Just use it!" said one president. Another stated that "You can use power and authority to do anything you want, and can get away with it at any time. You have to have an innate desire for power and authority to be a leader."

Most of the respondents said authority was explicit in their contracts. There were a few of them,
however, who had some difficulty learning to delegate authority. Three presidents said that every once in awhile they had to remind an over-zealous administrator just who was in charge, or as one president put it, "pull his string a little." One way presidents have maintained authority is by surrounding themselves with technically skilled people. Another way suggested was to share authority so that others had a stake in the operation.

Only four potential threats to autonomy were named by the presidents: state control of programs, an occasional board member, having a shared campus, and the state budgeting process. No one claimed, however, to be threatened significantly by any of these factors.

Comparing these factors which influenced the work activities of the presidents to other studies revealed some patterns over time in the intensity and frequency of presidential "pressures." Morgan's study in 1970, for example, yielded the following rank ordering of the intensity and frequency of the greatest sources of pressure on two-year college presidents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finances and budget</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative details</td>
<td>Finances and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Community sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus development</td>
<td>Administrative details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community sources</td>
<td>Campus development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It would appear that financial and budgetary pressures have had a more intense impact on presidential responsibilities than other constraints for more than a decade. Administrative details and faculty problems have probably waned some in the last decade, although faculty pressures appear to be increasing somewhat as institutions face retrenchment.

**Allocation of Time.** Most of the presidents reported spending an average of 60-70 hours per week in job-related activities, although three presidents said they averaged 50 hours per week, and one new president reported spending 80+ hours per week while learning and developing his job. For most presidents there were no "average days." But there were some daily routines. One president, for example, reported having breakfast each morning with other community leaders; another said he maintained an "open door" for the first hour so that anyone could come in and talk. Still others had set aside a block of time for paperwork or for "touring" the campus to see how things were going. Most presidents reported having regularly scheduled meetings with their cabinet officers, advisory committee, board, faculty association, and special committees or task forces.

The presidents indicated that most of their time was spent talking to people—usually in scheduled
meetings with staff or with community representatives. Most of the presidents had been involved in from 5 to 20 community organizations or agencies (e.g., United Way, Chamber of Commerce, Boy Scouts, Rotary Club, Community Development Council, and others). Some reported they had received so many requests to meet with or speak to community groups that they have had to become selective about their community involvement. Thus, they had chosen to participate in those activities most strategic and with the greatest long-term benefit to the college and its position in the community. They delegated participation in other activities to other personnel within the college.

In addition to community groups, the presidents interacted with their district legislators, city government officials, and state agency officials on a periodic basis. The intensity of these activities was reported to be more issue specific, although some of the presidents reported meeting fairly regularly with their local legislators. They also met once each month, as a group, with the Vice Chancellor for Two-Year Campuses of the Ohio Board of Regents. (Since the Vice Chancellor's retirement in March of 1982, they have been meeting once each month with the Chancellor.) The presidents also met together once each month as the Ohio Technical and Community College Association.
Overall, technical college presidents reported spending approximately 60 percent of their time directed to internal activities and about 40 percent directed to external meetings. The ratio was just the opposite for community college presidents—60 percent external and 40 percent internal meetings. Two of the presidents indicated they spent approximately 10 percent on national activities, and several of the presidents reported that state-level meetings necessitated being away from their campuses an average of one day per week.

Most of the presidents had split their time about evenly between planning and problem-solving activities, although technical college presidents, on the average, tended to be more problem directed, and community college presidents tended to spend more time on planning activities. Presidents tended to prioritize their activities in the following way: (1) how strategic the activity was to the institution (e.g., problematic or complex nature of the issue/problem); (2) what the long-term benefits would be to the college; (3) whether the task could be delegated to someone else; and (4) personal interest or challenge. Routine correspondence and general reading were lowest on the list of priorities. Some presidents, however, did report having had more time to read since they
began delegating many of the operational tasks to others within the college.

**Specialized Knowledge/Skills/Abilities Required.**

One of the questions asked in the formal interview sought information regarding specialized knowledge, skills, and abilities that were necessary for effective job performance. As indicated in Table 6, knowledge, skills, and abilities related to human relations engendered the majority response. "People problems are the most frequent and the most difficult to respond to," said one president. The second most frequent response was management-related knowledge and skills, with political/legislative skills and knowledge a close third. One president offered that if one were to compile a want-ad from the composite of skills and abilities needed, it would read something like the following:

*Wanted: College President. Must be a patient, thick-skinned generalist who is part actor, part politician, part visionary. Must like people!*

What this statement reflects is the fact that these college presidents have cultivated a wide range of skills and abilities and a broad, general knowledge base. They have relied, for the most part, on their administrators to be the specialists and have attempted to select people who have strengths that counterbalance those of the president. It also reflects the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Abilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>human resource management</td>
<td>interpersonal/human relations</td>
<td>&quot;read&quot; people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finances</td>
<td>listening/understanding</td>
<td>&quot;understand rather than know&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information processing</td>
<td>management</td>
<td>risk taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legislative system</td>
<td>communication</td>
<td>common sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design of structure</td>
<td>conceptualizing</td>
<td>delegate wisely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>federal/state rules and regulations</td>
<td>decision-making</td>
<td>&quot;syncratic reasoning&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;where you are going&quot;</td>
<td>problem-solving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adult education</td>
<td>leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technical education</td>
<td>persuasion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technical skills, especially finances</td>
<td>diplomacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>political</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negotiating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>technical skills, especially finances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fact that the presidents have acknowledged they cannot take themselves or their jobs too seriously because they have often become the scapegoat for a variety of special interest groups.

**Roles**

Task clusters, expectations of others, and role relationships provided indications of the presidents' roles. These factors are discussed briefly in the following section.

**Task Clusters.** The presidents' formal position descriptions alluded to a variety of roles, such as: mediator, liaison, manager, leader, politician, architect, orchestrator, and disseminator of information. The presidential responsibilities outlined in the section on task characteristics tended to cluster logically into the following broad categories:

**Managerial:** maintenance of organizational efficiency and effectiveness.

- develops and maintains plan of organization;
- authorizes expenditures and transfer of funds;
- assigns personnel to positions, coordinates, supervises, and evaluates their work;
- prepares annual budget;
- directs building program, use of facilities, maintenance, safety and security;
- assumes other responsibilities as directed by the board;
- develops in-service programs for personnel;
- recommends salary and wage schedules;
- manages resources of the college;
creates internal committees to facilitate operations of the college; and assures compliance with local, state, and federal regulations.

**Informational:** monitors and disseminates information coming into and going out of organization.

sets criteria for long-range progress and evaluation (including institutional research);
establishes and maintains public relations program;
issues administrative directives, reports, manuals; and maintains records and issues reports required by state, federal agencies.

**Liaison:** intermediary between board and faculty, between college and community.

recommends to Board employment and dismissal of personnel;
recommends, interprets, enforces Board policies and regulations;
recommends instructional programs;
sets agenda for Board meetings;
serves as liaison between board and faculty; board and community;
develops and makes appointments to citizen advisory committees; and organizes and participates in fund-raising efforts;

**Leader:** Shapes the direction of the college.

develops and maintains college's position externally;
provides leadership for overall organization, governance and progress of college;
delegates powers and duties of presidency to subordinates;
formulates, recommends and implements institutional philosophy, goals and objectives;
participates in development of local, state, and national policy; and exercises broad discretionary powers.
It was apparent that the formal position description served the following functions: formalizing the relationship between board and faculty, college and community; establishing formal operational responsibilities for which the president was held accountable; prescribing formal communication and the president's legal authority. The position description has not, however, prescribed the way in which the president was to carry out these responsibilities. One factor which has shaped the way in which presidents have carried out their responsibilities has been the expectations of others both inside and outside the organization.

**Expectation of Others.** The presidential role has been shaped by the expectations of a myriad of constituents with whom the president has interacted. Ambiguity in roles, as well as conflict, has often arisen when the actions of the president and the expectations of significant others have not been in synchronization.

In general, the presidents related that in the past their roles were not well understood by others, but have been perceived more clearly in recent years. Some presidents attributed this to their length of tenure (e.g., the longer they have been president, the better understood has been their role); others
attributed the understanding of their roles to the general development of a two-year college culture through state and national associations of trustees, presidents, faculty, and other administrators.

The presidents indicated that their board members expected them to: (1) recommend policy to the board and implement policy decisions; (2) maintain fiscal integrity of the college; (3) create and project a positive image for the college; (4) act in the best interests of the college; and (5) resolve conflicts. Some presidents, particularly the newer ones, have received more prescriptive indications of their roles from board members. In three cases, for example, presidents reported they were hired with the expectation that they would resolve particular institutional problems (e.g., rebuild an institution which had lost favor in the community; eliminate faculty divisiveness; reduce the labor intensiveness of the college budget; raise capital funds for expansion of college facilities).

Some presidents have had to walk a fine line to balance the boards' expectation on the one hand that they be a leader in the community, and on the other hand that they be behind their desks monitoring the everyday activities of the college. Four presidents volunteered that they had on at least one occasion
tendered their resignation because they had reached a point of conflict with their board members. In all four cases, however, the conflict was resolved and the president remained at the institution. In two of these cases, resolution of the conflict resulted in resignation of board members.

For the most part, the presidents indicated that the greatest source of role conflict was with faculty. They indicated that on the one hand faculty expected presidents to be leaders and to create the best learning environment possible. On the other hand, however, faculty have expected presidents to respond to their self interests, sometimes to the detriment of the college as a whole. In some cases, faculty have tried to exert pressure on board members to have the president removed. Two presidents indicated, for example, that they had received votes of no confidence from the faculty. To indicate how seriously these have been taken by the presidents, one president had his letters of no confidence framed and hanging on the wall in his office.

According to the presidents, students probably have had the least understanding of the president's role. Among all the other constituent groups with whom the presidents have interacted, students have voiced the least expectations. For the most part, they have
viewed the president as a figurehead, someone who has been instrumental in creating and maintaining an image for the college.

Individuals both inside and outside the colleges have expected the college presidents to respond quickly and affirmatively to their needs and concerns. Thus, for many presidents, the role expectations have been diverse and have been consistent with those found in other studies of the expectations of two-year college presidents. Hillway (1959) found, for example, that the following characteristics in presidents were desired by faculty (in rank order):

- Integrity in personal and professional relations;
- Intellectual ability and scholarship;
- Ability to organize and lead;
- Democratic attitude and methods;
- Warmth of personality;
- High moral and intellectual ideals;
- Objectivity and fairness;
- Interest in education and educational philosophy;
- Culture and breeding; and
- Self-confidence and firmness;

Undesirable characteristics Hillway found from his survey of 500 faculty from 93 colleges in 24 states, in rank order, were as follows:

- Dictatorial undemocratic attitude;
- Dishonesty and insincerity;
- Weakness as educator and scholar;
- Vacillation in organizing and leading;
- Poor personality; and
- Bias or favoritism.

In Morgan's (1970) study of two-year college presidents, faculty members were asked their
perceptions of the "ideal" duties of colleges presidents. Their responses (ranked from highest to lowest priority) were as follows:

- Administration/supervision;
- Public relations/politics;
- Leadership;
- Coordination/arbitration;
- Improvement in quality of education;
- Planning programs and courses;
- Finances; and
- Support of faculty associations.

Morgan asked the same question of second ranking administrators (usually academic deans or vice presidents). The administrators responded as follows (ranked from highest to lowest priority):

- Leadership;
- Administration/supervision;
- Policy making/decision making;
- Financial officer and fund raiser;
- Coordinator/arbitrator;
- Public relations and politics;
- Planner/developer; and
- Educational program director.

Factors considered by trustees in judging presidents were found by Hillway (1961) to include (in rank order):

- Leadership in maintaining high academic standards;
- Good judgment in selection of faculty and staff;
- Ability to maintain high morale among faculty and staff;
- Facility for making friends in the institution;
- General intellectual leadership in the college and community;
- Fairness and honesty in treatment of faculty;
- Good judgment in promoting faculty and staff; and
- Ability to maintain a balanced budget.

In Gipson's (1981) study of the desired political activity of community college presidents in Texas,
it was revealed that board members, faculty association heads, and selected state legislators expected the presidents to be involved in political activities.

Often, the presidential role expectations of board members have been clouded by misunderstandings and overlaps in responsibilities of the board and the chief executive officer regarding "policy" issues and "management/administrative" issues (Pray, 1975; Cleary, 1979). Cleary found that the more controversial the issue (especially moral or social issues), the more divided presidents and board members became in determining their respective roles. He concluded that the interpersonal relationships cultivated by the president with board members were a determining factor in the ease with which decisional responses were made. In the following section, presidential role relationships are examined.

**Role relationships.** In their daily work-related activities, the presidents have entered a variety of formal and informal role relationships. These relationships have varied from casual encounters in the hallway, to scheduled meetings both on and off campus. Several formal role relationships emerged from the data on two-year college presidents in Ohio.

First, in formal relations with his executive cabinet members, the president has been cast in a role
as leader of leaders. Each of the cabinet members has had a significant area of responsibility and a certain amount of power based on access to specific information and/or personal expertise. The president's primary function in these relations, as many of the subjects described it, was to set priorities and define parameters for the group. How the other administrators operated within those parameters was usually a matter of their own choice. The power exchange among cabinet members was often issue specific, e.g., if faculty promotions were the topic of discussion, the group deferred to the expertise of the academic dean.

Several of the presidents reported that conflict had sometimes arisen between two cabinet members, and the president was expected to mediate that conflict. Two hypotheses were given by the presidents for these conflict relations. First, much of the stress that was once present in the president's job had been passed down to the second level of the organization and was being increasingly felt by cabinet members. Second, the basic personalities and administrative styles of these individuals varied. Some second-level administrators were reported to be very task oriented and structured in behavior, others were reported to be more flexible. Thus, the presidents often had to relate to each "team" member as an individual first—providing
more direction for some than for others. This has made it necessary for the president to know each of his cabinet members well enough to respond to individual needs and to integrate those needs and the tasks to be performed into a collective whole.

In a study of the power relationships among executive cabinet members, Fewell (1979) found that one cabinet member consistently emerged as a power leader, at times appearing more powerful than the president himself. Fewell did not, however, give full consideration to contextual factors which impacted the cabinet meetings of the three community colleges he studied, nor to the unique personal relationships between the president of the institution and each of his cabinet members.

Another role which the presidents have often assumed with cabinet members has been the mentor role, providing opportunities for each person to grow and develop to his/her potential as an administrator. For the most part, the presidents reported wanting to see those whom they deemed capable move into higher ranks either at their present institutions or at some other college. The mentoring role appeared to be one many of the presidents enjoyed.

The leader/superordinate role relationships the presidents have had with board members have been
carefully cultivated and guarded by the presidents. For each college there were seven to nine individuals with whom the president tried to build consensus regarding policy decisions and other board actions. Like the executive cabinet members, board members also had different personalities and styles as well as areas of expertise. In some cases, the president had to strategize differently with each board member in order to build needed consensus. This often involved helping clarify board members' understandings of their own responsibilities as well as helping them understand the president's responsibilities.

Only two of the presidents claimed to be formally evaluated by their board members, and in both cases, the evaluation was done at the president's request. Most of the presidents reported that they would like to have periodic performance evaluations, but that their boards did not want to do it. Instead of formal evaluations the presidents often prepared an annual report of activities which was presented to the board. This informal, self-report process was the general practice in most of the two-year colleges in Ohio, which corroborates the claims made by Tucker and Mautz (1979) and Nason (1979) that most boards tend to conduct continuous informal assessments of presidential performance rather than formal evaluations.
The presidents' role relationships with other constituents were usually not as critical to his job performance as the two just described, although they were often viewed in terms of their potential for problems or opportunities. The presidents used a variety of sensing techniques to try and ferret out potential problems before they happened. Some of the techniques mentioned were as follows:

- paying attention to rumor mills or grapevine;
- touring the campus and talking to people at random;
- using informants both inside and outside the organization who could be trusted and who provided reliable information;
- seeking preliminary reactions to ideas from others—sometimes at random, sometimes selected actors;
- maintaining an open-door policy which encouraged people to bring concerns to his attention; and
- learning of potential problems and opportunities from other presidents.

These were all ways in which the presidents kept their fingers on the pulse of their organizations and the general context in which they worked.

According to the presidents in this sample, relations with other people were judged to be critical to successful job performance. They spoke of four "partnerships" which they felt to be very important. The partnership viewed most crucial to presidential performance was the one with his board of trustees. It
was that relationship which determined the amount of autonomy and authority the president had. "The caring and feeding of the board," said one president, "is my most strategic activity." Access to board members, as well as the choice of type and quantity of information provided to the board members has been carefully controlled by most of the president. They also have worked diligently to learn about board members, and to cultivate good interpersonal relationships with them. They have learned of the special expertise of board members and of their particular biases. In addition, many of the presidents have planned very strategically ways to approach board members on particular issues based on the potential counter-influence of each member, and assessments of gain or loss if the president's influence attempts were to fail.

Without exception, the presidents reported that they generally have had good relationships with their board members. For some, this has not always been the case, as mentioned earlier. Rotation of board members has sometimes resulted in a group of individuals who were not very cohesive, and were not easy to get to know or to predict. In other cases, particular issues have divided the board. Three presidents reported current problems with one particular trustee. In all three cases, these were new board members, "who have
not been properly socialized and are over-zealous," as one president stated. A strong, reliable board chairperson provided the key to resolving these types of problems, according to the presidents interviewed.

The partnership the presidents cultivated with their "teams," or executive cabinets, were also deemed crucial to their success. Not only have these administrators tended to the operational details of the college, but they also have helped shape the image of the president. The loyalty, trust and recognition of competence each team member has extended to the others has contributed significantly to the smooth operation of the college. This does not mean that the presidents have attempted to surround themselves with "yes" people; in fact, they have usually attempted to select people who would bring a variety of perspectives to bear on a particular issue. These variations in perspectives, however, have sometimes resulted in disputes between team members which the president has had to mediate.

It appeared from the information submitted by the presidents, that there has often been a particular dyadic relationship between the president and one of the team members that was stronger than the rest. This relationship was not necessarily position specific, but in most cases it involved the president/chief academic
officer dyad. That particular dyadic relationship had been in existence, in many cases, since the president took office.

Another important partnership the presidents reported was with their secretaries or executive assistants. These persons have also been a significant force in shaping the presidential image as well as protecting the image of the college. The secretary was the person who most often determined who had access to the president and when. She/he also facilitated the president's daily work activities by answering correspondence, responding to requests for information, and otherwise putting a semblance of order to the president's daily work life.

Spouses were the fourth partner important to the president's work. Many of the president's spouses have had careers and/or family responsibilities to manage as well as the social obligations that being a presidential spouse has entailed. One president offered that he thought his wife had more to manage than he did. In many cases, the spouse has been the chief confidant of the president, the one who has helped celebrate the triumphs and who has shared in the agonies of defeat.

Aside from these partnerships which collectively have facilitated the president's work, the president
has also had to interact with a variety of constituent groups. At the time of the interview, all of the presidents reported having good relations with faculty, although most of them volunteered that there were a few individuals who were periodic "irritants." For the most part, however, the presidents reported that they enjoyed talking informally with faculty, staff and students. Many of them had set aside time to "roam the halls" just so they could get to know their employees. A few of them had periodically taught classes or conducted in-service workshops in order to keep in touch with their students and faculty.

The presidents, on the whole, have been spending more time interacting with a variety of community leaders in both business and social settings. The relationships they have cultivated in the community have often resulted in future opportunities for the college. Thus, the image the president has projected has been important to the way in which the college has been perceived.

In sum, the data indicated that the presidents not only assumed a variety of roles in a given day as they came in contact with others, but that they also wore several "hats" in a single encounter with a group of people. The role relationships they nurtured were
very important to their ability to carry out the responsibilities of their jobs.

Summary

More similarities than differences in the nature and scope of responsibilities of public two-year college presidents in Ohio were found. The formal responsibilities documented in written position descriptions indicated that the presidents have had broad authority and responsibility for the daily operations of their colleges. What was not reflected in the position descriptions, however, was the extent to which operational tasks were delegated to subordinates. While the presidents have reserved some of the strategic responsibilities for themselves, most of them have delegated many of the day-to-day operations of the college to members of their executive cabinets. Specialized skills which the presidents felt were most important to the successful achievement of their work objectives centered around interpersonal, management, leadership, and communication skills.

The presidents claimed they did not have "average" days, but they were able to identify some daily and weekly routines, and activities which occurred on a cyclical basis. They also reported allocating their time about evenly between planning and problem solving, and between internal and external affairs.
The complexities, ambiguities, and constraints that the presidents encountered in their jobs were treated as "givens." In like manner, the presidents felt they had enough power, authority, and autonomy to carry out their responsibilities. The role relationships they cultivated helped to assure that they maintained the power, authority, and autonomy they needed.

Presidential perceptions of the nature and scope of their positions have just been described. The personal characteristics that the presidents have brought to their positions are explored in the following section.

THE PERSON

There were similarities as well as differences in the personal backgrounds and traits of two-year college presidents in Ohio. General findings regarding the presidents' personal characteristics are presented in the following section.

Personal Background

Personal background information on the presidents included demographic data, education, and previous work experience. In the aggregate, the following background characteristics were found.
Demographic Information. All of Ohio's two-year college presidents were male and married; only one president was non-white. In terms of age, the median age range was 51-55 years for both technical and community college presidents, although there were two presidents under 40 and four over 60 years of age (see Table 7). All but three presidents were born in the Midwest; over half of the presidents were born in Ohio. Four have lived most of their lives within their present college district. Five of those born in Ohio have returned to the state after being away for an extended time.

The majority of the presidents were raised in rural communities; only four having reported growing up in a densely populated urban area. Although family background was not specifically discussed with the presidents, it was learned that two of them had fathers who were public school administrators.

According to the literature on two-year college presidents, the mean age in 1972 was 47 (Wing, 1972) compared with a mean age of 42.5 in 1960 (Hawk, 1960). Thus, it appears that college presidents have aged right along with their institutions.

Educational Preparation. Table 7 also reflects a number of similarities in the educational preparation of the respondents. The highest degree earned for
TABLE 7
SELECTED BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS IN OHIO BY TYPE OF COLLEGE (n = 21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Technical College</th>
<th>Community College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Range:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Origin:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education (Terminal Degree)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D./Ed.D. - Ed. Admin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. - Voc/Tech. Ed.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. - Other*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A./M.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A./B.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mathematics; Philosophy of Religion.
seventeen (81 percent) of the 21 respondents was the doctorate; three presidents (14 percent) had masters degrees, and one (5 percent) had a bachelors degree as their highest earned degree. Of those without the doctorate, two have participated rather extensively in American Management Association courses and seminars, as well as graduate-level coursework. Three of the presidents have engaged in formal post-doctoral study such as the Harvard University Leadership Program. All of the presidents have participated to varying degrees in seminars, conferences, and institutes related to their jobs. Three of the presidents said they deferred college, earning their first college degree after the age of thirty.

The presidents have employed a number of strategies to remain current in terms of knowledge and skills, from general reading, to teaching, consulting, and attending conferences, workshops, seminars, and courses. The most frequent responses to ways in which the presidents have tried to maintain currency were as follows:

- reading on specific topics;
- learning from others; advice from peers;
- attending seminars sponsored by American Management Association, American Society for Training and Development, Higher Education Management Institute, American Association of Community/Junior Colleges, and other organizations and agencies;
preparing and delivering speeches;
serving on accreditation review boards;
teaching/lecturing;
writing position papers;
attending Harvard University Leadership Program;
serving on advisory committees for university departments (e.g., vocational education; educational administration);
participating in national activities; learning what others were doing; and
writing articles for publication.

For the most part, there were provisions in the presidents' contracts for some of these self-development activities.

Nationally, increasing numbers of presidents have doctorates as their highest academic degree, as the following national surveys revealed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Young found that 66.4 percent of the presidents with earned doctorates studied in the field of education.

While the number of doctorates has risen, a similar decline has been experienced in the number of masters degrees as the terminal degree, as the following figures indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hawk, 1960</th>
<th>Roberts, 1964</th>
<th>Morgan, 1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The presidents in Young's (1981) study, however, felt that the only task their formal educational experience prepared them for was developing the philosophy and goals of the college. They claimed that it was their previous work experience which best prepared them for the tasks of the presidency. Ohio's two-year college presidents evidenced agreement with this assertion.

Career Paths. Career paths to the presidency appeared to vary more than other factors related to the respondents' backgrounds. As shown in Table 8, six of the technical college presidents came to their positions from inside their present institutions; three of the community college presidents came from presidencies of other institutions. All of these men came to their office with a variety of experiences.

Also shown in Table 8 is that 67 percent of the presidents in this sample had working experience in the public schools. Fourteen (67 percent) had teaching experience in the public schools, while three of the presidents had at one time been public school principals. Three presidents had been administrators in private industry, while nine had worked as engineers or technicians. While a number of the presidents had previous college administrative experience, eight had college/university teaching experience and six had previously served as presidents of other colleges.
TABLE 8
CAREER PATHS AND EXPERIENCE OF PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS IN OHIO BY TYPE OF COLLEGE (n = 21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Technical College</th>
<th>Community College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Past Position:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP/Dean - same institution</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President - other institution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP/Dean - other institution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir/Supt - Joint Vocational School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Experience:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP/Dean of Instruction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP/Dean of Student Serv.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP/Dean of Business Aff.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Industry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Industrial:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple-response item.
**Director of: alumni, conferences, counseling, admissions, special projects.
Only two presidents had previous working experience in public service organizations outside the educational sector.

These findings were consistent with the literature in the sense that fewer two-year college presidents have been entering the presidency from positions in other types of educational institutions, e.g., public schools or universities. More have been advancing from the academic deanship of two-year colleges (Morgan, 1970; Young, et al, 1981), or from other college presidencies (Carbone, 1981). In addition, Young (1981) found that most of the presidents had been in the job for a long time (84.2 percent had been in their present posts for 11 or more years).

It would appear from this limited information that two-year college presidents have been preparing themselves better than their predecessors for the presidential role through advanced education and strategic career choices. The presidents also appeared to have been establishing an independent identity apart from the public school system and the university, which is a major change from the developmental years of the two-year college movement.

**Personality Characteristics**

The college presidents in this sample have brought to their positions certain values, beliefs,
motivations, skills and abilities, temperaments, personalities, and administrative styles. The presidents' personality characteristics are the focus of this section.

Needs/Aspirations. When the presidents were asked what attracted them to the presidency, their responses were fairly similar. The most often expressed motivations were the needs for challenge, action, to "make something work," and "to be on the cutting edge." Motivations which tended to rank second in importance were the need for recognition and status and a desire to "be in charge." Other needs mentioned were power, achievement, and "to be liked."

When asked if they consciously aspired to being a college president, nine (43 percent) of the respondents answered "yes," nine (43 percent) answered "no," and three (14 percent) said "not particularly." Three respondents reported that it was more accurate to say that they aspired to be at the top of the organization, whether a public school system, business, or college.

Those who aspired to be a college president most often made that decision while in their first position in a college. Interestingly, of those who did aspire to be president, only three claimed to have purposefully planned their careers, mapping out direct paths to include specific goals regarding training, selection
of administrative positions, types of institutions, and strategies that would put them in the right place at the right time. Only two of the presidents made formal application for their position in response to an advertised opening. Nine were asked to consider the job after someone else had submitted their names, and the remaining ten came from inside the organization. Seven (33 percent) of the 21 respondents were the founding presidents of their institutions.

Values/Beliefs/Philosophy. Perhaps one of the most difficult questions for most of the presidents to answer in the interview related to their own personal values, beliefs, and philosophy. For a few of the presidents, an answer came readily because they were engaged at the time of the interview in career evaluation and planning, or because their beliefs were such a strong part of their personal identity. For many others, however, these were not surface issues or something that they could readily articulate. What emerged in the analysis was almost a dual set of issues—those which were personal, and those which were more global. The range of personal values which emerged, for example, were honesty, integrity, excellence, love and caring, equity, and a strong belief in the work ethic. In addition, some expressed strong religious beliefs.
The more global values to which many of the presidents subscribed were consideration of others, improvement of the quality of life for all, equality of opportunity, and service to people. One president stated, in reference to his concern for quality of life, that his values were not altruistic; rather, they just reflected a better way of living.

It was also difficult for most presidents to make a distinction between their "philosophy of life" and a "philosophy by which they administered their organizations." The range of responses included the following:

- shaping the future for the next generation;
- creating opportunities for people to develop to their potential;
- enhancing the quality of life;
- providing access to non-traditional, innovative education;
- keeping people informed;
- doing the nice things first;
- achieving quality without compromise;
- relying on third-party credentialing;
- running all parts of one's life the same way;
- choosing effectiveness over efficiency if a choice is necessary;
- trusting one's instincts;
- teaching and sharing good values (e.g., excellence, equality, good citizenship);
loving and caring for people;
letting nothing thwart objectives;
sharing the responsibility and the glory; and
treating people as individuals.

One could speculate from this list of responses that for many presidents, their administrative philosophies closely paralleled their general philosophies of life. Again, some were much more conscious of and better able to articulate their deeper feelings.

**Temperament.** To the outside observer, most of the presidents appeared to be gregarious, serious but flexible, and patient. They also appeared to have a good sense of humor. When asked to describe their temperaments, however, a variety of descriptors emerged, such as: fun-loving, hard-driving, adaptable, persistent, rigid, impatient, impulsive, optimistic, tenacious, calculative, and competitive. A number of the presidents admitted to having a strong temper that they attempted to hold in check most of the time.

With regard to overall personality, half of the presidents interviewed regarded themselves as both task- and people-oriented. Task orientation alone was the second most common response, followed by people orientation. Other personality indicators mentioned were: pragmatic, democratic, authoritarian, and eclectic. These self-perceived personality
characteristics corresponded with the behavioral characteristics that the presidents described.

**Behavioral Characteristics**

Because the presidents were not observed consistently over time in a formalized manner, questions were asked in the formal interview which would engender some indication of the presidents' perceived behavioral characteristics. Indicators such as administrative style, presidential images, skills and abilities, and stresses and satisfactions were used to gain a better understanding of presidential behaviors.

**Administrative Style.** The range of descriptors of personal administrative style used by the presidents included the following:

- informal but structured;
- delegative;
- fiscally conservative;
- persuasive;
- cautious/reflective;
- willing to take calculated risks;
- willing to share authority;
- participative (guided);
- facilitative; and
- consultative.
An important point made by most of the presidents was that they had a "general" style, but that they had a range of specific styles that were used in specific situations—some very strategically planned and implemented. As one president explained, he has had to be able to relate to all different types of people, in a variety of situations, so he has had to have a repertoire of potential ways of relating, but indicated that the repertoire must be within the range of his general personality. "People know in a minute if you're trying to be someone you're not," he said.

Presidential Image. Some interesting patterns were revealed in the images the presidents attempted to project, the way in which they wanted to be perceived, and the way in which they perceived themselves. Most of the presidents reported that they tried to project a positive image, especially in these difficult economic times—even if they didn't feel particularly optimistic on a given day. As one president said, "There is enough gloom and doom around us—I need to provide a sense of security and purpose." In addition, most of the presidents attempted to present themselves as genuine, articulate, reasonable, helpful, and easy to talk to. Some wanted to be seen as progressive—as a community or national leader. A few presidents were
concerned that they presented an image that they were always in control and always knew what they were doing.

For the most part, the presidents wanted to be perceived according to the image they attempted to project, and used a variety of strategies to enhance and maintain their images. Manner of dress, carriage, and the use of protocol were mentioned most often by the presidents as strategies for image maintenance. Several mentioned sacrificing salary increases and fringe benefits offered by their boards as strategies to maintain a positive image with faculty. Still others took a little time periodically to informally chat with college personnel so they would be more visible to their subordinates. Some met in open discussion sessions or maintained an "open-door" policy so that people had greater access to them.

For many of the presidents, the personal image they attempted to project was closely tied to the way in which they wanted the college to be perceived. Some evidence of this was seen as the investigator toured the college campuses. As an example, in several of the colleges where the president was concerned with projecting a progressive image, posters, internal newsletters and reports were visibly displayed so that students, staff, and visitors could see the evidence of progress. Images of quality and service to the
community were also visible in the way in which campus facilities had been designed and maintained.

The presidents were asked if they perceived themselves as leaders or managers. Ten (47 percent) of the presidents perceived themselves as leaders, nine (43 percent) saw themselves as managers, and two (9 percent) said they were leaders/managers. Those who perceived themselves as leaders used some of the following descriptors of the qualities they thought contributed to that perception:

- creativity/innovativeness;
- use of indirect persuasion;
- conceptualization of whole organization;
- setting of tone and direction of the college;
- creating a climate for personal growth of others;
- making tasks easier and organization stronger;
- encouraging self-direction in others;
- creating an environment that fostered excellence; and
- sensing and developing organizational opportunities.

One president adamantly stated that he was not a leader, saying, "I don't lead anyone anywhere--I shape and facilitate the work of others." Another president had some difficulty perceiving himself as a leader because his behavior did not match that of his own pre-conceived notion of leadership. His perception of
a "real" leader was of a rather coercive, authoritarian, always-in-charge person, and as this president explained, his personality and style did not lend themselves to this image of leadership.

Perhaps one of the most interesting revelations of the data was that many of the statements reflected above were also made by those who perceived themselves to be managers. In like manner, many of the operational concerns and expressed directive behaviors mentioned by those who described themselves as managers were also used as descriptors of leadership.

Finally, in an attempt to find out if the presidents felt that had sufficient personal freedom, they were asked, "Are you always the president?". Overwhelmingly, the response was "yes." Always being perceived by others, in a variety of social settings, as president of their colleges was not problematic for most of the respondents, however. As one president said, "It's part of the job . . . and the status is nice." Many said they enjoyed the status; some indicted they would prefer a little less visibility. Some presidents had purposely chosen to live in a community away from the college so that they would have a private life away from the job.

Skills and Abilities. The presidents cited a number of skills and abilities which they brought to
the presidency. Interpersonal skills were most often mentioned, followed by communication, problem-solving, and fiscal management skills which were all named by a number of presidents. Also included among the range of skills were: crisis management, creativity/innovativeness, empathy, organization, decision-making, planning, negotiation, marketing, conceptualizing, and having an in-depth understanding of vocational and technical education. While many of the presidents felt their graduate programs were worthwhile, the overwhelming majority felt their skills and abilities were acquired through years of work experience and observation of others. Some had role models which played an important part in shaping their careers, others learned from their peers and from being "on the firing line."

Stresses and Satisfactions. Very few of the presidents claimed that their jobs were overly stressful, although there were particular times and particular issues or events which produced more stress than others. Several of the presidents reported, for example, that preparation for a board meeting—particularly if there was a controversial issue on the agenda—was a little more stressful than normal. Many of the presidents indicated that their jobs were much more stressful in earlier years than now. Many have learned to manage stress by cultivating hobbies, family
businesses, recreational, or athletic activities. In addition, most of the presidents have learned to manage stress through delegation of many of the operational tasks.

Some of the presidents reported some frustration in the fact that they had accomplished their goals and found little challenge left in the job. Two of these presidents were at relatively early stages in their careers and were facing career decisions which they found difficult to make. The presidency was considered the pinnacle of the career ladder, yet some of the younger presidents were pondering their career futures. This pointed to a potential problem for those who had moved through the college ranks fairly rapidly and had accepted a college presidency at a young age. Boredom was also a problem for some of the presidents who had long tenure, although early retirement was an added option for them. Some had invested time and money to develop a family business venture which would sustain their interests after retirement.

There were a variety of sources of satisfaction for college presidents, including the following:

seeing new programs put into action;
being at the center of the operation;
commencement—seeing students achieve their goals;
challenge;
orchestrating;

seeing potential being developed in individuals;

and

contributing to the betterment of the community.

One president reported that the ultimate satisfaction for him would be "turning the job over to someone else." Six presidents reported that this source of satisfaction would be realized in from 3 to 5 years—when they had planned to retire. For one president, however, pending retirement posed a problem because, as he stated, his job had been his hobby!

**Summary**

Many of the presidents were able to identify ways in which their family backgrounds, education, and prior work experience shaped both the way they perceived their jobs and the way they carried them out. Strong values, beliefs, and attitudes were often molded in the family setting and later translated by the president into a philosophy by which he desired to live. Choice of career in many cases was related to a desire to carry out that philosophy. Life experiences also helped shape the president's ability to relate to a variety of people in a variety of settings. Those with broad experiences appeared to have a wider range of personal styles of interacting and relating to people than those with a limited range of experiences. These
experiences also shaped their images of leadership, their needs for achievement, power, and challenge, and helped shape their personal career aspirations. Activities such as varsity athletics, Boy Scouts, and church provided many of the presidents with early leadership experiences.

Educational experiences served as a foundation for the interests, skills, abilities, and competencies of the presidents. Several examples of this relationship were derived from the data. First, those presidents who said they enjoyed public speaking and felt competent in communicating articulately, developed that skill and interest as a member of a high school or college debate team. Second, two of the presidents who particularly enjoyed the challenges of problem-solving, traced that interest to their strong mathematical backgrounds. Third, several of the presidents who felt most confident in their abilities to work with people had collegiate backgrounds in the humanities and social sciences. In contrast, two of the presidents who felt less skilled in human relations had educational backgrounds in science and technology. Finally, several of the presidents cited examples of educational role models, or mentors, who helped shape their career interests and, in some cases, opened the doors for career opportunities.
Perhaps even more important to many of the presidents were the learning experiences acquired through previous jobs. Many of the strategies they used on the job had been learned by watching and interacting with peers and superordinates. In addition, much of what they currently did—and had chosen not to do—had been shaped by front-line experiences in other levels of management. Many of the issues and events they had encountered at other levels of management were also found in the presidency, as is pointed out in the following section.

WORK RELATED SITUATIONS

Review and synthesis of the literature provided a broad definition of situations, which included events, problems or issues which would serve as stimuli to behavior. Dubin (1980) challenged those who study institutional leadership to use organizational problems as a unit of analysis. Thus, the first attempt to refine the concept of situation was designed to explore with the presidents their perceptions of the problems they had encountered in the recent past. In a group session, using an open discussion format, the presidents were asked to identify the elements they considered when analyzing situations. The following list of items reflected their responses:
actors (congruence of values);
constraints (legal, regulatory limitations);
timing (what else was going on at the same time);
degree of importance (relative to other things occurring);
topic (subject matter);
cost-benefit ratio (what would happen if the problem was not solved);
expectations of others;
governance model (who needed to be involved);
decision-making capabilities (was there anything that could be done about the problem); and
overall objectives (how strategic the problem/issue was to the organizational mission and goals).

Consensus reflected four additional factors to be considered in relation to specific situations. First, several of the presidents stated that their immediate response to situations was more intuitive than calculative. In other words, they responded initially out of a "sense" of the situation based upon their knowledge of the people, the resources available, other organizational factors involved, and their historical experience related to similar situations. If the situation required further deliberation, then they broke it down into elements and determined strategies for problem resolution. Second, the group agreed that, for the most part, they approached situations with the organizational gestalt in mind—e.g., what would be the
outcome and effects on the organization as a whole? Third, several of the presidents acknowledged use of a "selective procrastination" strategy to buy time for careful consideration of the situation. Finally, it was pointed out that not all situations were viewed as problems; rather, some were viewed as opportunities.

Accepting the view that situations were defined as occasions for action, the presidents (in the same group session) generated a list of the types of problems they had encountered in the recent past. The problems and issues derived from the group session are presented in the following section.

Problems and Issues

Duplicate items on the list of problems and issues generated by the presidents were eliminated and the list was arranged in logical categories. As illustrated in Table 9, all but three problems/issues could be placed in the following categories: instructional, internal/operational, personal, governance, and external relations. Subsequent comparison of this list against a list of problems generated from the literature showed considerable congruence between the self-reports of the presidents and the literature.

The same group of presidents was asked to prioritize the list of problems/issues in order of significance to them, but this presented a dilemma to
TABLE 9
CLUSTERED LIST OF PROBLEMS FACED BY
PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS IN OHIO
(n = 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional</th>
<th>Administrative/Operational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instructional support</td>
<td>facilities usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accreditation</td>
<td>space allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructional delivery</td>
<td>scheduling (buildings/personnel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advisory committees</td>
<td>plant operations and maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum development</td>
<td>conflict management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student retention</td>
<td>personnel problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student attrition</td>
<td>hiring practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student admission</td>
<td>protocol (internal communications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student articulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom excellence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competency based instruction</td>
<td>human resource development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional development</td>
<td>collective bargaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(technology and pedagogy)</td>
<td>student relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology needed to serve</td>
<td>parking and other auxiliary services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training needs of community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governance models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relations with Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relations with Ohio Board of Regents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal contract negotiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal career concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future of the institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survival of the institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the group. They cited three reasons why they could not, as a group, prioritize the list. First, as chief executive officers, they stated that they had ultimate responsibility for addressing these problems/issues, but that they were not always personally or operationally involved with the particular problem/issue. Second, the significance of the problems/issues varied among the presidents represented in the group, making it difficult to reach consensus on a prioritization scheme. Finally, the time constraints placed on the presidents in the group session were such that prioritization was not possible.

During the formal interview sessions, each president was probed for examples of problems and issues. An interesting array of situations were generated, which tended to cluster into the following types: crisis, strategic, complex, clearly defined, repetitive, structured, routine, and long-term.

Crisis situations presented an immediate threat to the organization or to persons within the organization (e.g., a student carrying a gun; a hole in the roof of the gymnasium). They also engendered an immediate response. Strategic situations were those which had a significant impact on the mission and goals of the institution, and usually required a policy decision for resolution. Examples provided by the presidents were:
significant loss of revenue; expansion of college service area. Complex situations involved a number and variety of variables and/or actors, with little cause and effect knowledge. The development of research parks in collaboration with other institutions was an example given by two presidents.

When cause/effect and the parameters of the situation were known, and the decision options clear, the situation was clearly defined (e.g., the computer system was down). Repetitive situations were cyclical, such as monthly board meetings and year-end reports. Situations that were structured were similar to clearly defined situations, but the structure was imposed by external forces, such as requests for compliance reports, or capital equipment projections. Routine situations occurred frequently and were guided by standard operating procedures, e.g., a fire drill. Long-term situations extended over a long period of time and often included other characteristics described above. Accreditation visits, for example, required an extended period of planning and preparation of reports.

Situations could also be described by a combination of the characteristics mentioned above. A bomb threat, for example, was considered a crisis situation on the one hand, but the response was guided
by standard operating procedures, so the situation could also have been considered routine.

The presidents were also asked in the formal interview to cite trends they could foresee that would elicit their concern. The range of their responses, in random order, follows:

- alternative sources for student financial aid;
- alternative sources of revenue for operations;
- more non-traditional programs and modes of delivery;
- more student (customer) centered atmosphere;
- accelerating technological development;
- development of new industries;
- increased collaboration and cooperation with other educational institutions;
- greater emphasis on quality; and
- merger of technical colleges and branch campuses.

Some of the concerns which the presidents felt would have to be addressed either individually or collectively were:

- lack of compensation for growth;
- cultivation of legislators;
- need for better management skills throughout the organization;
- rising utility costs;
- cost-effectiveness of programs;
- changes in demographics;
- equity in state funding;
development of faculty and staff to keep up with changing technologies;
marketing of institution; and
need to reduce personnel costs.

Some of these concerns have been addressed by the presidents as a collectivity, as evidenced in the meeting agendas of the Ohio Technical and Community College Association.

Several of the issues identified by the presidents in this study were consistent with the findings of Myran's (1981) research. The most important issues facing the two-year college presidents, according to Myran's national sample of presidents, were as follows (in rank order):

- basic reading, writing and mathematics skills;
- counseling and information services for prospective students;
- results-oriented instruction based on specific learning outcomes;
- greater collaboration with constituents and other community groups;
- more severe financial problems caused primarily by inflation;
- increased enrollment by women in occupational education programs;
- increased use of television and computers in instruction;
- more emphasis on marketing techniques; and
- service adaptations for specific "limited options" groups: low income persons, handicapped persons, persons in institutions, etc.
Its indicated, the issues of access, quality, cost-effectiveness, and collaboration expressed by the Ohio presidents were very similar to those expressed by two-year college presidents across the nation.

In addition to the problems and issues which served as occasions for action for the presidents, two other components of situations were revealed by the data, timing and setting. Those findings are presented in the following section.

**Timing and Setting**

The best illustration of the interactive aspects of timing and setting on situations came from a situation that the investigator observed that was common to many of the presidents in the sample. The observations were recorded of a situation that occurred on the day the group session with the presidents was held. The following presents a scenario of those events:

Scenario: The presidents met as a group with the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents at 1:30 p.m. on January 14, 1982. It was announced at that meeting that a press conference had been called by the Director of the State Office of Budget and Management to discuss a recently discovered $1 billion shortfall in the State's budget. After the Chancellor's meeting was adjourned, the presidents attended the press conference and learned of the potential impact of the shortfall on their institutional budgets, which had just been allocated the previous month. The proposal to be submitted to the Governor was
to call for up to a 16 percent reduction in institutional operating budgets for the first year of the biennium, which was almost at the half-way point.

The investigator was also present at the press conference and was able to observe and record the first reactions that many of the presidents had to this potentially devastating news. The following characteristics of the situation were reconstructed from the investigator's notes:

the decision to reduce the budgets was made at a higher level and nothing could be done to reverse the decision;

the timing was critical; in some cases salary increases had just been approved and operating budgets just distributed;

there were limited choice options since an across-the-board cut was ordered;

the situation had potential long-term effects;

the situation was strategic in nature;

the presidents had to prepare to "beat the media" back to their campuses; and

the following day, January 15, 1982, was a holiday on many of the campuses; for others, the following Monday, January 18, 1982, was a holiday.

The presidents were also faced with concerns regarding who needed to know about this situation first, what the response of faculty and staff would be when they heard the news on television or read it in the newspapers, and what implications the budget cuts would have for the overall mission and goals of the institution.
These concerns were evidenced by remarks made by some of the presidents as they left the press conference:

1. "I was just ready to recommend faculty salaries to the Board and now I'll have to cancel."
2. "How am I going to tell my people?"
3. "Devastating—I don't know how we'll manage."
4. "I knew it was coming and prepared for it."
5. "Well, I guess it's back to the drawing board."
6. "This is going to hurt, but we'll manage."

Several hours later, these same six presidents were asked what their first action was following the press conference. The following were their remarks:

1. "I did nothing. I'll think it through overnight."
2. "I called my office and made arrangements to hold a college-wide meeting on Monday."
3. "Called my office and arranged an emergency meeting with my board."
4. "I didn't do anything because I knew we had enough money in reserve. Tomorrow's a holiday and we'll be ready to quiet the crowd on Monday."
5. "Told my secretary to stop typing the speech I'd prepared to give next week—needs to be changed."
6. "I called my dean and told him to freeze the budget."

Some interesting patterns were revealed in just those few remarks regarding perceptual and contextual
differences among the presidents. There was, for example, both a casualness and a seriousness to the presidents' first reactions. The statements also reflected a concern for the people that would potentially be affected, and a need on the part of the presidents for some time to strategize. It might be speculated, for example, that president #4 had been supported by a strong planning and information base which allowed for the prediction of the shortfall; president #3 either lacked autonomy to determine an institutional response to the problem, or the decision was strategic enough to have involved the board at the outset. President #1 realized that he couldn't do anything until Monday anyhow.

During the interviews in March, these same presidents were asked to relate how they then perceived the problem. All but president #3 admitted that it wasn't as serious as it seemed in January, and that they had managed to forge ahead with their plans. In most cases, however, resolution of the budget problem did involve some policy decisions (e.g., increasing student tuition, or eliminating programs).

Another element of situations revealed by the data was role relationships. The following section includes some observations about these relationships.
Role Relationships

Several role relationships emerged from the presidents' descriptions of situations. The presidents were involved, for example, in leader/superior role relations with trustees and with the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. In this case, the president was often considered the subordinate. In other situations, the president was superordinate, such as meetings with his executive cabinet officers, faculty, and staff. These relations were classified as leader/subordinate role relations. In other situations, leader/leader role relations predominated where the president was a peer with other presidents, with other community leaders in a Chamber of Commerce meeting, or with state legislators.

Another role configuration involved the president as citizen, in either leader/non-leader role relations (e.g., participation in a community task force, playing golf with the neighbor), or leader/leader role relations (e.g., parties to the situation may have both been leaders, but they were not acting in their official leadership capacity). These role relations have had an important impact on the presidents' choices of interaction strategies to use in specific situations, and on their perceptions of the potential influence of others in the role relationships.
Being able to assess the potential influence of others was especially important in naturally occurring situations and in situations contrived by others. Naturally occurring situations evolved from events or issues, in which case the presidents could attempt to have significant influence over the actions of others. In situations which the presidents contrived, they could choose the participants, setting and strategies, and attempt to define the situation for others. The opposite was true for situations contrived by others where the amount of control the president was able to maintain depended upon his ability to influence the actions of the other participants to the situation.

Summary

Situations were defined conceptually as "occasions for action." As such, situations have provided a cross-sectional view of the way in which the environmental, positional, and personal variables converged. Several situational elements were considered by the presidents when a situation was analyzed. The interrelationships among problems and issues, setting and timing, and actors in specific situations were illustrated by examples of situations provided by the presidents in the sample. Situations varied in intensity for presidents, and also evoked different responses. Thus, the findings have revealed that
situations have stimulated reactive responses (in the case of problems) and proactive responses (in the case of opportunities), which is an important consideration in the dynamics of the president's job.

Chapter Summary

Presented in this Chapter was a composite profile of the elements of the job of presidents of public two-year colleges in Ohio. Aggregate responses drawn from individual profiles revealed general characteristics of the presidents, their positions, the environments within which they worked, and specific situations which they faced. Some of the similarities and differences among Ohio's public two-year college presidents were illustrated by these general characteristics.

The second and final part of the findings is presented in Chapter V on the relationships within, between, and among the following variable sets: environmental, positional, personal, and situational. The patterns of interrelationship of the variable sets provide a better understanding of the dynamic forces which have shaped the jobs of the two-year college presidents in this sample.
Chapter V

RESEARCH FINDINGS -- PART II

Different institutions and different times require different skills and different strategies. There is no single prototype of an effective leader. (Brown, 1979, p. 54)

In the preceding chapter a composite profile was presented of the elements of the job of presidents of public two-year colleges in Ohio. The composite profile included ranges of variance derived from unobtrusive data and formal interviews. Some comparisons were made between community college and technical college presidents, their positions, and the environments within which they worked. Likewise, some indication was provided of interrelationships among the elements within the following variable sets: environmental, positional, personal, and situational.

The dynamic forces which have shaped the presidents' jobs are the focus of this chapter. The findings presented here were derived by (1) examining the composite profile for patterns of similarity and variance, (2) isolating each variable set to determine patterns of similarity and variance that emerged from the individual profiles, (3) examining ways in which each variable set impacted the others, and (4) drawing
a generalized composite of the forces which shaped the presidents' jobs. The findings of other studies related to two-year college presidents and their institutions are integrated throughout this chapter as a means of cross-checking the generalizability and reliability of the data collected.

For organizational purposes, this chapter is presented in four major sections: (1) general patterns of similarity and variance; (2) patterns of similarity and variance within variable sets; (3) dynamic relationships between variable sets; and (4) dynamic relationships among variable sets.

Patterns of Similarity and Variance Within Variable Sets

Some patterns of similarity and variance between technical and community colleges, between rural and urban/suburban institutions, and between newly appointed and long-tenured presidents emerged from the composite profile. The composite profile, however, yielded insufficient insight into the sources of variance among the respondents, and the factors which shaped the variance. Thus, the individual profiles were reexamined in depth to discern patterns within variable clusters that would emerge from the data.

Each of the variable sets (environmental, positional, personal, situational) was isolated and
examined in depth to determine patterns of similarity and variance. In all four variable sets, three distinct patterns emerged. First, the data within each variable set tended to cluster logically around specific themes. Second, certain paradoxes were evident which inhibited the precise classification of findings. Finally, patterns of change over time were revealed.

THEMATIC CATEGORIES

Within each variable set, thematic categories emerged. These are described in more detail in the following section.

Thematic Categories Within the Environmental Variable Set

When examining organizational and contextual elements of the environment, the data fall logically into three basic types of hierarchical systems: (1) single hierarchy; (2) expanded hierarchy; and (3) multiple hierarchy. Single-hierarchy and multiple-hierarchy systems represented the extremes, while expanded-hierarchy systems represented the middle range.

**Single-Hierarchy Systems.** Four of the two-year colleges clustered rather closely in terms of organizational and contextual variables. These colleges were characterized by simple organizational
structures with three fairly distinct layers. The first layer of the structure included the president and one or two administrators who composed the executive cabinet. The second layer included deans and/or department chairpersons. Faculty represented the third layer of the structure. All of these colleges had top-down governance structures where the presidents controlled the internal and external activities of the organization.

The organizations in this group were small, rural, and had a homogeneous population of students and faculty. Environmental demands were few and simple and were usually addressed through standard operating procedures. The goals of these organizations were primarily operational and consumer-oriented and were explicitly stated. Finally, decision-making and communication processes were centralized to the presidents of these organizations.

These organizations were comparable to the rational, bureaucratic structures espoused by Weber (1947) and Parsons (1960). Parsons described the single-hierarchy organization illustrated in Figure 14, as having a formal structure with three basic levels: (1) institutional, where organizational and environmental relationships were articulated (e.g., goal setting, policy formulation); (2) managerial,
where task groups were coordinated and supervised (e.g., scheduling work, evaluating performance); and (3) technical, where materials and people were integrated for task accomplishment (e.g., production of goods and services). In this configuration, the institutional level included the chief executive officer and others who were strategic to the policy formulation process (e.g., executive cabinet members). Stroup (1966) found similar characteristics in educational organizations (e.g., a formal hierarchy with formalized communication channels, standardized rules and regulations, impersonal treatment of clients, and power vested in formal authority).
Expanded-Hierarchy Systems. The middle range of organizations, which included fourteen colleges, had a hierarchical but more adaptive structure. These colleges were, for the most part, larger organizations serving more heterogeneous populations, and responding to shifting environmental demands. Communication and decision-making processes were more decentralized in order to adapt more readily to environmental stimuli.

These colleges resembled the organizational perspectives espoused by Thompson (1967), incorporating features from both the rational, bureaucratic and open systems (Katz and Kahn, 1966) models of organization. In Thompson's view, as illustrated in Figure 15, there were significant, powerful "others" within and outside

![Figure 15: Expanded-Hierarchy System.](image-url)
the organization who needed to be involved in the policy process in order to keep the organization viable in a changing environment. Thus, the decision-making processes in this organizational configuration dipped further down into the organization or even expanded to include persons from outside the organization.

**Multiple-Hierarchy Systems.** The third cluster of organizations included three colleges. These were large, urban institutions which served very diverse populations. Many constituent groups both inside and outside the organizations made demands on the institutions. These organizations also had more complex and diverse goals, more specialized units within the colleges, and more mechanized systems for monitoring the environment and maintaining the flow of information. Decision making was more decentralized, and communication flows were both vertical and horizontal. Environmental demands on these colleges were more varied and more political in nature than they were in the other colleges. These were also among the most mature of the colleges in the sample.

The colleges in this cluster resembled those described by Baldridge and his colleagues (Baldridge, 1971; Baldridge, et al, 1978) as having a political governance structure. These colleges also appeared to be much like other public service agencies described by
Duncan (1972) which, by definition, were shaped by multiple constituencies, each with their own goals and sources of influence, vying for limited resources through independent hierarchical structures and status positions. As illustrated in Figure 16, these hierarchical interest groups converged at a central point where bargaining and exchange of power took place. The policy leaders (president and executive cabinet) in this type of organization were, as Dahl (1961) suggested, at the center of intersecting circles of influence.

Figure 16: Multiple-Hierarchy System.
It was evident from the manner in which these organizations clustered that there was congruence between organizational and contextual variables within the categories. For example, age, type, location, stage of development, nature and source of environmental demands were interrelated with structure, authority and communication mechanisms, organizational actors, and processes. In like manner, there was congruence between the type, frequency, and intensity of contingencies and the way the organization was structured to minimize the disruptive effects of the contingencies. Finally, it was clear from information provided by the presidents that the organizations would have clustered differently five or ten years ago, a point which will be discussed in more detail later in this section.

It is important that the variations in hierarchical systems just noted would not have surfaced by simply comparing technical and community colleges or rural and urban/suburban institutions. Rather, it was the interrelationship between the organizational and contextual factors which yielded the patterns just described.

**Thematic Categories Within the Positional Variable Set**

Presidential responsibilities, as described formally in the written position descriptions, and as
described by the presidents themselves, clustered into

two broad categories: (1) maintenance tasks/roles, and

(2) development tasks/roles.

**Maintenance Tasks/Roles.** The presidents' responsibilities for maintaining the organization were outlined in the formal position descriptions as follows:

- Recommends to Board employment and dismissal of personnel;
- Recommends, interprets, enforces Board policies and regulations;
- Authorizes expenditures and transfer of funds;
- Assigns personnel to positions, coordinates, supervises, and evaluates their work;
- Prepares annual budget;
- Issues administrative directives, reports, manuals;
- Maintains records and issues reports required by state, federal agencies;
- Directs building program, use of facilities, maintenance, safety and security;
- Recommends instructional programs;
- Recommends salary and wage schedules; and
- Manages resources of the college.

As noted in the previous chapter, many of the functional tasks associated with college maintenance have been delegated to subordinates. Human relations skills and technical skills (especially budgeting, decision-making, problem-solving, and management) were
considered by the presidents to be the most important for maintenance of the organization.

In terms of roles, maintenance tasks clustered into the following: manager (of money, people, material, and information), interpreter, disseminator, and mediator. Role relationships most prevalent in organizational maintenance were internally directed, primarily to immediate administrative subordinates with whom the presidents spent a lot of time. Maintenance tasks were more internally directed and more problem-focused than development tasks.

Development Tasks/Roles. The presidents' responsibilities for developing the organization were outlined in the formal position description as follows:

- Develops and maintains college's position externally;
- Provides leadership for overall organization, governance and progress of college;
- Delegates powers and duties of presidency to subordinates;
- Formulates, recommends and implements institutional philosophy, goals and objectives;
- Participates in development of local, state, and national policy; and
- Exercises broad discretionary powers.

As indicated in the previous chapter, the first three items just mentioned ranked high in frequency of appearance on the presidents' formal job descriptions; the last three ranked much lower.
Development tasks in which the presidents claimed to be the most involved were the following:

- Setting general tone of the organization;
- Changing policy;
- Analyzing trends and affecting change;
- Sensing the future;
- Planting seeds for future activities;
- Conceptualizing the whole;
- Creating opportunities;
- Image building;
- Providing climate for excellence;
- Leadership;
- Long-range planning; and
- Insuring quality education.

These tasks were the most indicative of the multi-role nature of the presidential position. Roles associated with these tasks, for example, were planner, negotiator, conceptualizer, delegator, and leader.

Of the tasks which the presidents said they had not delegated, most fell within the development category (e.g., image setting, setting priorities and objectives, external relationships, faculty negotiation). These were deemed the most strategic to projecting and maintaining the image of the college. The role relationships involved in organizational development were more external than internal; the
internal role relationships were more group than individually oriented (e.g., relationship with faculty senate or union).

The interrelationships between tasks and roles were not as clearly separated in the daily operations of the colleges as they appeared in these categories. Although the parameters of presidential responsibilities were explicitly stated in formal position descriptions, prevailing contingencies often dictated the order of priority assigned to the situation, and the allocation of the president's time devoted to daily work activities.

Thematic Categories Within the Personal Variable Set

When background characteristics and personality and behavioral traits were examined, two basic types of individuals emerged from the data: (1) maintainers, and (2) shapers. The distinguishing characteristics of these two types of individuals follow.

Maintainers. The persons grouped into this category claimed to be more task-oriented than people-oriented. They did not necessarily aspire to be the head of their organizations, and were more overt in their expressions of the need to maintain control. Their power was, for the most part, based in their position, and they delegated fewer tasks and less authority to subordinates.
These presidents prided themselves in their technical skills in management (e.g., budgeting, staffing, planning, directing, controlling). They were more involved in the internal operations and less involved in the external relations of the college. Many of them were founding presidents, were mature in age, and had previous working experience in the same college, public schools, the vocational education system, or business organizations. They focused more on problem-solving than on planning, and more on the present than on the future. Managerial effectiveness, to these presidents, was determined by the degree to which they were able to maintain organizational rationality.

**Shapers.** In contrast to the maintainers, shapers were more person-oriented, relied more on expert and personal power than positional power, and shared authority with subordinates. While many of these presidents were also mature in age, their educational backgrounds were in educational administration, and their previous work experiences were in other two-year college systems or public service organizations. They expressed a need for challenge, achievement, and to be on the cutting edge of change. They were also able to articulate both a personal and an educational philosophy, and were primarily self-directed.
The presidents in this group aspired to be "at the top," or "in charge" of an organization and had carefully chosen their career paths in order to gain maximum experience and exposure. They had a strong commitment to a set of values and beliefs they espoused openly, a philosophy which guided their behavior, and had experienced leadership roles as youth, through athletic, church, or school activities. They had considerable training and experience in interpersonal skills and placed a lot of value on their abilities to "read" people and "sense" problems and opportunities. They spent considerable time thinking about the future and how to get there, while at the same time being cognizant of organizational history and tradition. In addition, they carefully strategized to shape the organization in the way they wanted it to go, by setting goals and objectives, shaping policy, influencing the behavior of others, and searching for opportunities for themselves and for the organization. Finally, they shared leadership by recognizing the competence of others, and by helping others achieve their potential. To these individuals, leadership effectiveness was determined by the degree to which the goals they had defined for the organization were achieved.
There was almost an even split between maintainers and shapers among the presidents included in the sample. This did not, however, represent an equal division between technical and community colleges, or between newly appointed or long-tenured presidents. Rather, there was an even distribution of maintainers and shapers among the technical college presidents, while 63 percent of the community college presidents were considered shapers, and 37 percent were maintainers. In like manner, half of the long-tenured presidents and all of the newly appointed presidents were considered to be shapers rather than maintainers. It is important to note that environmental contingencies often dictated behavioral variance exhibited in maintaining or shaping the organization on a daily basis.

**Thematic Categories Within the Situational Variable Set**

Situations, defined as "occasions for action," included several elements, such as: actors, constraints, timing, degree of importance, topic, cost-benefit ratio, expectations of others, governance model, decision-making capabilities, and overall objectives of the organization. When the data were categorized, two basic types of situations emerged: (1) static situations, and (2) dynamic situations.
Static Situations. The problems/issues involved in static situations tended to be simple, routine, clearly defined, structured, and often repetitive. Static situations, for the most part, involved homogeneous actors with congruent values and similar expectations in terms of outcomes, thus increasing the predictability of the actions and effects. These types of situations were more short-range in duration, more task-centered, and there were often rules, regulations and standard operating procedures in place to resolve the problem or address the issue. Static situations were also more internal to the organization, and related more closely to organizational maintenance.

Dynamic Situations. The problems/issues involved in dynamic situations were more complex and ambiguous in nature, and more strategic to the organization. Dynamic situations involved a more heterogeneous mix of actors, often with diverse values, expectations, and sources of power and influence. Outcomes were not as easily predicted because of the dispersed power and influence.

Dynamic situations were often people-centered, and required strategies beyond standard operating procedures to resolve. Thus, mediation, persuasion, and negotiation between and among actors were often used as strategies to influence situational outcomes.
Situations were shaped by environmental and personal contingencies. Thus, situational characteristics fluctuated from static to dynamic depending on the mix of environmental and personal variables.

As reported in the previous chapter, several types of situations, both static and dynamic, were found in the colleges examined. Situations were perceived by technical and community college presidents alike as problems or opportunities, depending upon what else was occurring in their institutions concurrently.

Summary

Thematic categories were found within the environmental, positional, personal, and situational variable sets. None of the thematic categories represented exclusive patterns of variance between technical and community colleges, between rural and urban/suburban colleges, or between newly appointed presidents and those with long tenure. Situational variance within the variable clusters led to the discovery that there were a number of paradoxes in the presidency which inhibited a more precise classification of findings.

PARADOXICAL NATURE OF THE PRESIDENCY

One pattern which emerged from the data was the paradoxical nature of the presidency. Paradoxes were
found within the environmental, positional, personal, and situational variable sets.

Paradoxical Nature of the Environment

Several paradoxes were found in the organizational and contextual characteristics of the two-year colleges in this sample. First, evidence was found that bureaucratic, professional (collegial), and political organizational structures coexisted in many of the organizations, particularly the large, urban institutions. This illustrated a need for maintaining rationality while at the same time being flexible enough to adapt to a changing environment. Second, characteristics of organizational stability and instability were found to coexist. This was particularly true in those mature colleges with new presidents. Finally, many of the organizations were at the same time stimulus reducing (internally directed toward problem-solving), and stimulus seeking (exploring new environmental opportunities).

Paradoxical Nature of the Position

As indicated earlier, the presidents' formal position descriptions included both maintenance and development tasks and responsibilities. Some presidents claimed to be leaders, yet performed
primarily management tasks and roles; others claimed to be managers and performed primarily leadership tasks and roles.

Presidential responsibilities included both formal and informal tasks and role relationships, both internally and externally directed tasks and role relationships, and both political and apolitical tasks and role relationships. Task requirements also necessitated that the president be fiscally conservative and innovative at the same time, and that his work responsibilities be conducted both face to face and at a distance.

**Paradoxical Nature of the Person**

The presidents in this sample indicated the need to have a repertoire of administrative styles, and a wide range of skills and abilities. The presidents reported behaving in an authoritarian manner some times, and in a democratic or charismatic manner at other times. In like manner, they were task-oriented some times, and people-oriented other times. They often had to be coercive with some people and persuasive with others. They also reported having to be cautious but at the same time take significant risks. Finally, the presidents claimed that their
behavior had to be fairly predictable, but not totally, and stated that their subordinates knew them fairly well, but not really.

Paradoxical Nature of the Situation

Situations, or contingencies, appeared to be the root of paradoxical phenomena. The problems/issues, predictability of outcomes, knowledge of actors and their expectations varied from situation to situation. Some situations appeared, from the examples provided by the presidents, to be more strategic to the organization than others. The use of particular strategies or behaviors, as the presidents reported, often depended upon the mix of situational variables.

Summary

A number of paradoxes within the variable sets were just described. They are amplified further in a statement made by Richman and Farmer (1974), who captured the paradoxical nature of the presidency as follows:

The president must often be a negotiator and a mediator, jockeying among power blocs, trying to carve out viable futures for his institution. He should not be either an autocrat or bureaucrat, or merely an administrator. He should be a professional manager, an active leader, and often an entrepreneur as well. He must understand and effectively use both formal bureaucratic and informal expert and participative structures and processes. He must also maintain channels of communication and influence between the formal and
informal structures. The faculty should have a major say regarding academic matters, and the students regarding matters that directly involve them. However, when conflicts cannot be resolved in a reasonably timely fashion, and there are not enough resources to meet all demands, the president must resolve conflicts either through his overall budgetary powers or some other means (p. 23).

This statement summarized in a succinct way the general perceptions of the presidents included in this sample. As many of them stated, if ambiguities, complexities, constraints, and contingencies did not exist, the president's job would be without challenge. The crux of the matter, as one respondent put it, is that "presidents have a job to do and they do it by whatever means necessary."

In addition to the paradoxes found in the presidents' jobs, a number of evolutionary changes were reported. Presidents who had been at the helm of their institutions for many years were able to provide insight into these changes.

EVOLUTIONARY CHANGES IN THE PRESIDENCY

As noted earlier, thirteen (61 percent) of the presidents interviewed had been in their positions for six or more years. Thus, most of the presidents were able to describe changes which had occurred over time in the environment, the position, and in themselves.
Changes in the Environment

Contextual determinants of change included age, size, organizational history, stages of development, and influences of the organizational environment. Most colleges began with just a skeleton staff, except for those which existed under another configuration. Enrollments, facilities, and faculty grew very rapidly in the late 1960's, and early 1970's. Rapid changes in environmental stimuli brought more demands on institutional resources. Goals became more diversified, the clientele served became more heterogeneous, and more people demanded participation in the institutional governance processes. This necessitated greater efforts at integrating the people and functions within the college (e.g., regulations and operating procedures), the addition of specialized personnel (e.g., public relations, personnel, and planning specialists), and sophisticated technologies for processing information, in order to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of college operations.

When enrollments began to peak in the late 1970's, and systems were in place to accommodate environmental demands, strategies were implemented in the colleges to assess environmental trends and focus internally on the quality of the programs and facilities that were in place. By most standards, the public two-year colleges
in Ohio have now matured. They have advanced in size and structure to a point of relative stability. For the most part, facilities have been completed and faculty and staff have been in place for many years. For most the environment has stabilized and methods for addressing the needs of a heterogeneous population have been institutionalized. There were, however, a few colleges which had not developed to capacity and which were, at the time of the interviews, in a process of expansion and revitalization under the direction of new presidents.

The distinct shifts in the stages of development of the two-year colleges in Ohio paralleled national trends. Economic, political, and social trends, for example, had a significant impact on two-year colleges nationally in the decade 1960-1970. This was a period of phenomenal growth for the two-year colleges, which were being founded at an average rate of one per week (Kauffman, 1982). Two-year colleges were gaining their own status as viable postsecondary institutions as they were separated from the public schools. But increased dependence upon federal and state funding for operational and capital expenditures brought new partners to the educational enterprise--federal and state governmental agencies. With these new partnerships came new rules and regulations, new behaviors
(e.g., lobbying), new dependencies, and new demands for accountability.

The turbulence in American society during the late 1960's and early 1970's, had a significant impact on higher education institutions. The assassinations of John and Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr., the Vietnam War, riots in the streets of impacted urban areas, hippies and yippies, and near impeachment of a U.S. president, called into question many of the traditional societal values. Emphasis on the youth culture, or the "me" generation, spawned a more permissive society, which in turn began to strip colleges of much of the authority they once had. Students questioned the relevance of the curriculum and the practice of in loco parentis; faculty claimed the right to negotiate their working conditions, and taxpayers lost confidence in the postsecondary education system. Courts and state and federal agencies began to intervene in the affairs of the once public colleges. College presidents had to face a new dilemma: how to run a "rational" organization in a society that behaved irrationally.

The 1970's have been characterized by some as the "cooling out" years. As the turbulence of the early part of the decade began to subside, the autonomy of colleges was further threatened by environmental
pressures impacting upon them. On the one hand, public confidence in higher education had eroded which resulted in a general reluctance toward increasing tax levies and an increased dependence on state and federal governments, which resulted in a tightening of state and federal rules and regulations. On the other hand, the pragmatic interests of the general population for career-related training produced major shifts in programming for many institutions with the addition of more technical and occupational courses. An increase in non-traditional students (e.g., older, development, minority, physically impaired) also impacted programming, especially as the economic climate began to deteriorate.

The social context of the 1980's created a new set of problems. Myran (1981), in a national survey of community college presidents, asked respondents to rank value shifts which had taken place in society in terms of their impact on community college development in the decade of the 1980's. The five value shifts the presidents selected (in rank order) were as follows:

- from consumption to conservation;
- from large scale to small scale;
- from a work to a leisure-oriented society;
- from job security to varied life experiences; and
- from conformity to individual self expression.

In this same study, presidents were asked to rank the major trends which would shape the development of
community colleges during the 1980's. These rankings were as follows (in order of priority):

- energy shortages;
- continuing inflation;
- advances in science and industry;
- entry of women into all or most career fields;
- changes in the nature of work;
- end to the youth culture, beginning of an "adult development culture";
- tendency toward centralized governmental control;
- advances in communications;
- diminution of higher education certificates as the means for job entry and security; and
- changes in family life (two-income families, single parent families).

Myran found that these trends were reflected in both the long-range planning documents and the goal statements of the institutions included in his sample.

Concurrent with environmental changes, the presidents' positions have also changed. This was evidenced in data provided by two-year college presidents in Ohio.

**Changes in the Position**

The positions of the two-year college presidents in Ohio have changed both historically and culturally in the twenty years since the first community college was founded. Those who were the founding presidents of their colleges and began operations with just one or two staff have seen their tasks and responsibilities become more complex and diversified. They also learned over the years that they did not have the requisite skills to deal with the economic, political, social,
and legal issues which impacted their positions during the growth period of the two-year college system. Although many of the presidents attempted to carry out their responsibilities without assistance, there just were not enough hours in the day to accomplish their tasks. Thus, they began delegating more of the operational duties to their newly appointed administrative officers.

During those developmental years, the presidents saw their roles change from entrepreneurship to management. They saw a shift in their responsibilities from a focus on facilities and resources to "people problems." Their positions became defined more clearly as organizational policies and procedures were developed.

Now that most of the colleges and their environments have stabilized, and the operational tasks have been delegated, many of the presidents have sought new challenges. They have begun to spend more time in planning, and have become more involved in the external relationships of the college. They have accepted the complexities and ambiguities of their roles as "givens" and have left few doubts that they have the power, authority, and autonomy to carry out their responsibilities. The presidents have also achieved a personal identity in their communities, and
a sense of belonging to a two-year college system through their participation in professional associations.

With the changes in their positional responsibilities, many of the presidents experienced boredom. Many have lost the challenge that came with their heavy workloads and the myriad problems they had to resolve. This has been a particular problem for some of the presidents who are nearing retirement. It has also become a problem, however, for those younger presidents who came into their organizations with a full complement of staff and a stable organization.

Some evidence of the changing roles of two-year college presidents emerged from the literature. Cohen and Roueche (1969) identified the responsibilities of the president in the 1960's as (1) pacesetting—providing general direction and philosophy; (2) goalsetting—interpreting philosophical views and building institutional structure; (3) accepting accountability for results obtained. Morgan (1970) concluded from his study of community college presidents that the principal role of the chief executive officer was leader. As chief executive, the president was responsible for management of faculty, curriculum, administration, personnel, and the studentbody—within board policies and state and federal laws. (This in itself
is a paradoxical description.) He/she also represented the faculty, administration, personnel and studentbody to the board. As a professional educator, the president engaged in the promotion of the profession of education as well as the philosophical tenets that undergirded the mission of the college.

In the study of the occupational perceptions of 326 two-year college presidents, Gilli (1978) concluded that presidents were becoming more and more like managers. He indicated that the presidents perceived their primary roles to be (1) institutional manager, (2) mediator, (3) advocate of the board. Only one-fourth of the respondents in Gilli's study thought that the real decision-making power resided in themselves, but they perceived their influence on board members, facility planning and allocation of resources to be considerable, while they felt they had only "some" influence on curriculum planning, faculty, and students.

Several presidential roles emerged during the late 1970's, such as money manager (Sims, 1978), marketer (Bickford, 1978), manipulator (Wygal, 1978), politician (Greenfield, 1978; Koltai and Erickson, 1979-80). Gipson (1981) demonstrated in a study of the political activity of community college presidents in Texas, that these executives were politically active at local,
state, and national levels. They watched very closely the state and national legislative activities which impacted their institutions, and used their personal contacts and coalitional forms of lobbying to influence political decision makers. In short, they used a variety of strategies to insure support for their own institutions, and for the community college movement in general and the role these institutions play in society.

The decade of the 1980's, Gleazer (1980) claimed, would require a higher order of leadership which would accomplish the following:

provide strong philosophy, goals and objectives to those inside and outside the organization;

overcome the complacency that sets in with a stable organization and little money to be innovative;

replace out-of-date equipment and teaching methods of adult learners;

focus on community research and problem-solving;

involve others in the change process; and

take an active role in the community political process.

Many of the presidents in Ohio have experienced the transitions in their positions noted in the literature. Perhaps one of the factors which shaped the positional transitions was personal adaptability.
Changes in the Person

Most of the two-year college presidents in this sample have matured right along with their institutions. They have grown older, wiser, and have encountered most problems or issues more than once in their tenure on the job. The presidents have learned to delegate operational responsibilities, thus freeing some time for planning, cultivating external relationships, and reading. For the most part, they have learned to shape the direction of the college in unobtrusive ways and have found it less necessary to use direct power. They have also learned to manage job stress by delegating tasks and by developing outside interests which have diverted their attention away from nagging problems.

An examination of the literature on two-year college presidents illuminated the findings of this study. Research done by Schultz (1969) and Morgan (1970) indicated that newly selected community college presidents were mature in years, had previous administrative experience (more coming from the deanship than before), and had previous community college experience (as opposed to the public school and university experience base which earlier presidents
More presidents had the Ph.D. as the terminal degree; more had doctorates in higher education or educational administration.

When Morgan asked the presidents in his study what they would like to do if they left the presidency, the most frequent response was "teach graduate school," followed very closely by "assume another presidency," and "retire." Their motivation to leave the presidency, in rank order, was reported to be: advancement; too much pressure; another educational position; health, age, retirement; need personal life; frustrations; unhappiness/fatigue. Asked what motivated them to stay in the presidency, they responded as follows (in rank order): challenge; satisfaction; reward; contribution; responsibility; power; personal and social advancement; and nowhere else to go.

Morgan concluded from his study that there were four types of presidents: (1) the "overwhelmed-by-himself" type who was ego involved in his position and survival; (2) the "seat-of-the-pants" type who was basically unskilled in the job; (3) the "follow-me-boys" type who changed direction on a whim and expected everyone to follow him; and (4) the "carpet-bagger" type who was a builder, troubleshooter, and politician all wrapped into one.
In like manner, Sims (1978-79) claimed that community college presidents fell basically into three categories: (1) builders, who "primarily prefer to work in new settings which are growing in terms of facilities, programs and staff," (2) maintainers, who "prefer to work in a setting in which an institution has reached a kind of plateau and is relatively stable," and (3) "Kamikaze" administrators, who were "persons who derive professional satisfaction in working with problem institutions."

The changes in personal attributes and personal styles evident in the literature were also found in the two-year college presidents in this study. To gain more insight into these changes, situational variables were examined.

**Changes in Work-Related Situations**

The problems and issues the presidents have faced over the years have changed from a focus on the development of facilities and curriculum, to a focus on student and faculty demands in the late 1960's, and early 1970's, to a scarcity of fiscal resources in the 1980's. Issues of access, quality, cost-effectiveness, and collaboration which the presidents reported to be an important focus for the 1980's, had been addressed before by some presidents.
Those presidents who have been on their jobs for many years have encountered fewer situations they have not faced before. They have experienced the building of facilities and fluctuations in enrollment; they have enjoyed affluence and have had to face retrenchment. Over the years they have established a basis for trust and reliability and have encountered most of the people with whom they would come in contact in a given situation. In addition, more standard operating procedures have been established to make most problems and issues somewhat routine. All of these factors shaped the nature and intensity of situations the presidents encountered and helped determine how strategic situations were to organizational rationality or survival.

Changes in problems and issues have historical roots in the literature. A number of dilemmas facing two-year college presidents in the 1960's were suggested by Blocker, et al (1965). Most of these dilemmas stemmed from the increasing comprehensiveness of the two-year colleges. Maintaining comprehensive programs to serve the needs of the community and a variety of "unselected" students was a large undertaking. But to do it well, without sacrificing educational integrity, and with sufficient fiscal resources, just added to the complexities of the
problem. Finding sufficient educational leaders and the best patterns of organization and administration were other important community college issues of the 1960's according to these authors.

The presidential image began to wane with the turbulence of the late 1960's and early 1970's which called for a new set of skills. Problems encountered during this period and in the subsequent "cooling out" years focused the president's attention on a new set of issues. As illustrated in Table 10, effectiveness and improvement of instruction had fallen from first to fifth in terms of priority, to be replaced by new issues which required a dual emphasis on management and interpersonal relations.

Major issues to be faced by the presidents in the late 1970's, according to Glenny (1976) were: enrollment and funding; curriculum; faculty, staff, and personnel policies; new markets, products, methods, resources and reorganization of "the industry"; management techniques and practices; and shifts in decision making and master planning. These were problems that required improved technical skills on the part of college leaders, and the addition of specialized personnel.

Spencer (1981) characterized the 1980's as the era of the 4R's--reduction, retrenchment, reallocation, and
TABLE 10
RANK ORDERING OF MAJOR ISSUES CONFRONTING
TWO-YEAR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS OVER THREE DECADES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1960's^a</th>
<th>1970's^b</th>
<th>1980's^c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness and improvement of instruction;</td>
<td>Collective bargaining;</td>
<td>Student retention;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of research and development;</td>
<td>Financial support;</td>
<td>Community impact;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-outs;</td>
<td>Applying sound principles of management;</td>
<td>Resource development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of instructional offerings;</td>
<td>President-Board relationships;</td>
<td>Educational productivity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support;</td>
<td>Effectiveness and improvement of instruction;</td>
<td>Management systems;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student characteristics (ability to predict success);</td>
<td>The &quot;new student&quot;;</td>
<td>Marketing strategies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of instructors;</td>
<td>Interpersonal relationships;</td>
<td>Program evaluation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic counseling;</td>
<td>Relationship of occupational offerings to employment needs of the community;</td>
<td>Innovative instruction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty loads;</td>
<td>Staff understanding and acceptance of the role and function of the community college;</td>
<td>Time management;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year and four-year college articulation.</td>
<td>State control.</td>
<td>President-Board relations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

renewal. A common agenda which Spencer claimed all two-year college presidents would face included the following items:

- students expect delivery on promises;
- reduction in force (RIF) procedures;
- status of part-time faculty;
- affirmative action;
- rights of community college presidents to challenge dismissal;
- Sunshine laws;
- developed and defined policies with hard data;
- more centralized control at the state level;
- national model of governance;
- adequate funding;
- renewal and redirection of traditional education;
- regain public support; and
- meet increasing competition from other educational sources.

As indicated in the previous chapter, Ohio public two-year colleges presidents cited many of these same issues when asked what future trends would shape the nature of their jobs.

**Summary**

Data provided by the presidents in this study, coupled with the findings of other studies of two-year college presidents, demonstrated patterns of
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evolutionary change in the presidency. These patterns were reported for environmental, positional, personal and situational variable sets.

SECTION SUMMARY

Thematic categories, paradoxes, and temporal changes were found. Within the environmental variable set, the data fell logically into three categories: single-hierarchy systems, expanded-hierarchy systems, and multiple-hierarchy systems. Positional data was categorized into two groups (maintenance tasks/roles and development tasks/roles), as was personal data (maintainers and shapers), and situational data (static situations and dynamic situations). In addition, it was found that paradoxes in all four variables inhibited more discrete classifications. Finally, there was substantial evidence which suggested that the presidents' jobs have changed over time. Literature on two-year college presidents and their colleges supported these findings.

The data were also examined for relationships between the variables. These are explored more fully in the following section.

Dynamic Relationships Between Variable Sets

Each of the variable sets was examined in relation to the others in an attempt to understand the dynamic
forces which shaped the job of the two-year college presidents in this sample. The relationships are described in dyadic fashion in this section, and are examined in composite form in the final section of this chapter.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SITUATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL VARIABLES

The relationship between situational and environmental variables was cyclical in nature, each one shaping and building on the other. As stimuli for organizational responses, situations have provided constraints and opportunities which have shaped the institutions over time. Environmental demands, for example, have impacted the mission and goals of institutions, and have made it necessary for organizations to have an adaptable structure to cope with environmental shifts.

Environmental variables (organizational and contextual elements), on the other hand, have provided the backdrop for individual situations. Situations were composed of the following organizational and contextual elements:

actors (congruence of values; expectations);
constraints;
timing (what else was happening at the same time);
degree of importance (relative to other things occurring);
subject matter of the situation;
cost-benefit ratio (what would happen if the problem was not solved);
who needed to be involved;
what processes and procedures were in place; and
how strategic the problem/issue was to the organization.

In essence, the organizational and contextual elements provided the cultural definition or interpretation of situations. Getzels, and Guba (1957) referred to this as the nomothetic dimension. Cultural definitions of situations differed because of the perceptual understandings of the participants.

As illustrated in Figure 17, when the thematic categories within the environmental and situational variable sets were superimposed upon each other, the relationships were more clearly established. The diagram indicates a predominance of static situations in single-hierarchy systems, and conversely a predominance of dynamic situations in multiple-hierarchy systems.

Single-hierarchy systems were stable, with few environmental demands. Authority was centralized, and rules and regulations had been established to deal with most situations that would be encountered. In a similar vein, most work situations encountered by the
presidents of these organizations were static in nature. Situational outcomes were more predictable, the sources of influence were known, the problems and issues more simple and clearly defined, and the strategies for problem resolution more routine. In addition, the actors were more homogeneous (higher congruence in values) and their expectations more predictable.

In contrast, the multiple hierarchy systems were characterized by more complex and diverse environmental demands coming from a variety of constituent groups with differing values and expectations. A variety of structural and procedural techniques, including mechanized information systems, were in place to reduce environmental uncertainty and make the organization more adaptable to environmental shifts. Work related
situations encountered by the presidents of these organizations were more dynamic in nature.

The contingencies what shaped the organizational and contextual elements varied with intensity. Thus, the broken line in the diagram illustrates the potential fluctuation between static and dynamic situations which existed in expanded-hierarchy systems. These systems were more adaptable to contingencies than single-hierarchy systems, but not as fluid as multiple-hierarchy systems.

These findings have implications for the structuring of two-year colleges and the design of information processing capabilities. If the information processing capabilities are inadequate, environmental uncertainty will most likely be interpreted as a constraint to the effectiveness of the college. Mechanized information systems, environmental scanning processes, and the cultivation of external relationships are strategies that have been used in some of the colleges in this sample to turn constraints into potential opportunities. Thus, the organizational capacity for rationality and flexibility has been enhanced by the introduction of methods for reducing contingencies and constraints imposed by the external environment.
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SITUATIONAL AND PERSONAL VARIABLES

The relationship between situational and personal variables also appeared to be cyclical, with the elements of both variables shaping and building upon one another. Situational variables placed demands on the president's time and shaped his sense of priority and choice of strategy. The dynamic nature of the situation impacted the president's use of influence and the way in which he cultivated interpersonal relations. Presidential responses to situations varied depending upon whether the situation was contrived by other actors, contrived by the president himself, or simple occurred naturally.

Personal variables influenced the manner in which the president interpreted situations, how he prioritized his time, and whether he delegated his responsibilities and authority to subordinates. The contingencies also shaped the president's selection of administrative style and method of influence he thought would achieve desired results. With a wide range of styles, skills and abilities, the presidents could respond in a variety of ways to particular situations.

The president provided the subjective or personal interpretation of situations, acting upon his own interpretation and gauging his strategies upon the
potential influence of other actors to the situation. Getzels and Guba (1957) referred to this as the idiographic dimension.

When the thematic categories within the situational and personal variable sets were superimposed, some interesting patterns were found. Figure 18 illustrates that "maintainers" were more internally directed and problem-oriented. Since they involved themselves personally in both static and dynamic situations, the latter placed extreme demands on their time. In many cases, these individuals did not have adequate organizational systems in place to reduce the stress on the organization imposed by dynamic situations. Organizational and contextual demands often

Static Situations

Maintainers

(Contingencies)

Shapers

Dynamic Situations

Figure 18: Relationships Between Situational and Personal Variables.
shaped the presidents' response rather than the reverse. Thus, maintainers were more reactive than proactive to situational demands. Many of these presidents claimed it was easier, depending upon the stakes involved, to shape their behavior to particular situations than to shape the situation itself.

"Shapers," on the other hand, were more externally directed and spent a majority of their time "sensing" the environment, and through indirect persuasion, "planting seeds" to shape the situational outcomes. Shapers often used their influence to contrive the situational variables such that the cultural definition of the situation was the same or close to his own personal definition. These individuals also tended to be more proactive than reactive, and attempted when possible to turn potential problems into opportunities for themselves and for their colleges.

As indicated in Figure 19, those presidents who were considered "maintainers" made use of organization structure and standard operating procedures to resolve static situations, and used their positional authority to influence the outcomes of dynamic situations.
In contrast, those presidents who were considered "shapers," delegated most of the static situations to subordinates and spent their time concentrating on dynamic situations. While they had, for the most part, established organizational systems for resolving dynamic situations, they also used their personal influence to shape the situational outcomes.

These findings have implications for the organizational capacity to respond to environmental demands, and to plan strategically to accommodate environmental shifts. Presidential behavior appeared to be a determining factor in whether the organization was adaptable or more rigid, or whether the organization could respond rapidly when confronted with
opportunities, or was constantly trying to keep up with changes imposed by the environment.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SITUATIONAL AND POSITIONAL VARIABLES

Situations, defined as "occasions for action," were the building blocks of the president's position. The president's daily work activities were comprised of a series of situations which varied in scope and intensity. Some were more complex than others, some were more problematic, some were more long-range in scope, and some more routine. As indicated earlier, the organizational and contextual variables constituted the cultural dimension of situations and the personal variables shaped the personal dimension of situations. The cultural dimension reflected the role expectations of the president as perceived by others; the personal dimension reflected the president's own interpretation of his responsibilities and the way in which he would carry out those responsibilities. Situations also dictated the president's role relationships and created paradoxes and temporal changes in the president's job.

As indicated in the previous chapter, the presidents reported that their initial response to situations was more intuitive than calculative. They responded more out of a "sense" of the situation based upon their cumulative knowledge of the people, the
resources available, and other organizational factors involved, rather than analyzing each situation and its component parts. The presidents also reported that they usually approached situations with organizational outcomes and effects in mind.

The latitude for presidential response to situations was established by positional variables. The formal position description, for example, contained written statements regarding the legal authority of the president and the formal relationships with persons internal and external to the organization (e.g., board, faculty, governmental agencies, administrative personnel). It also defined the parameters for structuring the organization in response to situations, and provided formal mechanisms for influencing constituents (e.g., allocation of resources, in-service programs for personnel; public relations program; setting the agenda for the board; liaison activities). The formal position description also helped define the position for others and shaped cultural understanding.

When superimposed, as illustrated in Figure 20, situational and positional variables were congruent. Situational demands shaped the presidential responsibilities as well as the skills needed for the job, internal and external role relationships, and whether the president delegated responsibilities. Some
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Figure 20: Relationships Between Situational and Positional Variables.

situations evoked maintenance tasks and roles, some evoked development tasks and roles; some required problem-solving activities, others required planning activities. It appeared that the more dynamic the situation, the greater the need for conceptualizing and planning skills on the part of the president. The relationship between static situations and maintenance tasks and roles and between dynamic situations and development tasks and roles is demonstrated in Table 11.

The extent to which the presidents used their formal position descriptions to shape the direction of the college varied among the respondents. A majority of the presidents had written their own formal position descriptions, but only a few of them had actually translated their positions into measurable objectives
### TABLE 11

**POSITIONAL RESPONSES TO STATIC AND DYNAMIC SITUATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance Tasks</th>
<th>Static Situations</th>
<th>Dynamic Situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>Decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authorizing</td>
<td>Problem-solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Dynamic Situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Demander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter</td>
<td>Mediator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Tasks</th>
<th>Static Situations</th>
<th>Dynamic Situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>External relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting philosophy,</td>
<td>Local, State,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>goals, objectives</td>
<td>National Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assigning priorities</td>
<td>Image Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-range Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Dynamic Situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegator</td>
<td>Negotiator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Conceptualizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for behavioral and organizational outcomes for a specific period of time. Thus, it was apparent that many of the presidents did not fully utilize the latitude of their positions as formally stated. This had implications for their ability to shape organizational and environmental outcomes.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ENVIRONMENTAL AND POSITIONAL VARIABLES

It was clear from the data submitted by the presidents that there was an impact of environmental variables on positional variables. The reverse order of the relationship was not as clear.

Environmental variables have impacted positional variables in several ways. First, the historical evolution of the colleges, as well as the colleges' chartered missions have shaped the formal roles and responsibilities of the presidents as well as the work objectives which the presidents have established for themselves and their organizations. Second, environmental demands in terms of economic, political, legal, cultural, and technological forces, have shaped the nature of the organizations and the ways in which the organizations have had to respond in order to remain viable. The nature and scope of environmental demands and constraints have determined to a large extent how the presidents allocated their time and have impacted
their choices of responses. Knowing that they could not be all things to all people, the presidents have had to calculate the strategic nature of the demands and prioritize their activities accordingly. Finally, constituents both within and outside the organizations have shaped the role relationships and role expectations of the presidents.

Positional variables impacted environmental variables in one important way. The formal position descriptions of the presidents provided written statements of the parameters of the presidents' responsibilities and legal controlling authority. In a formal sense, the position descriptions determined some role relationships and a legal basis for controlling or shaping some of the environmental variables. The way in which presidential responsibilities and roles were actually carried out depended to a large part on the presidents' interpretations of their positions and the way in which they enacted their responsibilities based on their own interpretations.

When the thematic categories within the environmental and positional variable sets were superimposed upon one another, as illustrated in Figure 21, some interesting patterns were found. The presidents of the single-hierarchy organizations described their responsibilities as predominantly maintenance activities.
Their role relationships were more internal to the organization than external, and their tasks were more problem-solving than planning. They were, however, engaged in some long-range planning, and in some external relationships.

Presidents in the multiple-hierarchy organizations had delegated almost all operational tasks to their subordinates, although their formal position descriptions indicated that they had ultimate authority and responsibility for all operations of the colleges. There was a predominance of development activities among the tasks they reported, and more planning than problem-solving activities. Their role relationships were more external to the organization than internal.
The presidents in the expanded-hierarchy organizations split their positional emphasis almost in half with regard to maintenance and development tasks and responsibilities. They were involved in both problem-solving and planning, and had cultivated both internal and external role relationships.

The broken line in the diagram which separates maintenance and development tasks illustrates the contingencies or situational fluctuations in the focus of presidential responsibilities.

These findings indicate a necessity for presidents and boards of trustees to insure that the discretion and authority needed by the president to carry out his positional tasks are formally stated. Whether the president uses these discretionary powers to the fullest extent, has more to do with the person, as indicated in the next section.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ENVIRONMENTAL AND PERSONAL VARIABLES

Environmental variables impacted personal variables much the same way they influenced the positional variables, although the relationships between environmental and personal variables were much more interactive than those between the environmental and positional variables. The presidents' choices of
influence strategies and the way they allocated their time, were shaped by organizational and environmental demands.

Personal variables were an important factor in the presidents' abilities to shape their environment. There were a variety of ways the presidents could shape their environments, including: use of structure, positional power, personal influence, and indirect persuasion. Their choices of subordinates and the delegation of tasks and authority were other methods used. They could also shape the environment, particularly their external role relationships, by including community members on advisory committees, developing communication strategies and interpersonal relationships with board members, setting board agendas, and assigning organizational priorities. Some even had direct influence on the composition of their boards by making suggestions of potential board members to county commissioners and others involved in the selection process. Some used these strategies more than others as the following description of the convergence of thematic categories indicates.

When the thematic categories within the environmental and personal variable sets were superimposed upon one another, as illustrated in Figure 22, the following patterns emerged. First, the
presidents of the single-hierarchy organizations tended to be task oriented and problem focused and appeared to be more reactive than proactive in their response to problems than those in the other two groups. They delegated fewer tasks and were more authoritarian in administrative style. In terms of background, these presidents generally had more limited postsecondary administrative experience (outside the organizations they headed), and tended to have more parochial educational and work experiences which were limited to the state of Ohio.

Presidents of the organizations in the multiple-hierarchy classification had educational and work experiences outside the state of Ohio, in several two-year colleges, and more than one previous
presidency. The presidents were involved in many community activities as well as state and national activities. They had delegated almost all operational tasks to their subordinates and had sophisticated systems to respond to environmental demands. They were more externally oriented and spent much of their time trying to "read" the environment, strategize in advance of environmental demands, and influence environmental demands through the use of indirect persuasion. They depended extensively on the cultivation of good inter-personal relationships to shape their environments.

The presidents in the expanded-hierarchy organizations were more democratic in style and reported they were both people-oriented and task-oriented. They split their time about evenly between problem-solving and planning and between internal and external role relationships. They reported the use of both indirect persuasion and more authoritarian influence strategies.

These findings support the necessity for college boards of trustees to determine, through organizational and contextual assessments, where their organization stands in comparison to where they would like it to be. Using this information as one factor to consider in the
selection of new presidents would enhance the match between the person selected and the nature of the organization and its context. If the board members desired a significant change in the organization, these findings indicated that a person with the background, skills and abilities to shape the organization should be selected over someone who would be more oriented to maintaining the status quo. In a similar vein, presidents who have outgrown their organizations in terms of the match between their abilities and interests and the capacity for organizational growth, should probably seek other opportunities. Conversely, in situations where organizations have outgrown the president (e.g., the organizational and contextual factors have become too dynamic to match the presidents skills and abilities), he should engage in self-development activities or seek an organizational match more commensurate with his personal capabilities.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN POSITIONAL AND PERSONAL VARIABLES

As indicated earlier, the president's position was composed of situations with both cultural and personal dimensions. As such, the environmental (cultural) variables shaped the demands on the president's time and the personal variables shaped the way in which the president elected to allocate his time. The written position description formally established the rights,
responsibilities, and privileges of the president, and enumerated the discretionary options he had available to carry out his job. To be sure, not all discretionary options were outlined in the formal position descriptions. Informal influence processes, for example, consumed an inordinate amount of work time for many of the presidents.

The presidents shaped their positions in a variety of ways. First, most of them wrote their formal position descriptions, thus setting their own parameters and discretionary options. They established themselves as liaison to the board and determined that they would set the board agendas. Second, they often selected their own administrative staff to whom they could delegate many of the operational responsibilities. Third, they determined organizational priorities for themselves and for others and decided which tasks they would not delegate to subordinates. Fourth, the presidents determined which role relationships were important to them and to the success of the organization and cultivated those relationships carefully. They often protected those role relationships deemed critical to their own personal success or to the success of the organization (e.g., board members, legislators, key community
leaders). A considerable amount of informal influence was used to build these relationships.

Personal influence on positional variables was different for "maintainers" and "shapers," as illustrated in Figure 23. Maintainers were more involved in the internal operations of the college. They delegated fewer tasks and appeared to use more formal influence strategies (e.g., positional authority, organizational structure, standard operating procedures).

Shapers, on the other hand, were more future oriented, more opportunity seeking, and more involved in the external operations of the college. They were more active in shaping their positions and the role

![Figure 23: Relationships Between Positional and Personal Variables.](image-url)
relationships concomitant with their positions. They also spent more time using unobtrusive means to shape situational outcomes, and more indirect persuasion to influence the expectations of others.

A composite view of positional and personal variables is reflected in Figure 24. As indicated in the diagram, there is congruence between presidents categorized as "maintainers" and maintenance tasks. When maintainers were faced with increasing development type activities, job stress resulted. Over the years, many of the presidents have learned to reduce job stress by delegating operational responsibilities and engaging in recreational or avocational activities.

For those presidents who were considered "shapers" there was congruence with development tasks. It was these types of tasks that provided the challenge they

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance Tasks/Roles</th>
<th>Development Tasks/Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintainers</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapers</td>
<td>boredom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* x = congruence between personal and positional variables.

Figure 24: Personal Responses to Maintenance and Development Tasks and Roles.
sought. As the proportion of development tasks diminished to a point that the presidents were left with a predominance of maintenance tasks, boredom resulted. They had already delegated most of the operational tasks to subordinates. Thus, many of the presidents have sought new opportunities for the college that would increase their development tasks and make their jobs more challenging. It is important to assure that positional constraints do not preclude the president's ability to perform the job he is hired to do. Several of the presidents, particularly the newer ones, have negotiated contracts with their trustees for this very reason.

SECTION SUMMARY

Evidence was found to support Mintzberg's (1973) claim that there were interdependent relationships between the four sets of variables. While some of the documentation provided may have seemed redundant, it was included to demonstrate the strength of the interdependencies. Findings related to the dynamic relationships among all the variables considered in this study are presented in the following section.

Dynamic Relationships Among Variable Sets

The first three sections of this chapter have provided the basis for drawing a generalized composite
of the forces which shaped the presidents' jobs. The composite includes a discussion of the dynamic relationships among the environmental, positional, personal and situational variables, and is focused on three main themes: (1) situational determinance of the president's job; (2) environmental influences on the president's job; (3) personal influence on the president's job, and (4) patterns of congruence among the variables.

SITUATIONAL DETERMINANCE OF THE PRESIDENT'S JOB

It was determined from the data that situations were the focal point of the presidents' jobs. As discussed previously, situations were defined as "occasions for action," or stimuli that were antecedent to behavioral responses. Evidence was provided which suggested that situations had two broad dimensions: (1) the cultural dimension, and (2) the personal dimension. As illustrated in Figure 25, the cultural dimension was shaped primarily by environmental variables (organizational and contextual elements); the personal dimension was shaped by personal variables (background, personality, and behavioral elements). There was also an interrelationship between the environmental (particularly other actors) and personal variables, each attempting to influence the other.

Figure 25: Influence of Environmental and Personal Variables on Situational Variables and on Each Other.
There were close interdependencies between situational, environmental, and personal variables. Situational variables themselves were the contingencies which shaped organizational and contextual elements as well as personal traits and behaviors. Situations were the stimuli for paradoxical phenomena and also contributed to temporal changes in phenomena.

As occasions for action, situations were the building blocks for the presidents' positions, as indicated in Figure 26. The daily work activities of the chief executives were composed of multiple situations, some more dynamic than others. As such, the environmental variables shaped the cultural dimension of situations and also defined the expectations of others. In like manner, the personal variables shaped the personal dimension of situations, which comprised the presidents' expectations of self.

The multiple situations that composed the presidents' positions determined the nature and scope of responsibilities, role expectations, role relationships, skills and abilities needed for the job, and the way the presidents assigned priorities to tasks and allocated their time. Multiple and varied situations that the presidents encountered from day to day dictated multiple role expectations, relationships with a variety of actors or constituents, and multiple

Figure 26: Model of Interrelationships Among Environmental, Positional, Personal, and Situational Variables.
and varied responsibilities, requiring the presidents to work at an unrelenting pace. The evolution of situations over time also contributed to a concomitant evolution in the presidents' tasks and roles.

Presidents in this sample reported working an average of 60 hours per week. Since the number of work hours in a day or week were limited, the presidents had to make some choices about their responses to situations. Several options were mentioned, including the following:

- ignore the situation;
- respond selectively to those situations most critical;
- delegate responsibilities;
- procrastinate; and
- work more hours and respond to every situation.

Some of the presidents attempted to respond to most situations themselves and had experienced job stress as a result of time and task pressures. Some others had delegated most operational responsibilities and had experienced job stress as a result of boredom. Most of the presidents, however, had developed their jobs over time in such a way that they had achieved a balanced approach to their daily work activities.

In summary, it was determined that situations were the focal point of the presidents' jobs. Situations shaped and were shaped by environmental and personal variables, and when viewed in multiples, were the units upon which the presidents' positions were formed. The
way in which the presidents carried out their responsibilities were determined in part by the way they shaped their positions and the environment within which they worked.

ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES ON THE PRESIDENT'S JOB

Environmental demands were a significant force in shaping the jobs of public two-year college presidents in Ohio. Organizational and contextual factors determined the cultural dimension of situations and the behavioral expectations of others. They also influenced the way in which the presidents interpreted their jobs and carried out their responsibilities.

An illustration was presented in the previous chapter of a potentially acute situation which all the presidents faced in common (loss of subsidy due to state budget deficit). This was an environmentally imposed problem over which the presidents had no control. As indicated, however, the problem affected each college differently. In some colleges there were mechanisms in place (e.g., reserve accounts) to buffer the effects of the situation; in other colleges the effects of the problem were more severe.

This was just one example of environmental impact on the presidents' jobs. Presidential responses to environmental stimuli differed as illustrated by this example. Some presidents had anticipated the problem
and took steps to hedge against it, others did not. This indicated that some presidents were more reactive than proactive to environmental stimuli, a factor that is discussed in more detail in the following section.

PERSONAL INFLUENCE ON THE PRESIDENT'S JOB

The strongest single force that shaped the president's job was the president himself. For the most part, the presidents in this sample had the latitude, the power, and the discretion to shape their positions as well as the environments within which they worked. Some used their discretionary powers more fully than others.

At one extreme were the presidents who shaped their positions and the environment through the use of more formal means. They controlled situational outcomes through the use of structure and operational procedures. These presidents also used the power and authority of their positions to influence the actions of others and to respond to environmental demands. In most cases, these presidents were more often engaged in the management of organizational and contextual elements and were more often in a position of reacting to environmental pressures than influencing them. They focused more on internal operations than they did on building external relationships that would create future opportunities for the college. Thus, it could
be speculated that the jobs of these presidents were
shaped more by their personal responses to
environmental and situational elements.

At the other extreme were those presidents who
appeared to have the most influence on their jobs,
using a variety of strategies to shape their positions
and their environment. First, they formally defined
the parameters of their positions for themselves and
for others. Second, they used a variety of informal
influence strategies to help others both inside and
outside the organization understand their positions so
that there was congruence between the expectations of
others and expectations of self. Third, they selected
the staff to whom they delegated operational
responsibilities. These staff members were often
instrumental in enhancing the image of the president
and the college through their own capabilities and role
relationships.

The same presidents had considerable influence on
the environments within which they worked. They
determined the philosophy, goals, and objectives of
their organizations and assigned priorities and
responsibilities. They also monitored environmental
trends carefully so that they could take advantage of
opportunities and be able to detect problems before
they occurred. In addition, they worked very
diligently to cultivate good interpersonal relationships with persons both inside and outside the organization who were critical to their own success or the effectiveness of the college, particularly board members, legislators, key faculty, administrators, and community notables. They often played leadership roles in community organizations, and participated actively in the shaping of local, state, and national educational policies.

By maintaining considerable influence on their positions and their environment, these presidents had considerable control over situational variables. They often used strategies of persuasion on other actors involved in situations in order to shape situational outcomes. In addition, they often selected situational participants and "planted seeds" far in advance that would shape decisional outcomes. Thus, it was clear that these presidents had considerable influence over their jobs by shaping the positional, organizational, and contextual elements of their jobs.

In summary, it was determined that personal variables were the most instrumental force in shaping the presidents' jobs. Those presidents categorized as "shapers," had substantial influence over environmental, positional and situational variables. Those presidents categorized as "maintainers" had
considerable formal influence over their positions, but less influence over the environment within which they worked. Thus, they were less able to shape situational outcomes to their advantage.

PATTERNS OF CONGRUENCE AMONG THE VARIABLES

A composite profile of the thematic categories within the four types of variables used in this study indicated considerable congruence between the organizational system, presidential tasks/roles, types of situations encountered, and personal responses. As indicated in Table 12, presidents of single-hierarchy systems were more involved in maintenance tasks/roles, encountered more static situations, and functioned more as organizational maintainers than shapers. Conversely, presidents of multiple-hierarchy systems were engaged in work activities directed at organizational and contextual development, encountered more dynamic situations, and took a more active role in shaping their organizations and their positions.

Expanded-hierarchy systems and the presidents who headed them did not exhibit behaviors which could be categorized as discretely as the other two. Paradoxical phenomena appeared to be more operational with this group than the other two, although they were present in all three groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Variables:</th>
<th>Expanded Hierarchy</th>
<th>Multiple Hierarchy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple structure</td>
<td>Simple structure</td>
<td>Complex structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top-down governance</td>
<td>Participative govern-</td>
<td>Political govern-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous population</td>
<td>Heterogeneous popu-</td>
<td>Heterogeneous popu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Mid-sized</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical and horizontal communication</td>
<td>Vertical and horizontal communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diverse goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positional Variables:</th>
<th>Maintenance Tasks/Goals</th>
<th>Development Tasks/Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasks:</td>
<td>controlling, organizing,</td>
<td>Conceptualizing, plan-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>staffing, budgeting,</td>
<td>ning, negotiating,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>directing, managing</td>
<td>developing, leading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles:</td>
<td>manager, interpreter,</td>
<td>manager, negotiator,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disseminator, mediator,</td>
<td>delegator, conceptuali-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>controller</td>
<td>zer, planner, leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills/Abilities:</td>
<td>technical, human relations</td>
<td>technical, human rela-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tions, conceptual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Variables:</th>
<th>Maintainers</th>
<th>Shapers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task oriented</td>
<td>People-oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-oriented</td>
<td>Opportunity-oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally focused</td>
<td>Externally focused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founding president</td>
<td>Previous 2-year college experience (administrative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio native</td>
<td>Administrative training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited previous administrative experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on present</td>
<td>Had worked outside Ohio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positional power</td>
<td>Focus on future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment shaped person</td>
<td>Personal power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person shaped environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situational Variables:</th>
<th>Static</th>
<th>Dynamic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>simple, routine, clearly defined, homogeneous actors, short-range</td>
<td>complex, political, ambiguous, heterogeneous actors, long-range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When all of the presidents in this sample were plotted according to their individual profiles, the bell diagram in Figure 27 resulted. The bell diagram represented by the solid line indicates the composite view of the presidents' interpretations of their jobs at the time of the interviews. The diagonal and vertical broken lines simply indicate that these are not rigid classifications. Due to the situational and paradoxical nature of the presidents' jobs, more

*TC = technical colleges.
**CC = community colleges.

Figure 27: Composite Profile of the Presidents' Jobs.
discrete classification was not possible. The bell diagram represented by the broken line was constructed from the presidents' descriptions of their jobs during their formative years as heads of their institutions. The difference between the two bell diagrams shows how their jobs have evolved over time.

Contrary to Cohen and March's (1974) claim that presidents were deluding themselves if they thought they had significant influence on their organizations, it was found that presidential impact differed. In single-hierarchy systems, for example, the president had significant control and influence over organizational maintenance. Because these presidents delegated very few operational responsibilities, it was speculated that the impact of the presidents was significant. As pointed out earlier, however, these presidents engaged themselves in fewer development activities, so it could be speculated that they had less impact on the progressive development of their organizations. It could be said that these colleges evolved more in response to environmental influence—sometimes in spite of the presidents.

In contrast, the presidents in multiple hierarchy systems had significant influence in shaping the future of their organizations. Their own personal influence
was instrumental in setting the tone for the college and in establishing the college's image in the community. Since these presidents were not as actively involved in the daily internal operations of their colleges, having delegated these responsibilities to subordinates, it could be speculated that maintenance of the college occurred with or without the president. This was confirmed by the presidents who indicated they could be away from their colleges two or three days a week and trust that everything was functioning smoothly.

In summary, it was determined that considerable congruence existed in the type of environmental system, the tasks and responsibilities of the president, the type of situations he encountered, and the way in which he carried out his job. It was also determined that the presidents impacted their organizations in different ways.

SECTION SUMMARY

A composite view of the forces which shaped the presidents' jobs was described, including a discussion of the dynamic relationships among the environmental, positional, personal, and situational variables. Interrelationships among the variables were also presented. Indications were from the data that the
presidents' positions were situationally determined. Situations, in turn, were shaped by environmental and personal variables. The personal variables, however, were the most dynamic force in shaping the presidents' job.

Chapter Summary

The variance in the nature of the work of chief executives was speculated by Mintzberg (1973) to be a result of the interrelationships among environmental, positional, personal, and situational variables. These interdependencies were presented. Patterns emerged from the individual presidential profiles which indicated (1) thematic categories could be derived from the data, (2) there were paradoxes which inhibited more discrete classifications, and (3) there were temporal changes in the variables. It was determined that situational variables were the focal point of the presidents' jobs, but the most significant finding was the extent to which the personal variables shaped the presidents' positions.
A number of conclusions have been made and implications drawn from the findings. These are reported in Chapter VI.
Chapter VI

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Some are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrown upon them.

—Shakespeare, Twelfth Night

The purpose of this study was to gain a greater understanding of the nature and scope of high-level leadership in public organizations by focusing on the position of chief executive officer of public two-year colleges. The aim of the inquiry was to determine the dynamics of the chief executive's job, by exploring the antecedents to executive behavior, or those factors which shape the nature and direction of the executive's job. The research was guided by three broad questions:

(1) What are the elements of the chief executive's job?

(2) What are the factors that shape the chief executive's job?

(3) How do these factors interrelate?

The elements of the chief executive's job were identified through a process of successive refinement using a combination of techniques which were described in Chapter III. Data were collected through informal observation, written documents, and a two-hour semi-formal interview with 21 of the 24 public two-year
college presidents in Ohio. The data were analyzed to determine (1) if there was evidence to support job elements identified in the literature, and (2) how these elements were interrelated. The findings were reported in the aggregate in Chapters IV and V. What follows are general conclusions, implications, and recommendations based on those research findings.

Conclusions

Several conclusions were drawn from the findings on the dynamics of the job of public two-year college presidents in Ohio. They are reported in the following section.

DYNAMICS OF THE JOB OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS IN OHIO

Three general conclusions were drawn from the findings regarding the dynamics of the job. First, there was evidence which supported the inclusion of variables related to the environment, the position, the person, and the situation as elements of the president's job. Second, these elements were found to be interdependent. Finally, the dynamics within, between, and among the elements were the source of variance among the college presidents, their institutions, and their jobs. More explicit conclusions were drawn regarding (1) nature and scope of the
presidency, (2) forces that shaped the presidency, and (3) images of leadership.

**Nature and Scope of the Presidency**

It was concluded that the formal responsibilities of public two-year college presidents in Ohio were more similar than different. Additional conclusions regarding the nature and scope of the presidency are enumerated as follows:

1. Formal position descriptions provided considerable latitude in the use of discretionary power and authority.

2. Presidential responsibilities were broad in scope and complex in nature.

3. Presidential tasks were demanding in regard to time and energy.

4. Presidents did not have "average" days, but they did have daily and weekly routines and activities which occurred on a cyclical basis.

5. Presidential responsibilities dictated a need for a variety of technical, human relations, and conceptual skills.

6. The presidency was multi-role in character as a result of varied tasks, role expectations, and role relationships.

7. The most critical role relationships involved the president and members of the college board of trustees.

8. Complexities, ambiguities, and constraints of the presidency were considered by the presidents as "givens."

9. The presidency was paradoxical in nature, i.e., conflicting demands required paradoxical behavior.
10. The presidency has changed over time in both nature and scope.

11. The presidency was shaped by environmental, personal, and situational variables in dynamic interaction.

These conclusions paralleled many of the findings of Mintzberg (1973). In addition, evidence was provided that supported Mintzberg's claim that the variations among the executive's jobs could be attributed to interdependencies among the forces that shaped their jobs. These interdependencies are discussed more fully in the next section.

Forces That Shaped the Presidency

Environmental, positional, personal, and situational variables, in dynamic interaction, shaped the presidents' jobs. It was concluded from the findings that there were significant interrelationships between and among the variables. First, the presidents' jobs were composed of multiple situations, which were in turn shaped by environmental and personal variables. Second, environmental and personal variables not only shaped situations, but also shaped each other and the positional variables.

Situational Determinance of the Presidency. Situations were found to be the point of convergence of the forces which shaped the presidents' jobs. The
evidence supported Getzels and Guba (1957) claim that there were cultural (nomothetic) and personal (idiographic) dimensions to situations. The cultural dimension was shaped by environmental variables; the personal dimension was shaped by personal variables. Additional conclusions regarding situations follow:

1. Situations provided the building blocks of the president's position, each with an cultural and a personal dimension.

2. The cultural dimension of situations shaped the expectations of others; the personal dimension shaped the president's expectation of self.

3. Situations varied in complexity and intensity.

4. Most presidents reacted more intuitively than calculatively to situations.

5. Presidents with longer tenure found fewer situations which they had not encountered before.

6. Situations determined the paradoxical nature of the presidency and produced incremental changes in the presidency over time.

Situations, themselves, were shaped by environmental and personal variables. Conclusions regarding each of these forces on the presidency follow.

Environmental Influences on the Presidency. It was concluded that environmental influences were a significant force in shaping the jobs of two-year college presidents. Environmental demands and constraints influenced situations and consequently, the
way in which presidents responded to situations.

Additional conclusions were the following:

1. There were many environmentally imposed constraints (e.g., economic recession, compliance regulations) over which the presidents had little or no control.

2. In terms of organizational characteristics, the colleges were similar in depth (layers of the hierarchy), but varied in breadth (lateral expansion) of structure. Organizational mission and goal statements were similar within the types of institutions although technical college goals were not as broad as community college goals because of statutorial limitations.

3. Similar environmental characteristics placed similar demands on the presidents. Small, rural colleges, for example, were similar in organizational and contextual characteristics; large, urban institutions were very much like one another.

4. In recent years, there has been greater participation by constituents outside the college, as well as increased participation by those inside, in the institutional planning and decision-making processes.

5. There has been increased stability in organizational and environmental impact on the president's job, especially for those presidents who founded their colleges.

6. There has been increased use of mechanized information and communication systems, which have enhanced the capacity of the college to respond to environmental demands.

7. Administrative (line and staff) experts have been added to whom the president could delegate operational responsibilities.

The congruence between organizational and contextual elements and the similarity of demands made upon the
presidency were an affirmation of similar claims made by Stoke in 1959.

While there were a number of environmental constraints over which these presidents had little or no control, they were not as extensive nor as debilitating as Mundt (1978) and Glenny (1979) claimed. Neither were environmental demands and constraints the major determinant of presidential power and authority as claimed by Cohen and March (1974), Mayhew (1971), and Mayhew and Glenn (1975). This point is illuminated more fully in the following section.

**Personal Influences on the Presidency.** One inescapable conclusion was the extent to which the presidents have shaped their jobs and the environment within which they work. Regardless of their administrative styles, the presidents established a variety of formal and informal means to control and influence environmental, positional, and situational elements that impacted upon them. Other conclusions about the presidents follow:

1. The presidents had a broad range of knowledge, skills, abilities, and administrative styles they could draw upon for particular situations.

2. The ability to shape the behavior of others through unobtrusive means hinged on the president's skill in interpersonal relations, particularly his skill at being able to sense in advance how another person would behave.
Presidents who were new to their organizations were involved in rebuilding the image of their colleges, both internally and externally. This involved (1) restructuring their organizations and updating organizational systems; (2) establishing a personal basis for trust, loyalty, and credibility in their colleges and in their communities; and (3) building external relationships to pave the way for future planning.

Presidents who had headed their institutions for many years knew their people well and had established behavioral patterns over the years which others came to know and expect.

Those presidents who made the most use of informal influence strategies had firm convictions about the direction in which their colleges should be shaped.

Presidents who had considerable influence on the environment within which they worked had a greater capacity to shape situational outcomes. Conversely, those presidents who had less influence on their environments were less able to shape situational outcomes.

New presidents had more direct experience in other community colleges outside the state of Ohio. They were better prepared educationally and experientially than many of the tenured presidents were when they initially became presidents.

The presidents had learned to delegate operational responsibilities to subordinates, thus, freeing some time for planning, cultivating external relationships, and reading.

The presidents had learned to manage job stress by delegating tasks, and by developing outside interests which diverted their attention away from nagging work problems.

The presidents had achieved a sense of identity and culture through the support system provided by their participation in the activities of the Ohio Technical and
Community College Association. This association provided socialization for new members, a forum for exchange of ideas and information, a support group that served as a check against norms, and a coalitional opportunity to affect state policy and to solve common problems.

Some of these characteristics (e.g., multiple styles, dynamic personal traits) were cited by Hollander (1978) as characteristics of executive leadership. The conclusions also confirmed that in many organizations, the chief executive has been central to shaping environmental outcomes (Stoke, 1959; Cohen and Roueche, 1969; Hesburgh, 1971; Millett, 1976; Burke, 1977). At the same time, these conclusions tended to refute the claim made by Cohen and March (1974) that presidents have not been instrumental in shaping organizational outcomes.

Patterns of Variance. Consistent patterns of variance between technical and community college presidents, between new and tenured presidents, and between presidents of rural and urban institutions, did not emerge from the composite profiles of the individuals. It was only when the thematic categories within variable sets were compared that consistent patterns of variance emerged. Thus, the following conclusions were derived:
1. There was congruence among the presidents in terms of thematic categories, indicating consistency between environmental, positional, personal and situational variables. Comparison on the basis of single variables (e.g., age, administrative style, type of college, stage of organizational development) did not provide for discrete classifications.

2. Single-hierarchy systems were found within relatively small, environmentally stable organizations. Presidential tasks were more maintenance-oriented, and the president was engaged in more management activities, using formal strategies of control and influence.

3. Multiple-hierarchy systems were found within larger, more dynamic institutions, with a more complex and demanding environment. Presidential tasks were more development oriented, and the presidents were engaged in more leadership activities, using informal strategies of control and influence.

4. Expanded-hierarchy systems were the most paradoxical, possessing characteristics of the other two systems. These were the organizations which were experiencing the most change.

5. New presidents, who were considered to be more development than maintenance oriented, were in the process of rebuilding the organizational image from a single-hierarchy system to an expanded-hierarchy system.

Choran's (1969) distinctions between chief executives of small and large companies seemed to apply to these findings. In like manner the distinctions between business-type organizations and client-centered organizations made by Dubin and Spray (1964), Katz and Kahn (1966), and Mintzberg (1973) were also supported by these findings. This suggests that organizational
and contextual elements in combination with personal elements, were more significant factors in the determination of patterns of variance than a single variable. These interdependencies were also instrumental in determining the images of leadership.

Images of Executive Leadership

The findings led to some conclusions about the distinctions between management and leadership and about the general image of executive leadership in two-year colleges. It was concluded, for example, that the situational nature of the presidency required the use of both management and leadership skills and behaviors. Yet, it was found that some presidents who claimed to be leaders actually performed more maintenance tasks and exhibited more management behaviors. The reverse was also true. Several conclusions have been drawn regarding these factors:

1. All presidents in this study were found to be positional leaders by virtue of the fact that legal authority had been vested in the presidents by their trustees. The formally stated parameters of presidential power and authority were detailed in the presidents' written position descriptions.

2. Variance in leadership style among the presidents was related to their personal use of power and influence. "Maintainers," for example, used more formal means of control and influence (e.g., rewards, coercion, constraints, and legitimate power). They did not move far beyond the powers vested in
their legitimate authority. "Shapers," on the other hand, used more informal means of influence (e.g., referent and expert power, inducements, and persuasion).

3. Executive leadership was found to be situationally determined. Role relationships within situational settings shaped the type and amount of power and influence used by the president. In situations involving president-subordinate role relationships, formal or informal influence strategies could be used. In contrast, situations involving president-superordinate role relationships involved more informal influence strategies because the superordinate had more potential power than the president. It was possible, however, for the president to have more referent or expert power than the superordinate, as was the case for many president-board member relationships. In situations involving president-peer relationships, where each one's legal authority might be equal or even unimportant, influence would be based on each person's referent or expert power, unless one possessed something the other needed. In this case, one might have inducements which could be used as collateral for future influence attempts, while the other used indirect persuasion to influence situational outcomes.

4. Executive leadership was found to be multi-dimensional in nature. Organizational leadership varied with organizational and contextual elements. Small organizations with stable environments, for example, did not necessitate the use of informal influence strategies. In contrast, large, complex organizations required the use of both formal and informal influence strategies.

5. Executive leadership was found to be dynamic in nature. Leadership requirements have changed over time. The more political the colleges have become, the greater has been the necessity for presidents to use informal influence strategies.
6. Executive leadership was found to be corporate in nature. In very few instances were organizational control and influence vested in only one individual. In most cases, executive leadership was a team responsibility as a result of increased delegation of operational tasks and the use of more participative decisional strategies.

The presidents identified in this study as "maintainers" equated more closely with the executives in Mintzberg's (1973) study of the nature of managerial work, and the managers described by Zaleznik (1977). In contrast, the "shapers," particularly those in multiple-hierarchy organizations, were more similar to the leaders described by Zaleznik (1977), Gibb (1969), and Steiglitz (1969). Two-year college presidents, as a collectivity, did not fit exclusively into one category or another. Thus, as leaders of public organizations, some resembled chief executives of business and industrial enterprises, others resembled chief executives of political organizations.

**Section Summary**

A variety of conclusions were drawn from this exploratory study of the dynamics of the job of public two-year college presidents in Ohio. The findings of other studies related to two-year college presidents and their institutions were integrated throughout the findings and conclusions as a means of cross-checking
the generalizability and reliability of information provided by the presidents in this sample. It was found that the findings of this study and those drawn from the literature were mutually reinforcing. Thus, presidential images reflected in the literature on two-year college presidents appeared to be accurate for the majority of those included in this study. In some cases, however, the images matched those of executives in business organizations, political organizations, four-year colleges and universities, and public school systems.

Conclusions drawn from this study have a number of implications for practitioners and those interested in further research on high-level leadership.

Implications

The research findings have both practical and theoretical implications.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Several implications have significance for the presidents as practitioners. Briefly stated, they are:

1. The corporate nature of executive leadership implies that control and influence are not always centered in the president, but may be the result of a team effort. Thus, presidents should carefully assess their own strengths and weaknesses and those of their subordinates to determine their collective capacity for management and leadership.
2. The complex, multi-role nature of the presidency implies that the president needs a repertoire of cognitive and affective knowledge, skills and abilities upon which to draw.

3. Environmental trends indicate that presidents will need to shape new policies, new markets, and new sources of fiscal support. Presidents will need to develop their human relations skills and informal influence strategies because they will have to interact more with persons external to the organization over whom they have little formal control.

4. The variance of leadership requirements among organizations implies that there should be a match between environmental, positional, and personal characteristics. Incongruence among these characteristics may lead to personal or organizational ineffectiveness. In order for the best match to occur, trustees should assess organizational and contextual strengths and weaknesses, determine problem areas and potential for growth, and then search for a presidential candidate who best matches (in terms of personal abilities and style) the development needs of the organization. In like manner, presidential candidates should determine in advance potential environmental and positional constraints that would inhibit their ability to fulfill the responsibilities of their jobs.

5. The president's intuitive responses to situations indicated that previous work experience is an important factor in presidential capacity to perform effectively.

6. Job stress and boredom being experienced by some presidents implies that organizations may outgrow their presidents and vice versa. In such cases, the presidents should engage in self-development activities. If the problem persists, the president should relocate.
7. On the personal side, job stress and boredom indicates a need for presidents to cultivate interests and activities outside the work environment that would lessen the dependence on work for their personal satisfaction.

8. Increased delegation of operational responsibilities to subordinates implied that much of the job stress prevalent in the presidency may have been transferred to the second level of the organization.

In summary, it was apparent that the positional designation of "president" or "chief executive officer" carried considerable power, authority, and potential influence. Those presidents who exercised the rights and responsibilities of their office to the fullest were better able to shape their jobs and the environment within which they worked. Those who did not use power and influence effectively were more vulnerable to environmentally imposed constraints. This suggested that where power and influence were not effectively used by the president, power and influence would be used effectively against him.

THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

There were several implications for further research on high-level leadership:

1. The fragmented nature of the literature on college presidents and other chief executive officers implied a need to integrate research findings more systematically.

2. The interdependencies found among the variables in this study implied a necessity
to investigate dynamic as well as static dimensions of high-level leadership and related phenomena.

3. The complexities involved in studying dynamic phenomena such as high-level leadership implied a need to use multi-dimensional, multi-method approaches to probe beyond the obvious surface level indicators.

4. Increased involvement of others in the leadership process implied that the study of high-level leadership should include those whom the executive perceives to be included in the executive elite (e.g., those most involved in the executive leadership process).

Barnard (1938) pointed out that the executive process is "a matter of art rather than science, and is aesthetic rather than logical" (p. 235). The evidence provided here did not fully support this thesis. The executive process is both an art and a science. Too often, however, researchers have attempted to quantify the aesthetic and qualify the logical. What is needed most is a research strategy, perhaps as complex as the phenomenon itself, that takes into account both aspects of the phenomenon.

SECTION SUMMARY

The practical and theoretical implications of this study were both obvious and obscure. The more obvious have been reported in this section; the more obscure will surface as more evidence is gathered and reported by researchers in the future. What follow are some
recommendations for the practice of high-level leadership as well as some recommendations for further research.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, a number of recommendations can be made. These include suggestions for the practitioner, the aspiring practitioner, and the researcher.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICE

For the practitioner, the following recommendations are made:

1. Presidents need to take an offensive posture with regard to organizational and contextual constraints, playing a more proactive role in shaping their environment.

2. Presidents should move beyond a more parochial concern for formal control and authority and strengthen their skills at informal influence.

3. Presidents need to be more creative in seeking opportunities for their organizations by delegating more operational responsibilities and concentrating their efforts on development activities.

4. Presidents need to select their administrative team members carefully and use them effectively in the management and leadership of the organization.

5. Presidents need to engage continually in self-development activities and encourage others to do the same.

For those aspiring to become two-year college presidents, the following recommendations are made:
1. Assess personal values carefully and make a firm commitment to a personal philosophy about education and about leadership.

2. Map out a career path which includes educational and experiential development opportunities best suited for a leadership role.

3. Develop good human relations skills and an ability to conceptualize and resolve complex problems.

4. Become acutely aware of the interdependencies among personal and environmental elements involved in any job in the career path.

5. Assess in advance the potential organizational and environmental constraints that might inhibit job performance in the presidency.

6. Negotiate a contract with the trustees that reduces uncertainties on the part of both parties regarding expectations.

7. Keep the job in perspective. Enjoy the challenges and learn from defeats.

These recommendations included ways in which presidents and those who aspire to be presidents could increase their effectiveness. What follow are recommendations for further research on high-level leadership.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Based on the perceptions of 21 two-year college presidents in Ohio, this study has contributed to a general understanding of the dynamics of a chief executive's job. There is a need to conduct further
research to test a variety of propositions which have emerged. The following are some recommendations:

1. Use situations as a unit of analysis and map out interpersonal relationships, the use of power and influence, and the interrelationships between environmental and personal variables. This would represent a more quantifiable approach to determining the dynamics of the chief executive's job.

2. Conduct an in-depth study (case studies, perhaps) on the president to determine the interrelationships among background, personality, and behavioral characteristics to understand more fully how chief executives have achieved a wide range of skills, abilities, and styles. Personality inventories used in conjunction with unobtrusive data, personal observations and interviews would provide a well-rounded approach to the study of presidents as individuals.

3. Focus on the stages of development of the organization and stages of development of the president. Are they parallel? How do presidents adapt to changing skill and behavioral requirements? Do presidents influence the stages of development of the organization, or does the organization shape the development of the president?

4. Study presidential role relationships (leader/leader, leader/superordinate, leader/subordinate, leader/other), both formal and informal, to determine if the president behaves differently in each of these relationships. If so, how does the behavior differ?

5. Examine the way in which chief executives establish leadership images. How do subordinates contribute to image building? Is there a difference between image building strategies directed to the internal organization and those directed to the external environment? Is there a match between others' perceptions of the leadership
image of the president and the overall image of the college? If so, is there physical evidence (e.g., visible to an outside observer) that would support that claim?

6. Examine the process of executive leadership. Who is involved and how? Is job stress more prevalent for executive cabinet members as a result of team leadership? Are executive cabinet members "team players"? What are the dynamics of team leadership.

The possibilities for additional research on high-level leadership are inhibited only by one's imagination. An important point to make, however, is that whatever further research is conducted, every attempt should be made to integrate that which is already known with that which is newly discovered.

SECTION SUMMARY

In theory and in practice, high level leadership is not a well developed concept. Although this in-depth approach has produced a rich data source for further analysis and development of the concept of high-level leadership, it is only through collaborative research involving those who practice high-level leadership, that a better understanding of the phenomenon can be gained. The collaborative process, in turn, provides a learning experience for both practitioners and researchers.
Chapter Summary

A variety of conclusions, implications, and recommendations have been generated regarding the dynamics of the job of public two-year college presidents in Ohio. While a number of findings and conclusions support existing literature on two-year college presidents, they have expanded existing knowledge by focusing on the interdependencies within, between, and among environmental, positional, personal, and situational variables. The research also provided an exploratory base from which hypotheses can be generated and further research conducted. Most importantly, however, the research strategy used provided an opportunity for the presidents themselves to share their knowledge, their perceptions, and their feelings with a much broader audience, and in the process to contribute to a better understanding of the dynamics of their jobs.
Dear

As you are probably aware, I have been working for several months now on an exploratory study of the "dynamics of the job" of two-year college presidents in Ohio. This research (my doctoral dissertation) is part of a broader inquiry into high-level leadership in public organizations being conducted at the Mershon Center. It is in no way connected to my responsibilities at the Ohio Board of Regents.

The first phase of the research included observation of Ohio Technical and Community College Association meetings to learn of some of the complexities of the president's job. The second phase involved participation by many of the OTCCA members in determining the scope and nature of the information needed to accurately reflect the work activities of college presidents. I am grateful for the confidence placed in me by OTCCA members shown by their willingness to let me attend meetings, and by their participation in the study.

The data collection phase of the research is now underway and I would like to schedule an interview with you, at your campus. It is anticipated that the interview will take approximately two hours. I will contact your secretary to schedule a time convenient to you.

With your permission, I would like to tape-record the interview session. The interview will be identified only by a code number, and once I have transcribed the tapes, they will be destroyed. Every precaution will be taken to protect your anonymity.

I look forward to meeting with you soon.

Sincerely,

Ann H. Pruitt
Mershon Associate

Research and Education in National Security and Policy Sciences
APPENDIX B
The purpose of this interview is to explore the dynamics of the job of two-year college presidents in Ohio. I want to learn from you the forces which shape what you do. The questions I will ask center around four sets of variables—characteristics of the context in which the job is performed, characteristics of the job itself, characteristics of the person performing the job, and characteristics of a specific situation you have encountered in recent weeks. The information you provide will be used in aggregate form with anonymity protected.

(approx. 30 minutes)

When did you become president of ___________________?

When was the college founded?

Briefly describe the college when you came on board.
(probe: size, goals/objectives, structure, predecessor's style, conflicts, problems, etc.)

Briefly describe your college today.
(probe: size of faculty—full-time/part-time
# of students—headcount/FTE
# divisions/departments
size of budget—operations/capital
flow of communication]
flow of authority . ] type of structure
flow of control ]
nature of faculty—transfer/tech., conflicts?
technology—mechanized systems?
environment—stable/turbulent, few/many
demands, etc.?
major problems/opportunities

Were changes consciously structured, or did they just evolve? Explain.

* * *

(approx. 60 minutes)

Do you have a formal job description? A signed contract?
What do you consider your primary responsibilities as president?

probe: instructional leadership
institutional management
institutional planning
mediating conflict
negotiating for organization
figurehead - ceremonial duties
allocating resources
disseminating information (internal & external)
collecting information for organization
monitoring information
spokesman for organization to outside
change agent
other?

Do the board's expectations differ from this? If so, how?

Do the faculty's expectations differ from this? If so, how?

Describe what you do on an average day.

probe: initiating telephone calls
answering telephone calls
initiating correspondence
answering correspondence
unscheduled meetings
scheduled meetings
reading reports
preparing reports
touring (walking halls, visiting offices)

Approximately how many hours/week do you spend on work related activities?

What major tasks would you include in a description of what you do? Which ones are delegated to someone else?

What aspects of your job do you believe cannot be delegated and must be reserved for you as chief executive?

What are the factors or bases that determine what you delegate to others?

Which tasks do you particularly like to do? Which do you dislike? Why?
What proportion of your time is spend on campus? Off campus? in scheduled meetings? Planning? Problem-solving?

On the average, do you interact more with people inside or outside your college?

How would you characterize your relationship with your Board? Who prepares the Board agenda? Who orients the board? Who takes the lead in policy development? (if conflict relationship, how is it managed?)

How would you characterize your relationship with your faculty? (if conflict relationship, how is it managed?)

What are the major ambiguities associated with your job? Explain.

How would you describe the complexities of your job?

What are the major organizational or environmental constraints (obstructions) on your ability to do your job? How do you manage them?

probe: political
legal (laws)
legislative (rules & regulations)
financial
relations with board
relations with faculty
relations with community groups/individuals
Board of Regents
state agencies (OBM, SDVE, Public Works, DECD, etc.)
accreditation agencies
lack of information
lack of authority
mission too broad
ambiguous goals

What constituents (groups or individuals) have major influence (positive or negative) on how you carry out your job? How are outside pressures managed?

probe: students
parents of students
prospective students
alumni
faculty
immediate administrative staff
deans
department chairpersons
clerical/support staff
legal counsel
foundation representatives
community leaders
state legislators
city mayor
city council members
board of trustees members
other college presidents
trade union officials
community special interest groups
community social groups/clubs
members of the media
federal grant officers
federal agency representatives
state agency representatives
state governor
faculty senate representatives
faculty union representatives
other?

What kind of "sensing" technique do you use to determine trouble spots or monitor what is going on? Explain.

probe: positions of persons used in informal system

What are the major skills required to carry out your job?

probe: cognitive - e.g., technical skills
affective - e.g., sensing, creativity,
risk-taking, etc.

Do you feel you have enough autonomy, authority, power to carry out your responsibilities?

How would you characterize your administrative style?

Do you practice "team management"? If so, who is on the team? What are their primary responsibilities?

By what criteria is your performance as chief executive officer evaluated? By whom are you evaluated? (formal or informal process?)

What are the personal stresses associated with your job? How do you deal with them?

What are the personal satisfactions associated with your job?

What issues/challenges will you likely face in the next few years?
What leadership skills do you think will be required to meet these challenges?

What do you do to enhance your skills or knowledge in terms of personal/professional development?

Where will you go from here?

* * *

(30 minutes)

Why did you aspire to become a college president?

What factors led you to where you are today?
  probe: basic philosophy, family influence, personal needs, role models (mentors), education, experience, administrative principles

What criteria did the board use to select you?

What criteria did you use to select the college?

What skills/abilities do you think you brought to the job?

Were these the result of education? Experience? Explain. (probe for quality of preparation)

How would you characterize your personality? Explain.
  probe: temperament, values, beliefs

Is there a difference in the private and public images you try to project? Explain.

How do you maintain your public image?

* * *

(if time allows, proceed to the following questions)

I would like to change the course of our discussion a little by taking a cross-sectional view of the things we have been talking about and explore a specific situation that has occurred in recent weeks.

On January 14, in your meeting with Chancellor Moulton, he announced that Mr. Collier (State Office of Budget & Management) was about to make a public statement regarding the state's projected $1 billion deficit, resulting in a significant cut in educational subsidies.
What was your initial reaction?

What was your first action? (probe: whom called, what instructions were given, etc.)

Describe what you have done subsequently. (probe: meetings held, who involved, information needed/used, process used for problem-solving, decision-making, etc.)

What impact has this situation had on other plans, activities you had previously scheduled?

What other activities or problems were going on at the same time?

What impact has this situation had on the way you carry our your responsibilities?

How do you strategize for large-scale problems such as this?

★  ★  ★

This concludes the interview. Thank you very much for your valuable assistance. You will receive a summary report of the findings at the conclusion of the study.

If possible, I would like to have copies of: college catalog, your resume, job description, organizational/operational chart or plan for the college.
INTERVIEWER PERCEPTIONS

Setting of Interview:

Physical Traits of Subject:

Attitude toward Researcher/Interview:

Quality of Interview:

Need further information?

Other Comments:

Time in: Time out: Total:
TABLE 13
SAMPLE OF GRID USED IN DATA ANALYSIS

<p>| Variable Set: Environment | Technical Colleges | | Community Colleges |
|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
|                           | Case 1             | Case 2          | Case 10          | Case 21          |
|                           |                    |                 |                 |
| Size                      |                    |                 |                 |
| History                   |                    |                 |                 |
| Maturity                  |                    |                 |                 |
| Chartered? (Age)          |                    |                 |                 |
| Type                      |                    |                 |                 |
| College Image             |                    |                 |                 |
| Social Environment        |                    |                 |                 |
| Political Environ.        |                    |                 |                 |
| Economic Environ.         |                    |                 |                 |
| Service Area              |                    |                 |                 |
| Nat/Nat Industry          |                    |                 |                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Set:</th>
<th>Technical Colleges</th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment (continued)</td>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>Case 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population to College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission/Goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Set</td>
<td>Technical Colleges</td>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>Case 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When hired?</td>
<td>Contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks Delegated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours/week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Set</td>
<td>Technical Colleges</td>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stressors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of the Future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing Technique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader/Manager?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case 1 | Case 2 | Case 20 | Case 21
TABLE 13—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Set</th>
<th>Technical Colleges</th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>Case 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Case 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values/Beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills/Abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbies/Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs/Aimications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperament</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Set</td>
<td>Technical Colleges</td>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person (continued)</td>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>Case 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 13—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Set:</th>
<th>Technical Colleges</th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>Case 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem/Issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Situation $1$:**
- Problem/Issue
- Actors
- Timing
- Setting
- Impact

**Situation $2$:**
- Problem/Issue
- Actors
- Timing
- Setting
- Impact

**Situation $3$:**
- Problem/Issue
- Actors
- Timing
- Setting
- Impact

**Situation $4$:**
- Problem/Issue
- Actors
- Timing
- Setting
- Impact

**Case 20**

**Case 21**
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