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ABSTRACT

AN EXAMINATION OF THE LEADERSHIP OF ADMINISTRATORS IN HIGHER EDUCATION AS REPRESENTED IN THE AMERICAN ACADEMIC NOVEL FROM 1950 TO 1990

by

Laura Taylor Barnett

The purpose of this study was to examine the academic leadership as portrayed in the American academic novel from 1950 to 1990. Leadership positions from higher education (president, vice-president, dean, and chairperson) were examined in this analysis of 40 academic fiction novels.

The leader behavior of the selected characters was classified, using the following categories: autocratic (telling), democratic (selling), participative (participating), delegative (delegating), situational (varying) and "other" (unclassifiable due to lack of information or criteria variance).

The finding was that the majority of academic leaders, in the novels studied, behaved using an autocratic (telling) leadership behavior. Also, the majority of the selected novels were written from the viewpoint of a professor; however, the autocratic image of the administrators was considered accurate from the professorcharacter's point of view.

The results of this study should prove useful to educational institutions in deciding the usefulness, choice, planning, and implementation of leadership training for academic administrators. The introduction of leadership methods in education would be warranted to effect the future leadership performance of educators and, eventually, improve the leadership image of academic administrators.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Throughout history most scholars have been aware that leadership was crucial to the effectiveness of any endeavor. One of the earliest sources for effective leadership examples in western literature was the book of Exodus. When Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt, he selected men and women with special leadership behaviors to keep the people organized and to interpret the law (Exodus 17:13-26). Comparable examples of leadership activity have been found throughout the literature of every civilization. For example, the Chinese classics included leadership advice to the country's rulers, and Homer's Iliad contained characters with leadership types, such as Achilles (Bass, 1981), who had the staying power to solve problems as each new difficulty was presented in the epic. Also, western leadership theory could be observed through various Renaissance writings, including Machiavelli's The Prince (Bass, 1981, p. 5).

In the past few decades many leadership studies have been completed, examining most aspects of American life. The leaders in academic fiction were generally overlooked in leadership studies. This circumstance offered a relatively untapped avenue of observation of the academic leader in American fiction published during the past several decades.
There were over 400 novels concerning academia (VanderMeer, 1982), with the major characters emerging as educational leaders in perhaps one-third of the offering. The criteria for selection of the 40 academic novels in this study were that each novel be one "in which higher education is treated with seriousness and the main characters are students and professors" (Lyons, 1962, p. xvii), or academic administrators.

**Leadership and Higher Education**

In general, leadership in higher education has been structured somewhat like leadership in the United States, in that hierarchy and leadership positions were easily recognized. In America, the most easily recognized, and the most visible leaders were members of Congress and Presidents. These political leaders were in great supply and had the highest profile because of their daily exposure to the aspect of world affairs and their access to the mass media, due to political competition (Emery & Smythe, 1980, p. 80). During the past 40 years, the leaders of higher education were also easily identified, but not so easily observed.

Leadership of the government and leadership in higher education have shared mutual interests and concerns throughout our national history. Academic leaders traditionally have conferred with political leaders in order
to satisfy the public need for professional training, even though the public desire to support higher education has fluctuated over the years. For instance, in the early years of the republic there was evidence that political leaders and educational leaders were generally identical. For example George Washington, James Madison, Thomas Jefferson and the two Adams proposed the establishment of a national university (Veysey, 1965). This idea received no support from Congress and any mention of education was removed from the Constitution. However, Congress enacted the Land Ordinance Act (1785), which laid the foundation for the land-grant colleges (Veysey, 1965).

By the mid-nineteenth century leaders in higher education were on the defensive due to pressure for change in the curriculum. They were "torn between allegiance to the classical course of studies and demands that it be made more practical" (Green & Levine, 1985, p. 21). However, the leaders of many of the traditional colleges; notably Harvard, Cambridge, Quincey and other institutions quietly and effectively developed practices, priorities, and purposes that gave promise to many new educational ideas (Green & Levine, 1985).

Examples of pragmatic leadership were generally viewed as a practical end of higher education, as the concept adapted through political and social change. American higher education evolved "in substance and style, as a
creature of the society it served" (Green & Levine, 1985, p. 24). This idea was supported by the assertion of Stogdill that "the behaviors of leaders differ from one cultural setting to another" (cited in Bass, 1981, p. 5). For example, different leadership types emerged in the north and south as the Civil War approached. Immediately before the Civil War, when Henry Adams commented upon his personal educational experience, he determined that in the context of leadership, Southern pomposity, when not arrogant, was "genial and sympathetic, almost quaint and childlike in simplemindedness; quite a different thing from the Websterian or Conklian pomposity of the North" (cited in Samuels, 1973, p. 46). Adam's observations revealed a sophistication of leadership in the North which did not appear to be present in the Southern leader.

Although there has been an enormous body of literature devoted to great leaders (in the context of historical and cultural emphasis) during the last 50 years, leadership has been the focus of a great deal of empirical study. According to Bass (1981):

The period 1950 to 1965 was marked by an enormous amount of original, creative research. The same period witnessed a wasteful repetition of testing shopworn hypotheses accompanied by a general disregard for negative results. Naive, uncritical theorizing is likely to retard the process of
discovery. Fortunately, much research published since 1965 exhibits a just regard for scientific objectivity. (p. 616)

Since World War II leadership concepts have been routinely stressed in business, under the guise of management technique. Drucker (1990) stated, "Until quite recently, no one knew how to put people with different skills and knowledge together to achieve common goals" (p. 222). "After World War II we began to see that management is not business management. It pertains to every human effort that brings together in one organization people of diverse knowledge and skills" (p. 226). Indeed, it was discerned that certain kinds of leadership concepts could be learned and this idea has proceeded to be an essential part of most management training programs (Mathis & Jackson, 1976, p. 52).

While educational leaders have been often involved in empirical leadership studies, it has been the political leaders and the business leaders who have received the most public acclaim and who were the most commonly interviewed by the mass media concerning their insight into leadership. This focus was generally due to the fact that the most powerful media were "commercial and business oriented" (Emery & Smythe, 1980, p. 80). Research indicated that educational leaders warranted study, and academic novels have often mirrored "the complexity of the modern
administrator's tasks" (Kramer, 1983, p. 360). Although, Pittman and Theilmann (1986) maintained that the academic novel was lacking in some areas i.e., the "treatment of the growth of government regulations and the application of management information systems" (p. 416), the authors contended that "such novels [were] a rich source of valuable insight into modern higher education in the United States" (p. 404). They concluded that:

individuals of varying abilities and ethical standards are depicted performing administrative tasks in virtually all college novels [and] can be a good source of both enjoyment and insight into the administration of modern higher education.

(p. 416)

**Academic Administrators in Fiction**

Academic administration has been depicted in the pages of popular fiction novels (Pittman & Theilmann, 1986, p. 416). Some leaders routinely depicted were presidents, vice-presidents, deans, and department chairpersons.

However in research the leaders in American higher education have not, traditionally, shared the high profile leadership status of other professional disciplines. During the last four decades, after the initiation of the review of leadership behavior in this country (Office of Strategic Services, 1948), leadership was researched extensively in
health, social sciences, and law enforcement (Bass, 1981). During this time, Bass reported that the study of leadership in the contexts of politics, labor, criminal activities was neglected. Educational administration, as a field of study for leadership was so unrepresented, that Bass failed to mention it as a topic in his research. Leadership in academic fiction was also under-represented. As the study of leadership continued in education, the predominant method of study centered around survey research and methodology. According to Vandermeer (1982), the study of leadership, as represented in fiction, was neglected. This neglect was especially true in the area of educational administrative leadership in higher education. Given the noticeable lack of attention to educational leadership in higher education, especially in the context of educational administrative leadership as represented in popular fiction, the need for a study of this type was evident.

Statement of the Problem

In the past, there have been a variety of conceptualizations which were developed to facilitate the examination of leadership. Leadership has been examined from philosophical and/or quantifiable aspects. The problem of this study was one of presenting a clear, rich interpretation of the image of, or stereotypes of, academic administrative leadership.
Bellow believed that basic texts should be "taken literally" and not related "to myth, history, philosophy, or psychology" because this practice renders them "less accessible" to readers (cited in Siegel, 1989, p. 123). In order to present a clear interpretation of the leadership images, the novels in this study were examined for the presence of literal aspects of academic leadership types.

Since American academic fiction characters represented a current interpretation of academic administrators, and according to Pittman and Theilmann (1986), "individuals of varying abilities and ethical standards are depicted performing administrative tasks in virtually all college novels" (p. 416), it seemed appropriate to examine academic fiction in order to arrive at a better understanding of how these administrators were stereotyped and presented to a mass audience.

Through the examination of these fictional administrative characters in contemporary academic fiction, certain leadership criteria were expected to be evident. This evidence was then applied toward a better understanding of how academic leaders were stereotyped, or depicted, in contemporary fiction.

The Novel

The vehicle chosen for this study, the modern novel, according to Fiedler (1984) was:
invented once and for all in the middle of the eighteenth century by that extraordinarily anti-elitist genius Samuel Richardson, [was] the first successful form of popular art to have entered a culture more and more dominated by such sub- or quasi- or para-literature. It must be clearly distinguished, therefore, from old-style aristocratic art (an art dependent on limited literacy) as well as from folk art (an art dependent on mass illiteracy). It is related not to such forms as the epic, on the one hand, or the folk ballad, on the other—in fact, to nothing which precedes it, but to much which follows: the comic strip, the comic book, cinema, TV. Like them, the novel is an art form which tends to make the classic distinction between literacy and illiteracy meaningless . . . for it is a product both of the Industrial Revolution and of the political shifts in power which have replaced class-structured societies by one version or another of the mass society. (p. 53)

The novel was selected for this study because it represented American culture and because it was written as a serious imitation of reality. It observed the probabilities of actual existence in its use of plot and action and in its depiction of character. Therefore, in this study the novel was distinguished from the romantic novel or the romance, and it was reviewed as prose fiction written to represent
actual persons and events in contemporary society. The academic novels chosen were selected, specifically, to research administrative leadership in higher education.

Fiedler (1984) stated that "distribution as well as production has been essential to making the novel the closest thing possible within the limits of literacy to a mass art" (p. 84), and that "its development was connected to the development of modern technology and modern means of mass distribution" (p. 54). Popular novels were read by members of the "majority [white] and minority [black, hispanic, American Indian] audience", and they appeared to "cross all conventional role boundaries: not only generational and sexual, but ethnic and class as well" (p. 136). Regarding the author's intentions, Mellard stated that "the academic or, more strictly, the college novel displays an author's actions to the college institution itself, its faculty, and the cycle of events linked to an academic calendar" (cited in Siegel, 1989, p. 54).

In light of these observations it was clear that the text of the American academic novel, taken literally, could be a useful tool in the study of modern leadership behavior, since the texts of academic novels were expected to contain basic academic administrative stereotypes which, generally, strived to mirror universally accepted academic leadership behavior.
Characterization In Novels. In considering the credibility of mirroring human behavior through the characterization in novels, Epstein (1989) was of the opinion that "novels provide a fine laboratory in which to study character and thus attempt to make some small progress in that deepest of all deep subjects, human nature" (p. 38). He further stated that novels "have been decisive in giving (him) a method or style of thinking, a general point of view, and a goodly portion of understanding of the world" (p. 33).

In regard to the credible depiction of characters in novels, Kroll (1965) felt that "the experiences of the characters in a novel or play may make sense only insofar as they can be related to phenomena the reader himself knows or has experienced" (p. 82). However, if we accept the premise that the "primary challenge of factual accuracy is literal proof" (p. 83), and if the author has made an attempt to depict reality, these circumstances make the novel worthwhile for examination. Kroll (1965) went on to observe that "most fiction focuses on the individual," and it "communicates in an intensely personal way" (p. 83). Taken literally, as suggested by Bellows, the novel can represent "actual experience," because people want to read about "men and women alive" (cited in Siegel 1989, p. 125). The use of the academic novel in a study of this type was appropriate because, according to Kroll:
popular novels are being written to influence large numbers of people on the basis of central ideas held by their authors. The credibility of such ideas merits examination, if for no other reason than the impact such ideas may have on substantial segments of the popular reading public. (p. 83)

Certain elements of human behavior were expected to be present in the novels. For instance, the presence of influential central leadership ideas or academic leadership themes were expected to be represented. Also, regarding the human condition represented in novels, Kroll (1965) observed that "the novelist's perception and conscious arrangement of reality can provide real, fruitful, and suggestive approaches" (p. 81).

In any event, Kroll (1965) believed that "the subject (novels) merits systematic treatment" and that "we are overdue for the acceptance of systematic treatments of human behavior and analysis that include the literary output" (p.84). This study involved a systematic treatment of the administrative leadership information contained in the academic novels of this study.

The Academic Novel

John O. Lyons, who is credited with the first book-length study of the academic novel in America, *The College Novel in America*, said:

The academic world offers a closed system in which
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a writer can easily achieve plot unity enclosing action in time and place. It fosters a sense of class structure often used effectively for satire and humor in fiction. Academic people are interesting (if not noble), enjoying ideas and actions which precipitate crises. They are articulate enough to express their problems well. (1962, p. xiii)

Novels, then, were considered to depict our culture and influence the perception of the reader(s). Also, novels were recognized to have been written as a serious imitation of life, and were observed to represent the probabilities of actual existence in the use of plot and action and in depiction of character. Furthermore, these novels were apparently enjoyed by the general public of all classes and provided a forum in which to study character. Through the perception and presentation of the writer the novels have also made a contribution toward the understanding of human nature, which can be measured through the examination of dialogue and basic text.

This study was undertaken with the intent of identifying academic leadership character type(s) in these novels, examining these leadership type(s), and analyzing the implications, thereby contributing toward a better understanding of the representation academic leadership in contemporary American fiction.

Given that the depiction of reality in each novel was
representative of the author's perception, and that each novel selected was worthy of examination in the consideration of individual leadership characters, toward the identification of credible leadership ideas which were accepted universally, it was the purpose of this study to describe the characters, problems, decision making, leadership types, academic leadership themes in each novel toward the purpose of achieving a better understanding of the way academic leaders lead.

Purpose of the Study

In light of the aforementioned lack of information on the depiction of academic leadership in popular fiction, the purpose of this study was to identify leadership characters in popular fiction, so that the educational leadership types and problems depicted could be examined. An examination of these leadership examples was made in the interest of determining whether or not this fiction denoted recognizable academic administrative leadership types, thereby indicating a popular credible perception of how American academic administrative leaders lead.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed in this study:

1. What specific leadership positions were depicted by the academic leadership characters in the study?
2. What were the leadership types among the educational administrators as depicted in the academic novels written between 1950 and 1990?

3. What administrative image of decision making was represented by the academic leadership characters in the fiction of the study?

**Significance of the Study**

Although the literature was replete with leadership studies, the study of academic leadership in fiction has been largely unexplored. A review of the studies addressing administrative leadership, as represented in American fiction (Maddock-Cowart, 1989; VanderMeer, 1982; Smith, 1968; Egger, 1959), revealed that the context of leadership in higher education had been neglected. Also, in the past 40 years there had been studies of American academic fiction which addressed campus life (Boys, 1946; Lyons, 1962; Kramer, 1981a; Williams & Willower, 1983), but these studies presented campus life from the viewpoint of the student, which did not address the problem of providing an in depth review of administrative behavior in higher educational institutions (Carpenter, 1960). This study focused on the activities of the administrative characters in American academic fiction.

While it was recognized that fiction might emphasize those individuals who were flagrant in behavior, rather than those who were productive, the conclusions derived from this
examination could help provide insight into how the academic leadership in the novels responded to this behavior, thereby providing a review of how the leaders in American higher education lead.

Assumptions
The basic assumptions related to this study were as follows:
1. The number of academic novels selected for the study were sufficient to reflect the periods from which they were chosen.
2. The novels selected were credible and representative of academic fiction depicting academic administrative behavior.
3. The leadership roles of the characters found in the selected novels, and examined in the study, were representative of leaders in higher education.

Limitations
1. The dimensions of leader types were limited by the number of academic novels found suitable for the study.
2. Leadership in this study was limited to certain positions: presidents, vice-presidents, deans, or department heads.
3. The leadership contexts in this study was limited to that found in the novels of this study.
Definitions

The following terms and names were defined or explained in regard to their application in the study.

1. Academic fiction. This term referred to novels depicting the characteristics of higher education either at private or public university, college, or junior college level.

2. Characterization. This term was used in the study to indicate the description or detailed account of the qualities of a person, pertaining to behavior or habits, denoting a position in a scheme or classification of notable traits. A character is a person who plays a part in a narrative. They may be flat—simple, one-dimensional, unsurprising, and usually unchanging or static—or round—complex, full, described in detail, often contradictory, and usually dynamic (i.e., changing in some way during the story).

3. Educational administrators. Characters in the popular novels holding leadership positions in higher education were selected for the study. These positions were limited to: presidents, vice-presidents, deans, and department chairpersons. The term "academic leadership" was used to refer to this group.

4. Higher education. This term referred to post-secondary institutions, both public and private, including universities, colleges, and junior colleges.
5. Leadership types. This term referred to certain leadership behaviors which were identified in the literature and in each novel of the study. In the literature, topology often gave way to the more commonly used term of "style." Style means "the typical or consistent behavior a leader tends to use while interacting with subordinates" (Hitt, Middlemist & Mathis, 1986, p. 649). The leadership styles sought after in this study were those from the Situational Leadership Training Model of Hersey and Blanchard (1979), which are task and relationship oriented. The types of leadership expected to be present were: autocratic (directive), democratic (persuasive), participative (group), and delegation (minimal) (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; 1981).

6. Novel. This term depicts the genuine literary form, invented by Samuel Richardson in the eighteenth Century. Distinguished from "folk art" and "old-style aristocratic art" (Fiedler, 1984, p. 53), the novels in this study were sometimes "best sellers" and were sometimes ignored, but they were written for and set in the location of the United States, and were marketed toward the mainstream reading public of the United States.

7. Stereotype. "To fix or perpetuate in an unchanging form" (Oxford English Diction, 1989, p. 652). In the context of social and political ideas, the term was first used by Walter Lippman (1922), when he referred to the
"pictures in our heads" of different social groups, and by Ashmore and Del Boca (1981) who defined stereotype "as a set of beliefs about the personal attributes of a group of people" (cited in Bar-Tal, Graumann, Kruglanski, & Stroebe 1989, p. 5).

The stereotype concept was generally based upon "generalizations about categories" (Bar-Tal, Graumann, Kruglanski, & Stroebe, 1989, p. 5), and stereotypes were considered "a set of beliefs about the personal attributes of a group of people" (Brigham 1971, p. 2).

Organization of the Study

When reading academic fiction a reader might pass over the leadership techniques employed in each novel. In this study, these novels were examined closely to determine the leadership type of the characters, in order to offer insight into the concept of how administrators of higher education lead.

Also, in order to insure a rationale for the study, four steps were taken: (1) the origin of each leadership type to be used in the study was explained in the literature, (2) the leadership positions of higher education were examined to place the data found in the study in perspective, (3) each leadership position included in the study was defined and clarified, and (4) the validity of the American academic novel as a credible tool for study was
reviewed and examined as documented in the literature.

The academic novels chosen for the study were selected from a list compiled and identified as containing administrative, or leadership, type behavior (VanderMeer, 1982; Maddock-Cowart, 1989; Books In Print). The academic fiction was identified and selected according to the academic administrative roles depicted in the individual novels. Only novels containing academic leadership roles were considered suitable for the study.

Forty books were chosen. This number provided a suitable sample from each time frame (1950-1959; 1960-1969; 1970-1979; 1980-1989). There were 10 books chosen from each decade. Only those novels which were found to contain the elements of academic leadership designated for the study were considered for inclusion in the study.

The novels selected were considered serious works, involving academic settings in the United States, providing characters who performed administrative duties in the positions of president, vice-president, dean, or department head of a college or university.

This study was organized into five chapters as follows:

Chapter I consists of an introduction, a statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, limitations, research questions, assumptions, limitations, definitions of terms, procedures, and overview.

Chapter II contains a review of the related literature,
pertaining to leadership behavior and types, leadership roles in higher education, and the credibility of academic novels for objective literary study.

Chapter III describes the methods and procedures employed in this study. The procedures and methods consisted of the data collection procedures, the population selected, the data collection instruments, and the data analysis methodology.

Chapter IV presents the results of an analysis of the data collected in this study.

Chapter V includes the summary, discussion, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

An Overview of the Study

The study examines the subject of leadership as represented in 40 academic novels published between 1950 and 1990. A distinct systematic classification method was developed and used to note the leadership patterns in each novel. The novels were listed in chronological order. The literary quality of each novel selected for the study was examined and the demographic data from each novel was recorded and classified.

In addition, the following leadership criteria was identified in each novel: the leader position, leader decision making, leader activities, leader theme of each novel (whenever possible), and the type of leadership was
recorded and classified according to the guidelines of the study.

This study was undertaken because the leadership of educational institutions was an area that had been depicted in contemporary fiction, and contemporary fiction had been cited as one source which affected the opinion of society toward higher education. Since a study of this kind had not been previously reported, there was reason to believe that a systematic effort to identify and classify the depiction of academic leadership in American fiction was needed.
Chapter 2
Review of Related Literature

Introduction

Overview of Leadership Studies

This section reviewed existing general research on leadership, on leadership positions in higher education, and on the use of fiction as a method of studying related phenomena. American academic novels were examined to discover the depiction of higher educational leaders in this particular genre, toward the purpose of achieving a better understanding of how academic administrators are represented in the fiction and how these administrators are portrayed as leaders. The literary review was divided into four major sections: (1) leadership, (2) leadership of higher education, (3) academic leadership roles; president, vice-president, dean, department heads, (4) and American academic novels.

Leadership

As stated earlier, there have been almost as many definitions for leadership as there are researchers. The individual leader has been generally recognized by status, position or manner. According to Knapp (1988), a leader is:

A person who stands at the head of an enterprise or movement (often political or military) and who guides followers toward a goal (social, cultural,
ideological, and/or geographical). The leader is always superior to other people in degree (by merit or by status), but not necessarily superior in kind; he is generally a human being, and not a god. Unlike the god, the leader is not superior to the physical world and the order of nature; with abilities and authority greater than those of his followers, he remains nevertheless fallible. The leader's position does not guarantee virtue; leaders can be evil as well as good, law-breakers as well as law-makers. Nor does the leader's position guarantee the respect of the followers; an incompetent leader may be judged weak, and a forceful leader may be considered dangerous. Often, however, the leader, in literature as life, has achieved leadership by representing the highest aspirations of a group; the followers most admire the person who best exemplifies their idealized view of themselves and their mission. But all leaders, whatever the response they evoke, are judged according to their ability to direct and command the groups at whose head they stand. (p. 733-4)

Early leadership studies were concerned with the "great man" theory, traits, personality and/or character. The "great man" theory of leadership involved the heredity of leaders (Galton, 1869). Another approach was that of Wood (1913), who equated a ruler's capabilities with the quality
of national life. According to Bass (1981), the idea of a leader possessing superior qualities was the assumption that gave rise to the trait theory of leadership. The special or superior qualities pertaining to personality and character were identified by Bernard (1926), Bingham (1927), Tead (1929), and Kilbourne (1935), while Bird (1940) analyzed 20 psychologically oriented research studies which considered 79 traits in an effort to determine the importance of traits.

Verderber (1989) stated that in trait studies leaders were found to display qualities related to "special ability, sociability, motivation, and interpersonal communication skills to a greater degree than do nonleaders," and in group studies, leaders appeared to "exceed average group members in traits such as intelligence, scholarship, intuition, and verbal facility" (p. 239). Individual leaders were also exceptional in the social aspects of "dependability, activeness, cooperativeness, popularity, initiative, persistence, and enthusiasm" (p. 239).

The findings from these, and other studies, indicated support for the idea that possession of certain traits would not make an individual a leader; however, a leader would need to exhibit at least some of these traits in order to lead effectively. This discovery resulted in the concept that leadership traits might tend to differ with the situation.
According to Bass (1981), "The evidence suggests that leadership is a relation that exists between persons in a social situation, and that persons who are leaders in one situation may not necessarily be leaders in other situations" (p. 67).

Other studies by Shaw (1981) and Patinka (1979) appeared to lend credence to the assertion that certain generalizations could be drawn between leadership traits and leader research measures. Cragan and Wright (1980) also noted that in the past 20 years much verifiable leadership research on individual leaders had suggested the importance of the presence of leadership traits.

Another important aspect of leadership was to consider the context of the leadership situation. Bass (1960) concluded that:

some of the variance in leadership is due to the situation, some is due to the person, and some is due to the interaction of person and situation. Sometimes, personal traits are paramount . . . sometimes, it is a combination effect: the right person, the right place, at the right time. (Cited in Stogdill, 1981, p. xiii.)

Therefore, researchers concluded that while traits appeared to be an important component of leadership, they did not in and of themselves spell success in the leadership process. Due to the numerous variables involved, the elements of leadership success have remained a matter for speculation.
A review of leadership studies and leadership, as represented in the literature, revealed that leadership had been studied extensively, and definitions of leadership have varied with each researcher. This review of different definitions and conceptions of leadership theory throughout the twentieth century touched on traits, behavior, and situations generic to this study.

The purpose of this overview of leadership was to provide a complete definition of the different types of leadership which were expected to be depicted by the characters in the novels of this study. The four leadership types were: (1) autocratic (directive), (2) democratic (persuasive or selling), (3) participative (group), and (4) delegative (minimal) (Hersey & Blanchard; 1969; 1981). The identification and examination of these four leadership types was made toward determining whether or not this fiction denoted recognizable academic administrative leadership, thereby indicating a popular credible perception of how American academic administrative leaders lead. These leadership types were deemed important toward determining leadership behavior, toward demonstrating leadership decision making techniques, and toward designating the possible leadership stereotypes depicted by the characters in the novels of the study.

Leadership Behavior

An overview of the literature provided several
different leadership styles, types, and behaviors. Harding (1949) identified 21 types of educational leaders. Among these were: autocrat, cooperator, elderstatesman, eager beaver, pontifical type, muddled person, loyal staff man, prophet, scientist, mystic, dogmatist, open-minded person, cynic, optimist and democrat. Additional leadership behaviors (Bass, 1981), also expected to be identifiable and useful, were autocratic, consideration, democratic, directive, initiating structure, laissez-faire, motivational, participative, relations-oriented, task-oriented, crowd leaders, experimental, small group leaders, organizational and political leaders.

These various educational leader types from Harding (1949) and Bass (1981) were grouped according to behavior under headings established by the most recent literary research. The leadership types formed by this grouping, identified in the literature, and selected for consideration in this study were: (1) autocratic (telling) leadership, (2) democratic (selling) leadership, (3) participation (sharing) leadership, and (4) delegation (minimal) leadership. These four types of leadership behavior were also compatible with the recognized concepts of situational leadership as described in the literature. These concepts of situational leadership evolved through the various leadership studies over the past 40 years.
Leader-follower behavior

In addition to the trait and behavior studies, an overview of the literature revealed that in 1948, at the University of Michigan, researchers studied the relationship between a leader's behavior and the follower's behavior in terms of morale, satisfaction, and productivity. As a result of this research, two leader behaviors were identified: employee-centered and job-centered (Katz, Maccoby, & Morse, 1950). The employee-centered leaders demonstrated a personal interest in their followers and concentrated on training followers for better jobs. The job-centered leaders had no personal interest in the follower, behaved in a demanding way and submitted the workers to punitive measures. The job-centered leaders were personally involved in the follower's tasks.

Organizational leadership

A leadership concern of this report was the context of leadership behavior in large organizations, since it was evident that higher education was, generally, administered in the context the large institution (Drucker, 1990, p. 226). Likert (1961) developed a system to depict interpersonal relationships in large organizations. Likert's four systems were: (1) exploitative autocratic; (2) benevolent autocratic; (3) consultative; and (4) democratic. Systems 3 and 4 were classified as democratic, because leaders and followers were found to
trust each other and the leaders were very supportive, easy to talk to and asked for ideas from followers. In this way, followers took part in goal setting and were influential in decisions and tasks.

Much of Likert's topology was found to be similar to those in other leadership research. For instance, Likert's Systems 1 and 2 were autocratic. Likert's exploitive autocrat used threats, fear and punishment and promised rewards if the followers obeyed. Likert's benevolent autocrat used more positive and less negative means to ensure that followers comply. Top down communication was used in Likert's Systems 1 and 2, and followers had little influence on tasks setting and methods for completion. In over 500 studies completed on measures of organizations performance, organizations attributed to be at System 3 or 4 showed positive associations between leadership and followers, while those at System 1 or 2 did not. The research could not positively ascertain that the positive effects were due to changes in leadership style, but given the pattern of large-scale, long-term changes reported in the studies (Likert, 1977) and since the changes included changes in leadership and organizational development, it seemed most realistic to attribute some of these effects, at least to the changes in leadership (Bass, 1981, p. 303). It could be concluded that followers reacted more positively to democratic leadership than to autocratic leadership.
About the same time the Michigan studies were conducted, research was being conducted at the Bureau of Business Research of Ohio State University. The Ohio State group's research identified two basic types of leader behavior: consideration and initiating structure. Consideration behavior matched the employee-centered criteria of the Michigan studies, and initiating structure matched the job-centered criteria of those studies (Halpin, 1966, p. 86). However, in comparing the two approaches, the Ohio State studies comprised the most complete research effort, and the published literature was especially meaningful in regard to the consideration and task criteria of leadership in this study. Halpin (1957) published his "Paradigm for Research on Administrator Behavior," a model which "identified the interaction of the administrator's perception of the organizational task with three sets of variables—personal, intraorganizational, and extraorganizational—as critical for explaining what administrators do" (Boyan, 1988, p. 79).

In further studies by the Ohio State Leadership studies Halpin (1966), the term "consideration" referred to "behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of the staff (p. 86), and initiating (task) structure referred to leader behavior which delineated "the relationship between (the leader) and members of the staff..."
in trying to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and method(s) of procedure" (p. 86). According to Stogdill (1970):

Surveys and experimentation suggests that consideration both increases subordinate satisfaction and is increased by it. Initiation of structure by the leader (if structure is low) improves subordinate performance, which in turn increases the leader's subsequent consideration and reduces the leader's initiation of structure. (p. 593)

This research conducted at Ohio State was of particular importance since the research involved one of the most comprehensive leadership research efforts undertaken. The literature resulting from these studies included the leadership measurement scales: Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (1957), (LBDQ) and Ideal Leader Behavior Questionnaire (1957), (ILBQ) which were determined by factor-analysis. Since the development of the measurement scales, numerous studies have used the literature.

For the purpose of this study the leadership behavior terms "consideration and structure" appeared synonymous with the behavior terms of the "employee centered and job centered" behaviors of the Michigan studies (Katz, Maccoby, & Morse, 1950), and the "relationship and initiating (task)" leadership behavior terms of the Ohio State studies (Halpin, 1966).
Leadership Types

At approximately the same time, Getzels and Guba (1957) had developed a "transactional model" of leadership, with three types of leadership: they claimed a leader was "nomothetic" (task oriented) when he was influenced by organizational demands, and "idiographic" (relationship oriented) when he was influenced by personal needs, and "synthetic" when he tried to "compromise the conflicting problems of two contrasting systems" (Bass, 1981, p. 21). In the synthetic method of leading, the leader focused on the realization that social system goals have high priority and organizational goals must be met, sometimes through compromise. The two readily familiar concepts of "relationship and task" orientation were accompanied by the organizational concept.

In addition, the Managerial Grid, developed by Blake and Mouton (1964) described organizational leader behavior using terms such as the leader's "concern for people" (consideration orientation) and "concern for production" (task orientation). Blake and Mouton demonstrated leadership styles in a model which organized the patterns of leadership types on a "grid," showing five basic combinations: 1,1: low concern for task and low concern for people; 9, 1: high concern for task and low concern for people; 1, 9: high concern for people and low concern for task; 5,5: moderate concern for both people and task; 9,9:
high concern for people and high concern for task. According to the Blake and Mouton research, the ideal leadership behavior was one that most closely resembled the 9,9 style or high concern for task and high concern for people (Bass, 1981, p. 357).

**Contingency Leadership.** Leadership in the literature also embraced accepting the situational responsibility of being in charge and striving to plan for contingencies. While exerting influence, accepting responsibility, and planning for contingencies, leaders facilitated individuals or groups toward the completion of a goal, or as in the case of successful administrators, several goals at once.

The contingency theory of leadership was developed by Fiedler (1967) and according to the research, the effectiveness of the leader depended upon the interaction of the leader behavior with organizational factors. Fiedler established a hierarchy of leader needs related to the task-relationship elements of leadership behavior. Fiedler demonstrated that leader needs vary, depending upon the individual leader. To aid in the identification of leadership styles, Fiedler developed the Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale (LPC). The scale was a semantic differential scale which consisted of 16 bipolar items. Each item was scored on a scale from one to eight, with one as the least preferred score, and eight as the most favorable. A high score on the LPC indicates that a person...
favorable. A high score on the LPC indicates that a person had described his co-worker positively and was therefore relationship oriented. A low score on the LPC indicates that a person had described his co-worker negatively and was therefore task oriented.

Fiedler (1967) also employed environmental factors to determine a favorable or unfavorable situation. He determined that environmental factors determined the leader's needs, therefore the following factors were considered:

1. Leader member relations: The degree to which the group respected and supported the leader,

2. Task structure: The degree to which the task was specified; whether it was simple or complex,

3. Position power: The degree to which the organization gave the leader power.

The Fiedler (1967) research suggested that whether or not a leader was successful was contingent on leader-member relations, task structure, and position power (p. 81). He explained that the interaction of these three factors would determine which leader was likely to be the most effective. Good leader-member relations were identified by the presence of an amicable working relationship, mutual trust and member loyalty. Bad leader-member relations were recognized by antagonism, mistrust, and lack of member loyalty. Fiedler identified task structure as: (1) goal clarity, (2) the
potential number of ways to complete the task, (3) the extent to which accomplishments can be evaluated by objective, (4) logical or feedback methods, and (5) the potential number of correct outcomes (Fiedler, 1967).

Regarding the Fiedler research and contingency concept, some researchers maintained that leaders could be educated to improve their style of leadership to meet the situation or contingency. Fiedler (1979) disagreed, and argued that "changing leader-member relations, task structure or a leader's position power is easier than changing a leader's personality" (Bass, 1981, p. 357). Fiedler maintained that:

we must train people differentially—not everyone should be trained to behave in the same way or to adopt the same attitudes. In fact, we will be better served by training our leaders in how to change their leadership situations than in how to change their personalities. (Fiedler, 1975, pp. 15-6)

Fiedler's contingency model did not address the potential for a leader to be both task-oriented and relationship oriented. However, it might be possible for a leader to learn to adapt to either approach. The question was not which style was best overall, but which style worked best in the situation faced by the leader.

Situational Leadership. Due to the nature of educational leadership and the organizational framework surrounding the academic administration, the aspects of
situational leadership were judged to be the most desirable pattern for this study. The leadership types considered most suited: autocratic (directive), democratic (persuasive), participative (shared), and delegation (minimal) were identified and chosen for this study for two reasons. First, autocratic, democratic, participative, and delegative leadership types spanned the time frame of this study, and second, the functions of these leadership types were contained in the elements of situational leadership, which were expected to be the most compatible with the leadership behaviors occurring in the academic fiction of this study.

Elements of situational leadership were identified in the studies of: Stogdill, 1950; Getzels and Guba, 1957; Likert, 1961; Blake and Mouton, 1964; Fiedler, 1967; Hersey and Blanchard, 1969; 1981; and Hersey, 1985. These leadership types were determined by their representation in the literature to be the best leadership types identified for the purpose of this study.

According to Atwell and Green (1985) these related trends of leadership were in the current climate of higher education: (1) "leadership calling for more decisive, less facilitative leadership," and (2) "the recognizing and legitimizing of the managerial and entrepreneurial elements of leadership" (p. 188). The first approach "is strong and assertive" and "exercises the will of the leadership" (p.
opportunistic" leadership methods and the leader "relies on the intelligence of the situation" (p. 188). Atwell and Green (1985) continued by stating:

The concept of "situational management," widely accepted in the management world, posits that managerial style and behavior will vary with the nature of the followers (task or relationship) and the task at hand. . . . different leadership will be required in each situation. (p. 188)

These "current trends of leadership," identified by Atwell and Green (1985), have given free rein to situational leadership in the use of directive (task), relationship (persuasion), participation (group), and delegation (minimal) leader behaviors. For these reasons these four types of leadership were selected for the study, were identified in the research, and were expected to be demonstrated through the administrative characters in the novels selected for this study.

Leadership Situations

As stated earlier, leaders may show greater degrees of capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation, status, and situation; however, the presence of these attributes did not guarantee the leader would lead effectively or accomplish the goals of the group or organization (Bass, 1981, p. 66). The type of leadership used and how the leader placed the activity into operation
in a particular situation may be the key to leadership success. There was a need to identify certain types of leadership in different situations in order to clarify the leadership type contained in each of the novels.

One leadership type, autocratic, embraced the activity concepts of directive (task) and delegative (minimal); while another type, democratic, utilized the activity concepts of persuasive (relationship), participative (group). As mentioned earlier, the concept of situational leadership easily lends itself to all types of activities.

**Autocratic and Democratic Leadership**

Throughout the previous section the research dealt with the identification and evolution of the four leadership types selected for this study: (1) task oriented or autocratic leadership, and (2) relationship oriented or democratic leadership, (3) participating or shared leadership, and (4) delegating or minimal leadership.

In this section the leadership behaviors of exerting influence toward setting and accomplishing goals was examined in different leader contexts as demonstrated in the literature. It was found that leadership or exerting influence was often accomplished through the use of directives (autocratic) and persuasion (democratic) activity. In both these behaviors there was a similarity to the leadership types identified for this study. The autocratic leadership stereotype was said to be directive.
and task-oriented. The democratic leadership stereotype used persuasion and was said to be both task- and relationship-oriented. However, the democratic leader behavior could also exert influence participatively, as well as delegatively, when the need arose.

**Autocratic behavior.** In the literature, one of the earliest and most memorable instances of exerting influence toward the accomplishment of goals was found in the book of Genesis when God exerted influence upon the elements and demonstrated the setting of a time frame for the accomplishment of creation. In this example of autocratic (directive) leadership, God exerted influence through the use of "raw power." He spoke and there was light. He moved objects rapidly, according to his will, and he exerted influence over Adam in much the same way. Throughout the old testament, God's goals were set and carried out, either by him, or with directives to his subordinates, such as Moses when he delivered the Ten Commandments to the Israelites. This autocratic leadership forced people or groups to submit, sometimes against their will. The control exerted by a directive leader, such as God, was viewed as an "autocratic leadership stereotype" in the context of this study.

**Democratic behavior.** Apart from the very directive "raw force" of autocratic leadership, another way a leader
exerted influence in the literature was through democratic leadership or acts of persuasion. Christ in the *New Testament* used situational leadership to lead his followers. The four gospels and the epistles of the *New Testament* are the earliest sources of information pertaining to the leadership of Christ and his teachings (Knapp, 1988, p. 738). Christ set goals of salvation through repentance and faith (confidence) and developed a method of persuasion and reason, by putting himself in the position of a follower, and through the use of parables and persuasive words he encouraged his followers to be capable and ready. This "golden rule" concept of leadership introduced a relationship aspect which "nurtured" the follower into action. This example of leader behavior offered a kind, patient method of influence aimed at compliance toward a goal, for the good of the follower(s). After a time of directing, persuading, and participating, Christ brought his followers to a state of capability and readiness, concluded his agenda, and delegated the task to the group. This method of democratic exertion of influence (persuasion) was considered, in this study, as a means toward effective leadership in situations involving participation or delegation between individuals or groups.

**Decision Making**

Throughout history, references to leadership instances requiring quick decision making (without discussion) were
present. This leadership behavior is generally expected from leaders, by individuals as well as groups. Strong leaders have often influenced others into quick action with autocratic decision making. This "telling" leader behavior was found to be most appropriate for followers who have low levels of ability and less desire to comply. At this stage the leader emphasized directive behavior, defined the follower's role repeatedly and told him precisely what to do and how to do it (Hersey & Blanchard, 1979, p. 28).

Decision making was also present in the structure of groups (Redl, 1942), power relationships (French, 1956; French & Raven, 1959) initiating group structure (Hemphill, 1954) and maintenance of structure in the interaction of groups (Stogdill, 1959).

**Leadership Training**

Over the past several years leadership training models have been developed. The leadership training model, which best suited this study, was that found in *The Situational Leader*, developed by Paul Hersey (1985).

**Situational Leadership**

In terms of methods of situational leadership training the Hersey, Blanchard & Keilty Maturity Style Matrix (Hersey, Blanchard, & Keilty, 1979) addressed a relationship between willingness and ability of the followers, and tied the concept to follower maturity of the task. This
leadership model helped determine the task and/or relationship behavior(s) of the leader. "Maturity" in the context of the Hersey and Blanchard Matrix (1979) was defined as the ability to do the task and the willingness to do the task. The Matrix was based on earlier work by Hersey and Blanchard (1969), in which maturity was considered a combination of the ability and willingness of the individual or group to take the responsibility for their own behavior in the completion of a task. The model was presented in its most recent form by Hersey (1985). According to Hersey, a continuum of immaturity-maturity guided the leader in appropriate leader behavior, from more task structure to less task structure (from directing to delegating). There were four quadrants in the model: high task and low relationship (telling); high task and high relationship (selling); low task high relationship (participating) low task and low relationship (delegation).

In the Hersey-Blanchard Model (1985), the telling style of leadership was very directive with little relationship activity. The selling style of leadership involved a simultaneous and strong emphasis on both task and relationship. The leader, when employing this style, was still in control of the task, but enticed the follower(s) into participating in the task through a process of communication and explanation. Through these acts of persuasion, the democratic leader usually demonstrated an
idea, or a means of achieving a goal to his/her follower(s), colleague(s), or superior(s), giving a rationale for action and explaining why other alternative ideas or methods were inferior. The individual or group chose to participate in the task of their own free will. The model exhibited both autocratic and democratic leadership techniques throughout the span of leader/follower need. Both leader techniques, "autocratic" and "democratic," were examples of exerting influence over individuals and groups in a leadership capacity either through directive or persuasive methods.

Leadership In Higher Education

Although there was an enormous body of literature devoted to leadership, relatively few researchers have chosen to deal with academic leadership. In order to give some foundation to the characters in the novels of this study, it was logical to first review the positions of the administrators in higher education.

The positions to be considered in this study have been present in colleges and universities throughout the past 40 years, which encompassed the time frame of this study. According to McCorkle and Archibald (1985) the 25 years between 1946 and 1970 were considered the "most creative period in the history of higher education in the United States" (p. 2). Enrollments, faculty numbers, research budgets, and expenditures all increased dramatically during this time period that was identified as "the golden age" of
higher education. The 1960s and 1970s were times of "rapid social change—the civil rights movement, student demonstrations, and conflicts between police and demonstrators often led to violence" (Green & Levine, 1985, p. 7).

According to Green and Levine (1985) as a result of cultural instability, the students in higher education were older, their values and attitudes were in a state of change, and they posed a "special challenge to the traditional values of the liberal arts" (p. 10). In the 1980s student priorities leaned more toward finding a "high paying job" than toward developing a meaningful philosophy of life (p. 11).

As a result of this important shift in values, leaders in higher education were forced to deal with political and financial trends. Since fiction writers tend to depict life and cultural milieu, the political factors and changes in the work order were expected to be indicated in the fiction of the time. For instance, during the decade of the 1950s the threat of communism hung over institutions of higher education. Also, during this time frame, post-war colleges and universities became more bureaucratized. In the decade of the 1960s administrators were forced to assume greater responsibility for dealing with students' financial and personal problems (Trow, 1988). By the decade of the 1970s, university relations, especially fund-raising, was an
important activity at both private and public institutions. While enrollments continued to climb during the decade of the 1970s, many campuses experienced substantial decline by the end of the decade as the effects of inflation took hold and research money was lost to other sectors of the economy. Beginning with the decade of the 1980s, higher education was "gradually losing its share of the basic research dollar" (Green & Levine, 1985, p. 6).

Successful athletic activities tended to strengthen the role and status of a leader. Another activity, which could weaken the role of a leader dramatically, was scandal. This was especially dreaded because incidents of scandal could do lasting damage to a school's image. Scenarios dealing with both athletics and scandal were expected to be discovered in fiction of this study, since novelists typically "dwell on conflicts, rather than administrative routine" (Pittman & Theilmann, 1989, p. 409).

**Leadership Positions**

In the literature of this study, "position power" was often a leadership factor, because an individual in a position of power was accepted by the group as having legitimate authority to lead, with the ability to punish or to grant rewards to members and possessed expertise on the topic. Another factor of "power" was whether the leader was particularly well liked by the group. It was determined that leaders in higher education were positioned in
situations of power, since the institution itself had legitimate power. These "power" positions were selected as represented and were easily recognizable in the selected novels. The leader positions selected and included in the study were: president, vice-president, dean, and department chairperson.

President. The president of the college or university has been generally recognized as the administrative officer with the most power in the hierarchy of the academic structure. More appropriately, the president always has been the recognized formal leader of the college or university. "The president . . . as chief executive officer, is responsible to the governing board for the administration of all affairs of the institution" (College & University Business Administration, 1974, p. 4).

Hesburgh, the president of Notre Dame, described the position as "a great vocation: exciting, demanding, surprising, at times very satisfying, and occasionally great fun." He went on to say it was "hard work, tiring to the point of exhaustion, repetitive, very often exasperating, but never really hopeless or dull if you have the right attitude about it" (Heyns, 1977, p. 1). Realizing that "at the heart of administration" was decision making," Hesburgh quoted his predecessor, John Cavanaugh, who said, "When you make a decision, however large or small . . . just ask what is the right decision, all things considered" (p. 2). "The
president's situation is unique" in that he/she represents justice, and "you make a decision simply because it is right in your judgment, not because someone will be grateful to you for making it" (p. 3).

Vice-President. In the university, there may be several vice-presidents, appointed to direct certain activities of academic administration (i.e., Vice-President of Student Affairs, Vice-President of Academic Affairs, etc).

Authority and responsibility are centralized in the president. Authority is delegated by the governing board to the president, who in turn delegates authority to officers responsible for major functional areas. These officers report to the president, who alone reports to the board.

No organization chart of the (institution) will set out clearly the measures of responsibility essential to successful and effective management. (College & University Business Administration, 1974, p. 6)

Dean. Wolotkiewicz (1980), in the College Administrator's Handbook, stated that "the dean of a college is the executive officer of his (her) college. The dean has the responsibility of chairman of the a particular college faculty and is ex officio member of all college committees (p. 25). The dean oversees the educational work, the
conduct of personnel, and manages the activities of all individuals within his/her domain. The dean is the executive officer of their division and directly responsible to the next administrator assigned to supervise. This may be a vice-president or the president depending upon the nature and size of the university or college (p. 22). The dean's duties include hiring of tenure track faculty, overseeing curriculum, determining the members of advisory committees, budget allocation, and presiding over special events.

**Department chairperson.** The position of department chairperson in traditional academic disciplines in American colleges and universities was designated as:

one of complete responsibility for business matters within their respective areas. Money was collected and disbursed, purchases were made, employees were engaged and released, and other business functions carried on with little reference to central procedure or to policies of other departments. *(College and University Business Administration, 1952, p. 9)*

According to the institution the duties were sometimes undefined, but the position required an individual who was able to balance the needs of both faculty and administration. The evolving battles over academic reform and faculty unions are generating combat that finds the
department chair trapped in the cross fire" (Brann & Emmet, 1972, p. 5). In terms of a "summary of occupation" Wolotkiewicz (1980) stated that department chairpersons duties included "development of long run strategies, creating necessary structures and overseeing implementation in areas such as curriculum, publicity, governance, budget, and staff" (p. 34). The role of a chairperson usually found an individual in charge of departmental governance, instruction, faculty affairs, student affairs, external communication, budget and resources, office management, and professional development (Tucker, 1981). Wolotkiewicz further stated that the role is complex and involves "no less than 10 and as many as 46 areas in which faculty and administrators expect the department chairperson to play a role" (p. 32).

American Academic Novels

The literary genre dealt with in this section pertained to American academic novels and included novels about the administration of such nonacademic institutions as business and industrial organizations. The nonacademic (administrative) novel reviews were included to strengthen the case for the study of novels in the discipline of social science in general.

Credibility of Novels

Most experts agreed popular novels were credible as a
research tool, since academic fiction influenced attitudes and perceptions of reality toward college life. For instance, Finn (cited in VanderMeer, 1982) was of the opinion that novels about college life "have helped to shape the image of higher education that now exists in the minds of many Americans" (p. 6). VanderMeer (1982) concluded that most researchers were of the opinion that "the academic novel exerted an influence on public attitudes and perceptions of higher education" (p. 9), while Williams and Willower (1983) viewed the study of academic novels as valuable, because "what the novel might capture most of all are the personal dilemmas and conflicts faced by administrators" who must solve problems (p. 362).

David E. Marion (1988) a professor of political science at Hampden-Sydney College, advocated the use of works of fiction in introductory level public administration courses, in the belief that:

The dramatic content of a novel not only gives (the reader) an introduction to arguments and practices to which they can imaginatively relate, but . . . it can also illuminate transcendent issues and problems of an administrative nature. (p. 45)

Furthermore, Kroll (1965) believed that "the novelist's perception and arrangement of reality can provide real, fruitful, and suggestive approaches" to the human condition.
He stated that "literature of political scientists on the political and administrative novel tends to support the value of fiction for professional reasons" (p. 80).

There was also evidence to support the concept that the ideas embedded in novels helped to explain human behavior. Sigmund Freud was said to have had a healthy respect for literary artists and their knowledge of human nature (Epstein, 1989). Freud once wrote to the Austrian novelist, Schnitzler: "The impression has been borne in on me that you know through intuition--really from a delicate self-observation--everything that I have discovered in other people by laborious work" (p. 33). However, in the matter of credibility of fiction as representative of human behavior, Kroll (1965) cautioned:

While the writer of fiction may offer a broad sweep of social analysis, in more instances he will present the subjective image of personal involvement. The behavior he describes, interprets or contrives will be personal. The world he depicts will be his world, drawn for his purposes; his world may be like none ever objectively observed, it may be a society distorted in the view of the reader. All depends on the author's purpose--his artistic purpose, social purpose (if he has any he consciously wants to communicate), and his own experience. (p. 80-1)

While VanderMeer (1981), also expressed some doubt as
to the value of the information contained in novels, the study and understanding of characterization in novels (in the search for a true image of human behavior) was strongly recommended by other experts. Epstein (1989), stated that "novels, along with history and biography, provide a fine laboratory in which to study character" (p. 38), and he agreed with H. L. Mencken's remark that "a novelist's chief claim on our attention is his ability to create interesting characters" (cited in Epstein, p. 38). Robert Louis Stevenson commented on the way books influence people when he said, "The most influential books, and the truest in their influence, are works of fiction" (cited in Epstein, 1989, p. 38).

Epstein (1989), somewhat in the manner of faint praise, was of the opinion that "Knowledge of the kind conveyed in novels may not, in any conventional sense, be useful. All that there is to recommend it is that it feels true," and, he concluded that this element of truth "may be all the recommendation required" (p. 39).

While there might be a problem with data credibility for scientific study, there was little doubt that novels expressed a passion for life and transmitted this passion to the reader. Alter (cited in Epstein, 1989) said, "without some form of passionate engagement in literary reading, the whole enterprise of teaching and writing about literature becomes pointless" (p. 36). He went on to assert that "the
language of literature is distinct from the use of language elsewhere in its resources and in its possibilities of expression," and can be an aid to understanding the world (p. 36). Booth said:

The authors who become our lasting friends are those who offer to teach us, by the sheer activity of considering their gifts, a life larger than any specific doctrine we might accept or reject. (Cited in Epstein, 1989, p. 36.)

Epstein (1989) was of the opinion that "the author himself frequently provided the clue for the judgment of credibility" in the biographical novel or fictionalized case study (p. 82). Furthermore, Epstein said "the universe of the arts is an integral part of man's relationship to his environment" (p. 84), and "fiction as an author's intentional presentation and analysis of contemporary social data simply cannot be ignored" (p. 82).

Novels and Educational Leadership

Educational leadership, as it appeared in popular fiction, has differed over the years. According to Pittman and Theilmann (1986), educational administrators sometimes fit stereotypes. Yet these researchers maintained:

the hackneyed images are far from universal. Even when stereotypes appear, they are of such a variety of the good and the evil, and the competent and the incompetent, that it is impossible to find any
archetypal fictional administrator. More often than not, at least some of the administrators in the modern college fiction are drawn as multi-dimensional figures, people of normal human abilities and frailties. (p. 416)

Research was scant in the area of American academic novels and there appeared to be several reasons for this lack of examination. VanderMeer (1982) listed two reasons: (1) The genre was viewed as second-rate by the academic community, and (2) scholars doubted the accuracy of academic novels for the study of professional disciplines (p. 33).

School administrators fared no better in the literature than did higher education administrators. Williams and Willower (1983) stated that the reason school administrators were not found in American novels was because "American authors have bypassed them in favor of such executives in business and industrial settings" (p. 360). This appeared to have happened because the life of the successful educational administrator appeared dull, and according to Callahan (1962) "the role of the twentieth century American public school administrator has become that of successful business executives" (p. 8).

According to Williams and Willower (1983), there was very little in the modern novel that dealt with the school administrator, in fact, they found only one book, Siegel's The Principal, that dealt with the complexities of the tasks
of the school administrator (p. 361). They recognized case studies and other simulations contained in university preparation programs in educational administration as resources in the examination of the "realities of administration" (p. 361). As a result, Williams and Willower (1983) strongly recommended the study of literature to help with the understanding of human behavior in the avenue of such problems as the conflict between society and personal values, individual values and authority, and the organization and radical change (p. 361).

The Depiction of Higher Education in Fiction

Seigel (1989) determined that "no other institution rivals the American university in harboring so many who criticize and even revile it while refusing to leave. No other nurtures so much internal factionalism and strife" (p. 7). It was evident that many writers of academic novels were annoyed by some aspect of academic life. For instance, Seigel (1989) maintained that Oates' writing revealed an "anger at the refusal of many academics to accept mystery over reason" (p. 11), and Trachtenberg (1979) determined that Oates used themes which "suggest the lack of originality that characterizes the academic mind" (p. 41). Seigel added that Oates, Malamud, and Roth also made "clear in (their) fiction just how emotionally and socially unstable American academics can be" (p. 15).

Occasionally, academic novelists tended to stress
higher education as a means of moving up in economic status. Nagel (1989) said that Heller's university training proved to be "a vehicle for both socioeconomic advancement and self-discovery" (p. 101), but that Heller, the author of Catch 22 (1961), Something Happened (1974), and Good As Gold (1979), used "progressive intensification of satirical antipathy toward the role of education in American society" in his novels and portrayed "higher education as the object of his most acrid satire as one of the institutions that perpetuate social stratification and moral insensitivity" (p. 112). Negal (1989) admitted that "the academic theme in Heller's fiction was hardly an endorsement for American universities, but it is a concern that deserves serious contemplation even by the members of the institutions most grievously portrayed" (p. 112).

Saul Bellow, another academic novelist, found fault with the academic idea of criticism, which reduced novels to cultural objects and dehumanized art. He compared the practice to "the Christian religion, which started with faith and ended with churches" (Seigel, 1989, p. 124). In reflection, Seigel (1989) maintained that "each literary generation cherishes the novel as a cultural object of high importance," and that Bellow advocated "literary study and analysis," even though he considered criticism as too "linear" or "sketchy" (p. 125).

Academic novels were also, occasionally, perceived to
be indicative of the novelist's view of western culture. Leslie A. Fiedler saw Malamud's novel, *A New Life* (1961) as:

a Western, or more accurately a neo- or meta-Western, which is to say, a Western written by an author (typically in a university, where such literature is studied) aware of the tradition, the genre, and therefore a book about that genre as well as about life in the West. (p. 212-219)


The novelist has to consider many elements, including his need to provide a detailed context for characters, themes, and plots . . . the academic or, more strictly, the college novel, displays an author's reactions to the college institution itself, its faculty, and the cycle of events linked to an academic calendar. (p. 54)

Other social images, projected by novelists of the academic genre, were the struggles between the liberal arts and the technical curriculum or the human spirit and the pragmatic. Mellard (1989) stated that:

Original sin, in terms provided by *A New Life*, (Malamud, 1961), is the separation of the human spirit from the material world, of humane values from our human acts. The Fall, as Malamud represents
it in academia, occurs when the liberal arts are separated from the crafts, imaginative vision from practical application. (p. 56)

The image of a separation of academe and reality appeared as a theme in several of the novels of the study. In these novels there was a struggle to merge the two distinct courses of action. Soloman (1989) said that Phillip Roth (My Life As a Man, 1974; The Professor of Desire, 1977) "insisted in his fiction that the dual worlds of academy and society remain distinct" (p. 69). Soloman also stated that in his novels, Roth created professors who indicated that "talking about great works of fiction (might) finally enable him to comprehend the meaning of his own life" (p. 68). Soloman was of the opinion that Roth created characters who exhibit extreme behavior in ordinary situations in order to try to control life so that his work could be impassioned. Occasionally, according to Soloman, "the characters in the novels were able to reconcile the life of academe with their own personal lives" (p. 68).

The image of academic leadership in the academic novels often reflected a dismal pragmatic ideals opposing humanistic education. The "thought patterns of the major characters were concerned with redeeming the arts" and in many novels the faculty and the administrators were overly concerned with being "good team players" and "satisfying the needs of the professional schools on the campus with respect
to written communication" rather than the study of literature or the arts (Mellard, 1989, p. 57).

Another image of the major characters, frequently in the academic novels was one of detective, whereby the stories become "as much of the detective story as of traditional Western, or frontier, or proletarian plots" (Mellard, 1989, p. 57). The major characters tended to play the part of "shamus," or "a scruffy, overage Hardy boy solving mysteries of identity and morality in which he himself (was) deeply implicated" (Mellard, 1989, p. 57). The mystery to be solved was often one of who controlled the college curriculum, the social and professional power struggle, and the lives of the characters in the book.

According to Pittman and Theilman (1989), "Fictions reflect their times" (p. 416), and the novels "written after World War II reveal the growing complexity of American higher education and the administrative response" (p. 406).

For the purpose of this study the academic novel was dealt with in the context of a "new vitality" that came from its new and stronger connection between the "strong delineation of setting or of character" of the post-1950 academic novel (Maddock-Cowart 1989, p. 18). According to Maddock-Cowart (1989), writers of the post-1950 academic novel were "members of the post-modern literary generation, and their attitudes and techniques reflect an aesthetic that has learned the lessons of the moderns and gone beyond them"
(p. 19). These post-1950 writers have brought the academic novel into the mainstream of the tradition of the novel through an establishment of contemporary style. According to Bradbury (1981):

This contemporary writing is by its nature multidirectional and elusive, since styles and directions keep constantly changing in writers who, unlike the writers of the past, are continuous, incomplete, not dead. (p. 9)

Summary

This section provided an overview of the general research on leadership, higher education, and American academic novels. The roles of higher education leaders in the novels of the study were also identified.

The review of indicated that leadership has been studied extensively, and the definition of leadership was varied. However, most researchers agreed that leaders could be identified based on certain traits, behavior, and the ability to influence followers. Leadership was identified as exerting influence toward setting and accomplishing goals.

The time frame of this study was 1950 to 1990. This was a time of major change in American higher education. There was rapid social evolution, involving such factors as: the civil rights movement, student demonstrations, increased enrollments. During this period, faculty and research
priorities changed dramatically. In addition, student priorities of job skills were on a collision course with the humanistic ideals of liberal education, and the leaders in higher education (both faculty and administration) were forced to deal with the trends of these political and financial factors and changes.

The literary genre dealt with in this section was the American academic novel, published from 1950-1990 in the United States of America. The criteria for selection also included the necessity of a college or university setting and that the character(s) must be students, faculty members, or administration members. There was also a need for academic leadership to be present in the text of the novel.

The credibility of novels for use in professional research was supported by the literary review in this section, owing to the recognized value of the examination of academic novels in the study of educational leadership. Given the paucity of research on the topic of educational administration and the influence the novel had exerted on shaping opinions of readers, coupled with the possibility that novels provided credible and needed insight into understanding administrative leadership in higher education, the researcher considered this study to be both timely and significant.
Chapter 3
Methodology and Procedures

Introduction

While novel selection was deemed critical to the study, organization played an important role in the methodology as well. Since this study relied heavily on qualitative analysis, several problems had to be addressed related to reliability and validity of variables.

Methodology

The information in this chapter was arranged to describe the methods and procedures which were used to conduct the study. In the interest of clarity the material in this chapter was divided into three sections. The first section addressed the data collection procedures. The second section described the collection of the data, and the third section described the methods which were used to analyze the data.

According to Webber (1985), "reliability (and validity) problems usually grow out of the ambiguity of word meanings or the ambiguity of category or variable definitions" (p. 19). Therefore, care was taken to insure that no ambiguity existed either in the category chosen (academic fiction) or the variables examined (leadership types).

Owing to the printed nature of the data and since the object of the study was to examine, specifically, leadership
types in academic fiction, and the procedures involved a traditional approach to data, the usefulness of content analysis was clear. Berelson (1952) recognized content analysis as "a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication" (p. 18), and Webber (1985) further identified content analysis as "a research methodology that utilized a set of procedures to make valid inferences from text" (p. 9).

The information supplied by Webber (1985) suggested identifying (1) the "intentions and other characteristics of the communicators" and (2) "the focus of individual, group, institutional, or societal attention" (p. 9). The selection and examination of these concepts was restricted to academic professional settings found in offices or conference meetings. No personal (home) relationship activity was selected or examined. The study involved a classification of these leadership acts, or episodes, in the context of actual academic leadership, and included an analysis of administrative leadership as represented in the academic settings in the selected fiction.

**Data Collection Procedures**

According to Bass (1981), "Leadership is a universal human phenomenon" (p. 5). In addition, leadership theory and research have covered a wide variety of theoretical assumptions. It was the contention of Bass (1981) that
"theory and empirical research should flow forward together" (p. 6). Immegart (1988) provided several guidelines for the study of leadership including the recommendation that "the focus of leadership study should shift to one on leading or the act of providing leadership (since) the import of behavioral study and getting at what leaders do has been established for quite some time" (p. 274). Immegart provided a model of a broad conceptualization of leadership (p. 274), and stated that "much remains to be done in mapping the leadership domain, in identifying dimensions and variables critical to the phenomenon (as well as their linkages), and in developing viable conceptualizations and constructs to guide research" (p. 273).

Toward the end of discovering "what academic leaders do," this study was guided by the aforementioned recommendations of Immegart (1988) using the "acts of leadership," represented in the academic novel. The data was collected by describing the leadership acts of the characters and analyzing them within the framework of leadership theory and literary criticism.

The acts of leadership were identified through the use of this broad conceptualization of leadership suggested by Immegart (1988). The end result was a description of academic leadership episodes in the fiction examined in this study, utilizing the concepts of the elements of leadership
communication process involving the context, the characters, the messages, the channels, the noise, and the feedback exhibited by the leadership episodes, exhibited in the text of the fiction. This information was listed, classified, and compiled for examination using content item analysis.

In order to facilitate the study, the fiction was arranged chronologically. Information from the leadership types in each novel was described in the context of leadership communication. Certain comparisons and contrasts were made, using the information in the novels, and finally, a discussion of the findings was provided.

**Materials**

The novels in this study were selected from a population of academic novels identified in the literature. There were two sources listed which resulted in discovery of fiction suitable for this study. One source heading descriptor was "academic fiction" the other source heading descriptor was "college and university novels." A novel list was selected from the bibliographies of Lyons (1962), Kramer (1981b), Ainsworth (1973), and from the dissertation studies of VanderMeer (1982) and Maddock-Cowart (1989). The remaining novels were located through an examination of *Dissertation Abstracts International, Books In Print, Books Out of Print*, and general periodicals.

The literary works in this study were written by American authors, set and published in America, and targeted
toward the readership of the general public. The popular novels selected for this study were of an academic administrative genre that contained leadership types that depicted academic leadership.

The criteria for selection of each academic novel were that the novel be one in which academia was depicted with seriousness and the main characters were either students, professors, or academic administrators. There also had to be a presence of episodes of academic leadership in the fiction. The genre of the novels was academic fiction, although a few novels considered to be academic mystery novels were included, when it was determined that the presence of the leadership positions and leadership types selected for examination in the study were represented in the work.

Forty works were selected: 10 from the decade of the 1950s (a time period expected to depict the expansion of leadership and higher education after World War II); 10 from the 1960s (a time period expected to depict educational leadership during the upheaval of the population explosion on campus and the campus unrest of the 1960s); 10 from the 1970s (a time period expected to depict the changes of academic leadership caused by the decline of public support and enrollment in the 1970s); 10 from the 1980s (a time period expected to depict the continued growth of higher education).
Novels Selected For the Study

According to the guidelines of the study, only academic novels containing administrative leadership examples were considered for inclusion in the study. Forty novels were selected. Ten novels were chosen from the decade of 1950-1959, 10 novels from the decade of 1960-1969, 10 novels from the decade of 1970-1979, and 10 novels from the decade of 1980-1989.

The 40 novels were selected from the bibliographies of recognized research in the field, most notably, Lyons (1962), VanderMeer (1982), and Cowart-Maddock (1989). Once 10 novels were located from each decade, fitting the leadership position criteria of the study, the search for novels was complete.

Novels of the 1950s

4. Pnin. (1953). Nabokov, V.

Novels of the 1960s

12. The Small Room. (1961). Sarton, M.
17. Stoner. (1965). Williams, J.
20. **The Department.** (1968). Brace, G. W.

**Novels of the 1970s**

22. **Endzone.** (1972). DeLillo, D.
23. **Gate of Heaven.** (1975). McInerny, R. M.
25. **Entertaining Strangers.** (1977). Gurney, A.
27. **The Professor of Desire.** (1977). Roth, P.
28. **A Man In Charge.** (1979). Philipson, M.
29. **A Certain Slant of Light.** (1979). Bonanno, M.

**Novels of the 1980s**

32. **The Dean's December.** (1982). Bellow, S.
34. **The Class.** (1983). Segal, E.
37. **The Elcholo Feeling Passes.** (1985). Barton, F.
40. **Professor Romeo.** (1989). Bernays, A.

**Data Collection Instruments**

The analysis technique used in this study was devised through a modification of a classification instrument used by VanderMeer (1982) in which the researcher classified selected data in 50 academic novels. However, the classification instruments used were particular to this study, devised in order to clarify the data as gathered, and address the research questions of this study.

1. The publication information of each novel was recorded chronologically, listing the title, author, date of publication.
publication, and leadership position(s) of interest found in each novel.

2. An index of leadership behaviors was provided. The leadership techniques identified and contained in the index were listed as: autocratic (telling), democratic (selling), participative (shared), delegating (minimal).

3. The academic leader characters were identified in each novel according to position: president, vice-president, dean, chairperson.

4. The leadership type was identified and represented by each leader character, according to leadership type: autocratic, democratic, participative, delegative.

Data Analysis Methodology

The identification of each novel was presented by identifying the title, author, date of publication, institution represented, academic position of the major character in the novel, the leadership position(s), the leadership type represented by each leader, the decision making technique represented. The information from each novel was compiled and examined through the use of content item analysis.

The following are examples of the classification and index method used to gather the data from the novels.

Example of Data Collection From Novels
1. a. Title: Pnin
   b. Author: Valdimar Nabokov

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Leadership Position(s) and Type(s) Represented:
(1) Dr. Hagen, Department Chair: autocratic
(2) President Poore: other (old)
(3) Dr. Blarenge, Department Chair: other
(not enough)

Leadership Situation Analysis

In order to analyze the leadership situations in each novel it was necessary to develop a logical approach, involving one or all of the elements of a "communication process" (Verderber, 1989, p. 6). Each of these activities was identified as a "leadership situation" and served to, narratively, explain the leadership activity contained in the academic novels of this study.

The leadership situations in each novel were described narratively, to demonstrate "how leaders lead" (Immergart, 1988) in the academic novels of this study. Since leadership communication has been viewed most often as a
dynamic, continuous and transactional process, there could be no fixed occurrence for identification. This was especially true in the circumstance of fiction, since the leadership action involved many elements.

For the purpose of analysis certain elements of leadership communication were expected to occur in the context of the academic novels. These elements were isolated and classified according to universal communication guidelines. The use of communication criteria pertaining to the activity of the leadership processes used in this study was in agreement with those found in the literature (Littlejohn, 1983; Arnold, 1984; Devito, 1986; Verderber, 1989). These criteria were:

1. Context. These were the interrelated conditions during the Leadership episode. One aspect of the context was the physical setting. These elements involved the place, the time, or the historical and psychological aspect of the episode. The political and social aspect of the episode was also noteworthy.

2. Character(s). The people engaged in the leadership communication episode were classified as the characters (i.e., the leader and the follower).

3. Rules. Rules were viewed as the guidelines or norms in effect during the leadership communication episode.
Often this aspect of the communication was expected to be viewed as "understood" procedure, especially in terms of hierarchy or organizational power positions.

4. Message. Messages were the ideas or thoughts transmitted or received during the leadership episode.

5. Channel. The channel was the means which was used to communicate during the leadership episode.

6. Noise. Noise was any stimuli that was interfering with the leadership message during the leadership activity. Noise involved internal or external or semantic factors. Internal factors would be thoughts or feelings that interfered with the meaning of the message. External factors would be sights or sounds, or other stimuli that diverted attention away from the meaning of the message. Semantic noise was considered to be alternate meanings caused by words that inhibit the meaning of the message (i.e., symbols, accents, or vocabulary) that was foreign or impossible for the character to comprehend.

7. Feedback. Feedback was viewed as a response during the leadership activity on the part of the leader or the follower.

The communication criteria above was used to isolate and demonstrated leadership in the novels. The leadership types were then classified, examined, and compiled.
Analysis of Leadership

The leadership data in the novels of this study were grouped according to behavior under headings established by the criteria of leadership type represented. The leadership type behavior formed by this grouping, identified in the literature, and selected for analysis were: (1) autocratic or "directive", (2) democratic or "persuasive", (3) participative or "shared", (4) delegative or "minimal", (5) situational "varied," and (6) other.

Table 1.
Behaviors Expected From the Four Leadership Types in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Type</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. autocratic</td>
<td>telling leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. democratic</td>
<td>selling leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. participative</td>
<td>sharing leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. delegative</td>
<td>minimal leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the classification of autocratic, the leaders were expected to be directive and to keep the follower(s) on task. Democratic leaders were expected to be friendly and to build and maintain a relationship with the follower, selling the follower toward compliance. Participative leaders were expected to encourage group participation.
Delegative leaders were expected to offer minimal communication to the follower, doing little more than defining the task. In the event that any variation of the four types of leadership existed, these "varied" leadership characters were identified, grouped and analyzed narratively.

Leadership type and decision making were expected to vary as would the approaches of the characters and problems presented in the novels of the study. The examination of leadership positions, leadership types, and academic concerns were considered to be situational variables, and these variables were recognized as important toward establishing an image of how academic leaders lead in the novels selected for the study.

**Decision making**

There were four decision making techniques used to classify the leader activities in this study. These decision making techniques were expected to be used by the four leadership types autocratic, democratic, participative, and delegative. As illustrated in Figure 2, autocratic leaders were expected to dictate decisions to the follower(s), and to concentrate on high task structure. Democratic leaders were expected to persuade the follower(s)
to comply with the decision, through the use of high task and high relationship orientation. Participative leaders were expected to share the decision making with the follower(s). This activity would include low task, high relationship emphasis. Delegative leaders were expected to totally delegate the decision to the follower. This activity would include low task and low relationship orientation.

As stated earlier, these four concepts of situational leadership illustrated in Figure 1, were taken from the Hersey and Blanchard Training Model (1979). The concepts of this model can be found throughout the literature. The behaviors expected from the four leadership types in the study in Figure 2 were particular to this study and were arranged to aid in the identification of leadership activity in the selected novels of the study.

**Leadership Episodes**

Leadership episodes (situations) were identified and examined in each academic novel of the study. Conflict was often mirrored in the personnel management of academic administrators. Problems of faculty members, such as, promotion and tenure problems were dealt with, as well as the hidden social and political agendas that were expected to occur in real life situations. The evidence of these
data was identified and discussed in this study. A determination of leadership type was made through the reflection and abstraction of the dialogue between the characters in each novel.

Investigations of this section were conducted for the purpose of describing the activity of the leaders found in the novels of this study. In addition to examining the leadership types, the narratives of leader activity were also examined. Examples of problematic factors, found in the literature, and expected to be exhibited by the characters in the novels were: (1) annoyance or frustration with academic life, (2) attitudes toward the role of higher education in American life, (3) views of tenure, (4) evidence of a dualism of academe and society, (5) and pragmatic versus humanistic education.

These academic concerns were identified as possible stereotypical occurrences in academic novels. These leadership episodes were grouped and presented, using narrative technique.

Summary

This chapter described the methods and procedures used to conduct the study. The first section described the data collection procedures, the second section of this chapter addressed the collection of the data and the classification.
methods which were used to group the data. The third section described the communication process terms necessary to analyze the data and listed the novels contained in the study.
Chapter Four
Analysis of Data

The purpose of this study was to identify and examine the administrative leadership types portrayed in American academic fiction novels from 1950-1990. Demographic variables identified in the selected novels were also examined, as were the leadership activities of the academic administrators. The decision making techniques of the administrators were identified and utilized as supporting evidence of leadership type. Major academic issues and concerns presented in the novels of this study were also examined within the context of their influence upon decision making and administrative behavior.

A description of the sample and analysis of the data are presented in this chapter. Section one contains the description of the sample and section two presents demographic data. An analysis of leadership types is presented in the third section. Section four addresses the dominant academic issues and concerns relevant to the administrative decision making of the leaders portrayed in the novels of this study. Conclusions are presented in the fifth section.

Description of the Sample

The sample was selected from a population of over 400
novels, compiled from the lists found in previous studies, most notably those of Lyons (1962), VanderMeer (1982), and Maddock-Cowart (1989). A major criterion for inclusion in the study was that the novels contain one or more of the academic administrative leadership positions designated for academic leadership study, i.e., president, vice-president, dean, and department head of an American college or university. The sample was comprised of a collection of 40 novels published between January 1, 1950 and December 31, 1989. There were 32 male authors and eight female authors represented by the selection. See Appendix I for a complete listing of the novels selected for inclusion.

Demographic Variables

The demographic variables selected for examination included a description of the geographic location and the type of institution (public or private) represented in the novel, the major character(s) in the novel, and the leadership position(s) of the characters. Many of these variables were readily disclosed, while others were mentioned obscurely, or left undisclosed to the reader. The type of institution (state or public) was occasionally openly stated, but often this information was simply implied through the text. Appendix A contains a complete list of these variables.
Based upon an examination of the novels, the institutions represented in the study were evenly represented from the public and private sectors. There were 18 (45%) public and 22 (55) private institutions represented in the novels. There were two public and eight private institutions represented in the novels of the decade of the 1950s, five public and five private institutions represented in the novels of the decade of the 1960s, five public and five private institutions represented in the novels of the decade of the 1970s, and six public and four private institutions represented in the decade of the 1980s. Two institutions were identified as women's colleges, while two other institutions were identified as religious in foundation and mission.

The location of the institutions in each of the 40 novels was usually identified, although there were six institutions whose location was ambiguous. Harvard University was represented twice, and the University of California at Los Angeles was represented once. Other easily identified locations, represented in the study, were three New York universities, a university in Chicago, and a college in Texas.

The general location of many of the institutions was established through references in the text, describing the
area as: midwest, northeast, south, and west, or the area was unidentified. The northeast and midwest regions were heavily represented, with 18 institutions set in the area of the northeast, 10 in the midwest, three in the south, two in the west and one in the northwest. The remaining six institutions were in unstated locations.

Leadership positions in the novels were the criteria for study, however the leaders were, most often, not the major characters in the novels. The major characters in the novels of the study were most often professors, with 22 represented. Of these professors represented as main characters, 17 were English professors (11 male and six female). There were two male psychology professors, one female theater professor, one male philosophy professor, and one male language professor, presented as main characters in the novels.

Administrators were the major characters in 13 of the 40 novels, with four deans, four presidents, four departmental chairs, and one vice-president. In the remaining novels, students were the major characters in four, and a news director was the major characters in one. There were seven women presented as main character (six English professors and one theater professor).
Analysis of Leadership Types

The leadership analysis focused on leader positions, leadership types, and the decision-making response of the administrators in the novels. These data were identified, collected, presented and analyzed through content analysis of the novels. A comparison was made to determine whether or not the leadership types contained in the literature mirrored the leader activities of the characters in the academic novels of the time period of the study, thereby indicating a match between leadership theory and application, so to better understand the concept of how academic leaders lead.

Leadership Position

There was a total of 97 leadership positions (presidents, vice-presidents, deans, chairpersons) found in the novels with 89 males and 9 females.

There were two female presidents in the decade of the 1970s and one female vice-president in the decade of the 1970s. There were three female deans, two in the decade of the 1960s, and one in the decade of the 1980s. There were two female chairpersons, both in the decade of the 1970s. There was not enough evidence to denote a trend in gender; however, the data presented in Table 2 suggests an absence of female academic leaders in the novels of the study.
Table 2

Administrative Leadership Position Distribution In the Novels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-president</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88 (91%)</td>
<td>9 (9%)</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership Types

The leadership types were: (1) autocratic "high task/low relationship" or telling, (2) democratic "high task/high relationship" or selling, (3) participative "low task/high relationship" or sharing and (4) delegative "low task/low relationship," or minimal. These four types were selected as they were recognized as compatible with the leadership types represented in the literature.

Special categories were established to include those leader characters who did not satisfy the criteria of the
four types in the model selected for the study. Leader characters in the study who demonstrated more than one or all of the leadership behaviors in the model and their leader behavior was modified to match the situation were classified as (5) "situational." Characters found to be in a position of leadership, but lacking sufficient evidence to classify the leader type were placed in the last category of (6) "other." Leadership types as represented by administrative position are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Leadership Types as Represented by Position in the Novels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>President</th>
<th>Vice-President</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presidents

Of the 97 leaders in the study, 28 were presidents. There were 10 presidents in the decade the 1950s, 9 in the decade of 1960s, 7 in the decade of 1970s, and 2 in the decade of 1980s. There were 3 female presidents in the study, 2 in the decade of 1970s, and 1 in the decade of 1980s.

The leadership types in the study were autocratic (telling), democratic (selling), participating (sharing), delegating, (minimal), situational, and other. The "telling" presidents were high task/low relationship in their leader behavior. The "selling" presidents were high task/high relationship in their behavior. The participating or "sharing" presidents were low task/high relationship in their leadership behavior. The delegating or "minimal" presidents were low task/low relationship leaders, and the situational presidents behaved according to the context of the situation, with "varied" leader action. The "other" category classified president characters who did not fit the criteria of the study, or did not offer enough evidence to depict leadership.

Autocratic presidents. Autocratic presidents were leaders who were directive in their leadership behavior. In the decade of 1950-1959, there were six autocratic
presidents, indicating that 60% of the presidents, represented in that decade, were autocratic. In the decade of 1960-1969, there were five autocratic presidents, indicating that 55% of the presidents, represented in that decade, were autocratic. In the decade of 1970-1979, there were three autocratic presidents, indicating that 20% of the presidents, represented in that decade, were autocratic. In the decade of 1980-1989, there was only one autocratic president.

The autocratic presidents were: David Gidney (The Spire, 1952), Andrew Aiken (Stones of the House, 1953), Anthony C. Cabot (Silas Timberman, 1954), Alexander Blackwell (The Searching Light, 1955), Jonathan Dorsey Tower (Eggheads In the Endzone, 1957); Anderson Pomton (Purely Academic, 1958), Adam "Doc" Rivers (The Long Gainer, 1961), Marion Labhart (A New Life, 1961); Bruce Clanronald McAndrews (Elizabeth Appleton, 1963); Lucius Rexford (Giles Goat Boy, 1966), Stewart Orr (The Fires of Arcadia, 1965); Father Hoyt (Gate of Heaven, 1975); Vito (Going Blind, 1977); Sister Francis Ann (A Certain Slant of Light, 1979) and Sythian MacGilvary (With Faith and Fury, 1985).

In The Spire (1952) President David Gidney was autocratic, high task/low relationship, when he made decisions and directed changes which would affect the
tradition of the college and ignore the wishes of the older faculty members. When the old dean resigned in protest Gidney plowed ahead to find a successor, appointing Henry Gaunt (p. 98).

President Andrew Aiken (*Stones of the House*, 1953) was an autocratic, high task/low relationship leader, because he kept information to himself and generally directed his subordinates and colleagues toward the completion of tasks without allowing feedback. For instance, Aiken told Dean John Abner, "Angela tells me one of us will have to accept that preaching engagement at Prampton Academy. . . . I hate to put it off on you, but if you could . . ." (p. 15).

Later when meeting with the chairman of the board of the college he demonstrated autocratic (directive) leadership behavior, when he informed the chairman, "I had hoped . . . that perhaps you could take it on yourself to explain to them, if you approve. . . . After all, we'll have to act quickly if we want to cool off the excitement and put the whole thing on a plane of reasonable discussion" (p. 100).

*Silas Timberman* (1954) was one of two novels in the study wherein the administrators were preoccupied with the "communist threat" of the McCarthy era. President Anthony C. Cabot's behavior was definitely high task/low
relationship, when he instilled fear into certain members of his faculty. For example, he called English Professor Silas Timberman to a private conference to observe Timberman's reaction to a letter another member of the faculty had written, in which the colleague refused to participate in the dictated "civil defense program" (p. 48). Cabot went on to direct Timberman to disclose who had circulated a petition, to outlaw atomic weapons, on campus. Then Cabot asked whether, or not, Timberman was a communist (pp. 54-5).

Timberman's fearful reaction to Cabot's behavior was evident, because the narrator said, he felt "the dangers of incurring this man's anger and enmity" (p. 53).

The "communist threat" was also evident in The Searching Light (1955). President Alexander Blackwell's high task/low relationship behavior was directed toward the demand that members of the faculty must sign a "loyalty oath" (p. 52). In justifying the action, he said:

I'd like to be practical for a moment. The question of university appropriations is coming up this spring . . . our funds are in jeopardy unless we clean house. We also face an investigation by the Committee on Un-American Activities if we don't act now (p. 84). Blackwell and his team formed a conspiracy, as they planned to confront the "era of
laissez faire toward communism" (p. 91) which was described as "a serious peril, a menace toward our liberties and civilization, to Penfield University in particular" (p. 92). Blackwell credited those responsible, and vowed to direct the activity of ridding the university of the menace, as he said: . . . Minot, the Cardozas and Curry . . . have been active in all the campus ruckuses and they cooperate not only with their colleagues but with the students! And they're not the only ones. This university needs a real house-cleaning. (p. 94)

Eggheads In the Endzone (1957) was a farce, contrived to demonstrate how football often could be more important than academics in higher education. President Jonathan Dorsey Tower was an autocratic (high task/low relationship) manipulator, who dictated the curriculum, which he called "The Plan." The Plan required that students read "a list of the World's Hundred Worthiest Works which included Machiavelli, Herbert Spencer, and Newton's Principia" (p. 17).

When Tower accepted a million dollars from an alumnus with the promise of a winning football team, he figured out a way to keep the money and distribute it among his faculty. To accomplish this end, he recruited a coach, got the
faculty drunk, and proposed the "Tower Supersanity Code," which directed that the faculty would make up the team players. Having engineered these activities successfully, he observed: A single, clever man, and especially one with legal training and ingrained habits of sobriety, is demonstrably the master of hundreds of lesser wits and a few alcoholics" (p. 45).

Another autocratic president was Anderson Pomton (Purely Academic, 1958). He was "regarded by his faculty as a necessary evil," and "the only means of obtaining funds for salaries" (p. 5).

Pomton was equally distrustful of his subordinates and favored a structured check on activities, since "The business office housed the one operation on the campus in which [Pomton] felt genuine confidence . . . it was the only operation that was in any real sense audited" (p. 5). Both his professional and personal investments demonstrated an autocratic (high task/low relationship) bent. Having personally invested in a development scheme near the campus Pomton "closed one entrance of the University grounds with a heavy chain, and the [competitive] real-estate development beyond it . . . withered and died" (p. 6).

Pomton manipulated funds and people throughout the novel, and when he resigned he "made it clear that he would
do all in his power to pass the crown [the presidency]" to a man of his choosing (p. 213). Demonstrating his lack of relationship orientation, as Pomton worked to get his man elected, he reflected "for the hundredth time that presiding over an academic faculty was like being pecked to death by ducks" (p. 255). Finally, when he appeared to have failed in his mission, Pomton "was furious. He had set his heart on the role of king-maker" (p. 277).

Adam "Doc" Rivers (The Long Gainer, 1961) was another autocratic (high task/low relationship) leader as he displayed his directive technique, during a discussion concerning accreditation for the university. There was some doubt, among the members of the committee that the university was ready for accreditation, until Doc Rivers announced sharply, "In my view we'd better be ready . . . I've already invited the accreditation team. Second the motion. At Rivers' announcement, Every hand went up" (p. 23).

As with Rivers', President Marion Labhart's (A New Life, 1961) autocratic (high task/low relationship) leadership was accepted with little or no opposition. In a discussion of new ideas for the curriculum a new professor was told by a veteran professor, "There's only one leader at Cascadia College and that's Marion Labhart. What he wants
is what we get." The new professor inquired, "Couldn't it [new curriculum] be suggested to him?" The professor replied, "It has been, but it won't do any good until he falls over it himself. One has to be careful with that type" (p. 99).

For instance, when President Labhart decided to fire a professor who was not "careful," but active in an anti-Fascist Scientists' committee. First, Labhart had a dossier compiled on the professor and called a college-wide open meeting to denounce the professor as a "fellow-traveling radical" (p. 40). (This label referred to the professor's membership in the Communist Party.) Second, Labhart had a list of the professor's "indiscretions" mimeographed and distributed to the audience. Finally, Labhart told the professor in front of the entire assembly, that he was a disgrace to the institution and his contract would not be renewed" (p. 40).

President Bruce Clanronald McAndrews' (Elizabeth Appleton, 1963) autocratic (hightask/low relationship) leadership was demonstrated when he directed Dean Appleton to handle a dispute in the Interfraternity Council. McAndrews stated, "I could have ordered you to take this responsibility as part of your duties, but I don't like to order anybody to do anything unless it becomes absolutely
necessary." (p. 224). Dean Appleton, notably not too eager to comply, asked, "It's an order, even if it is in the form of a request?" President McAndrews said, "Depends on your reply to the request" (p. 225).

The Fires of Arcadia (1965) was another farce, infusing goat-man satyrs with co-eds and ending in tragic disarray. President Stewart Orr believed in "liberty untrammeled by rules" (p. 21). He directed his innovations autocratically (high task/low relationship), and any faculty who disagreed found employment elsewhere. Furthermore, when Orr hired faculty or staff he "developed a kind of ritual of initiation," and "chose his team wisely" (p. 22). In short, Orr "was looking for disciples, not critics" (p. 24).

Orr followed through vigorously on matters which suited his purposes, and since the founder of the college had provided in the charter that, "the president had absolute powers if not of life and death, at least of summary dismissal, of any member of the faculty" (p. 39). Orr went virtually unchallenged. President Orr exercised his will in all matters of both curriculum and evaluations. Concerning grading practices, Orr "abolished grades and tests" (p. 45), and concerning matters of curriculum choice, he "selected designated readings for all students" (p. 45).
Giles Goat Boy (1966) was another farce and the leader of the institution, Chancellor Lucius Rexford, was decidedly autocratic (high task/low relationship) in his behavior. In the midst of a "war between the colleges" under his control, he was arbitrarily mixed in his opinions. He confounded the "profs" by thinking of "WESCAC (the main computer)" as a "colleague instead of [an] enemy," and he believed "the only cure for knowledge (was) more knowledge" (p. 444). Rexford also thought, "People ought to mind their own business, and get their work done, and not ask basic questions like whether anything's worth doing!" He was of the dogmatic opinion that "order is better than disorder." He didn't "question that for a second, and he didn't "care to hear it questioned" (p. 445).

The novels set in a religious context offered a special milieu due to the structure of the clerical context. However, the "understood procedure," of the clerics, was similar to academic procedures overall, due to the observance of hierarchy involved in the order of decision making. For instance Father Hoyt, as president of the catholic college in Gate of Heaven, (1975) repeatedly gave orders to Father Faiblesse, although Faiblesse was Hoyt's religious superior. Father Hoyt was completely confident that his dictates, promises and threats [as president] would
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be followed as he sought to defeat all opposition to a college building proposal. He tells Faiblesse:

When the election is held . . . you will preside.

You do not have to accept the results of the election.
If Tumulty is not voted in, you void the election and appoint him superior of Porta Coeli. That is perfectly within your rights. You know the rules of the society.

(p. 250)

The autocratic (high task/low relationship) president in Going Blind (1977) was never directly introduced in the novel. President Vito moved behind the scenes in matters of hiring and dictating apparent "tenure quotas," allowing his staff to "handle it" through his system of "telling." For instance, the assistant reported:

President Vito called me in this morning. He had the Times on his desk. When he read that you were blind and were involved in a killing he wanted to know what the hell was going on. Pending a report, which he asked me to write, he's deleted your name from the list recommended for tenure. (p. 173)

One of the female presidents, Sister Francis Ann, A Certain Slant of Light (1979) was autocratic (high task/low relationship) toward her subordinates and colleagues. For instance, when a veteran faculty member became the victim of
a stroke, Sister Francis was found to possess little sympathy. When the faculty member collapsed and couldn't continue her schedule, Sister Francis was concerned about the teaching schedule. On the practical side, Francis said, "It was thoughtful of her to fall ill so close to Christmas. We'll have ample time to find a substitute to take over her classes" (p. 31). Later when Sister Aquinas, a subordinate remarked:

I stopped by the chapel for a minute before I came here . . . to say a prayer for her. As soon as it was out of her mouth, she [Aquinas] realized she shouldn't have said it. In confirmation, she caught the cold blue glint in Sister Francis's eye. You are not authorized to pray for a member of the faculty before I do, the look said. (p. 31)

The novel (With Faith and Fury, 1985) presented a religious context of misguided faith and unprecedented fury concerning the free discussion of religious beliefs. While President Sythian MacGilvary insisted he was anxious to maintain the atmosphere of a modern, progressive university, he refused to implement the concept. MacGilvary regarded philosophy Professor Adrian DeWulf with fury, because DeWulf had angered MacGilvary and the trustees by "comparing himself and his fellow board members" with the "Presidium of
the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR" (p. 398). DeWulf was also "lipping off all the time on religion" and using antireligious arguments (p. 399). Finally, MacGilvary told his secretary to "remind him halfway through the winter term to have DeWulf terminated. He would have done it on the spot, but he had not wanted to disrupt the philosophy department" and, he realized "it would not be prudent [legally] . . . to remove even so lowly a person as a temporary faculty member on religious grounds" (p. 399).

Democratic presidents. When evidence was found that the presidential characters in the study sought feedback from their subordinates and colleagues, they were judged to have high task/high relationship leader behavior. These leaders identified the task, and were high on decision making, however they generally arrived at decision making through the use of feedback from others. There were three democratic presidents in the decade of the 1950s. There were two democratic presidents in the decade of 1960s. There were no democratic presidents in the selected novels published in the decades of 1970s and 1980s.

Of the 28 presidents in the study, 5 were classified as a democratic, or "selling," leadership type. These were Maynard Hoar (The Groves of Academe, 1951),

President Maynard Hoar The Groves of Academe (1951) was a democratic (high task/high relationship) leader, who had difficulty releasing English Professor Henry Mulcahy from the faculty, even though there was no funding to keep the professor hired. Mulcahy aligned himself with the humanities faculty and tried to build a power base under the guise of academic freedom. He went further and claimed to be a communist in order to force President Hoar to award him a new, permanent contract. Diplomatically, Hoar met with two humanities professors, who were sympathetic to Malcahy's cause, to discuss the reason for Mulcahy's termination. During this meeting, Hoar's behavior was both high task and high relationship. Hoar began by saying, "I'm not going to be stuffy . . . I recognize the right of this faculty to oppose what I do and, if they can, to amend it" (p. 172-3). He went on to state his position by saying, "Let's get this straight between the three of us. There was nothing permanent for Hen . . . Hen isn't being paid out of department funds; he's on a special stipend, borrowed from the emergency reserve (p. 176-7).
Dwight Robbins (Pictures From an Institution, 1952) was high task/high relationship. His high relationship leadership behavior was evident, as he performed his tasks in a "selling" manner. Robbins spent half his time on money-raising tours among the alumnae and/or his students' parents, grandparents and guardians (p. 27). The supporters of the college were almost mesmerized by Robbins high task/high relationship technique. According to the narrator, "Not to give [Robbins] what he asked, they felt would have been to mine the bridge that bears the train that carries the supply of this year's Norman Rockwell Boy Scout Calendars" (p. 27).

Another example was in the hiring of a faculty member. During the encounter, Robbins announced the low salary to the prospective faculty member and proceeded to admitted that "the salary was not what either would have wished it, but [Robbins] explained why it couldn't be in a way that was new to her" (p. 5).

Homer Virgil Vaughn (A Friend In Power, 1958) appeared to have learned to work with people, using democratic leadership technique to bring about the result he wanted. He believed "Power can be used or it can be abused . . . if you transcend the base uses of power, you can do a lot of good" (p. 239). Vaughn was described as a leader who "lined up his personnel" and ran "the whole shebang in such a way that he help[ed] others in their search for truth" (p. 239).
President Blake Tillotson (A Small Room, 1961) appeared to be a democratic leader, since he accepted feedback in a high task/high relationship manner. He sought and accepted information from both the professors and the deans, as well as from outside influences. There were two conferences in the novel, during which he directed, was open to feedback, allowing information to flow freely. He asked questions to guide the group toward the goal of solving the problems to everyone's satisfaction.

In one instance, an honor student was charged with plagiarism and was being ostracized by the students. Normally the student council handled such matters, but there was a charge that the council "was being emasculated" (p. 147); therefore, the council was told to "call on the President and present their case to him . . ." (p. 147). This action indicated that Tillotson was open to their ideas.

At the end of the disciplinary meeting, after much consideration by those present, Tillotson said:

I think I now have the sense of this meeting at last. With your permission, I am going to call the faculty and present [the student's] case in the light of all we have been saying. I shall try to move away from the passions . . . to the big questions that confront us . . . . (p. 180)

The character of Wilfred Mooney (The President, 1964)
exhibited democratic leadership (high task/high relationship) behavior. It was Mooney's desire to create his idea of what a university should be, while pleasing the students, the staff, the faculty, and the towns-folk. Toward that end "the first bargain that he offered to everyone else was, Let me get my hands bloody or dirty if necessary to Get the Job Done, while you keep your's clean to gather the benefits. But let me . . . (p. 76).

Mooney kept his subordinates and colleagues on task through the use of positive comments. He said, "I'll always need people better than I to fill in the gaps for me, catch me when I wobble, tell me off when I'm wrong" (p. 166).

The university spent more money than the budget allowed, because Mooney led his staff astray from moral responsibility through "attractive suggestions" (p. 168). He knew what he wanted and he used high task/high relationship leadership technique to get it. The narrator said that:

Mooney's genius was not in discerning how the other man might be bound to him . . . but in giving [the idea] the human sound of hope, giving an affirmative voice to amoral possibility so it could become their purpose and therefore their responsibility, like a choice. (p. 168)

Participative presidents. Participative leaders shared the burden of decision making with their subordinates, their
colleagues, and/or their superiors. The leadership behavior exhibited was low task/high relationship. There were no participative presidents in the decades of 1950-1959 and 1960-1969. There was one participative president in the decade of 1970-1979, and one in the decade of 1980-1989.

Of the 28 presidents in the study, two were judged to be participative. The participative leaders shared their decision making with colleagues or subordinates. The three participative presidents were President Doran (*Journey To Shalin*, 1971), Clare Norton (*Sweet Death, Kind Death*, 1984).

President Doran in (*Journey to Shalin*, 1971) had a mentor in Dean George Chambers, since Doran shared his decision making with the dean throughout the novel. He looked to the dean for insight into the problems of running the university. Chambers thought Doran used him. While the president was "chatty and intimate," Chambers saw him as manipulative. He thought Doran:

- clearly had his own motives; as an experienced administrator, he was capable (as Chambers was uneasily aware) of obtaining in dialogue a series of agreements that could lead his conversational partner to conclusions the partner might not wish to reach. Chambers disliked calculated friendliness as much as he disliked the ready-made phrases Doran often used. (p. 99)

However, low task/high relationship leadership was obvious between the two men. Doran took Chambers' judgement...
and ability for granted, and Doran did not correct Chambers' transgressions, as he may have someone else. For instance, on one occasion, when President Doran visited Dean Chambers' office he noticed Chambers was smoking a marijuana cigarette, but Doran did not censor Chambers' behavior. The narrator said this was because "the President of Bragwen was always caught between his desire for easy familiarity with staff and faculty and a need to maintain the dignity of a more remote position" (p. 93). These comments appear to be indicative of low task/high relationship behavior.

One of the female presidents in the study, President Clare Norton (Sweet Death, Kind Death, 1984), appeared to be low task/high relationship, although there was scant administrative evidence to give a true picture. The factor which implied that Norton made participatory decisions (based upon consideration of the opinions of other characters) was evident, when she said, "We all, that is the trustees and I, put our thinking caps on and decided to appoint you to our task force on the question of Gender Studies" (pp. 31-32).

Delegative presidents. Delegative leaders delegated the decision and responsibility to others. The leadership behavior evidenced by these leadership characters was expected to be low task/low relationship. Of the 28 presidents, 2 were delegative. There were no delegative presidents in the decade of 1950-1959. There was one
delegative president in the decade of 1960-1969. There was one delegative president in the decade of 1970-1979. There were no delegative presidents in the decade of 1980-1989. The delegative presidents in the study were Wells Thornton (The Dollar Diploma, 1960), Mrs. Tom Wade (End Zone, 1972).

Wells Thornton, (The Dollar Diploma, 1960) assumed the post of president and appointed Mark Franklin Bratton to be his second-in-command. Thornton regarded Bratton as capable of implementing his directives, so he described the tasks and delegated the work to Bratton. Thornton's delegative leadership, low task/high relationship, was evident because he, "asked for recommendations from every department, division, and school, and [then] dodged down to Arizona for two winter months, leaving the flames [of change] sweeping across the campus behind him" (p. 59).

Another delegative, low task/high relationship, president in the novels of the study was Mrs. Tom Wade (Endzone, 1972). Her deceased husband had been the founder and president of the college and she was carrying on the tradition. She was delegative because, like Thornton, she deferred the work of implementation of policy to her subordinates (p. 7).

Situational presidents. Situational leaders displayed a variety of leadership techniques, indicating they used different types of leadership behavior to fit the situation.
Of the 28 presidents in the study, there appeared to be no situational leaders.

**Other presidents.** Types of leadership which did not match those criteria of autocratic, democratic, participative, delegative, or situational were classified as "other." The leaders in this classification demonstrated either confused, manipulative, or impoverished leadership qualities. Also, when the evidence was too slight to classify the character, they were placed in this category.

There were four presidents classified as "other" in the study, one in the decade of 1950-1959. There was one in the decade of 1960-1969. There were two in the decade of 1970-1979. There were no presidents classified as "other" in the decade of 1980-1989.

The presidents classified as "other" were: President Poore (*Pnin*, 1953), Raynsford (*The Dollar Diploma*, 1960), Gregory Blackwell (*A Man In Charge*, 1979), President Garrett (*Unholy Loves*, 1979).

President Poore's (*Pnin*, 1953) leadership was minimal, since he was "relatively blind" and moved "in his private darkness to an invisible luncheon" (p. 71). Poore was an impoverished leader, and the fact that he delegated his duties to others was lost in the fact that he was virtually ineffective.

President Raynsford (*The Dollar Diploma*, 1960) was mentioned scantily as the president who was leaving, and who
had introduced the concept of "individualized education," having "sold" the concept to the majority of the other administrators and faculty. There was too little leadership evidence to classify Raynsford.

President Gregory Blackwell was perceived by Vice-president Taylor (a Man In Charge, 1979) as "industrious" and "only slightly bumbling" (p. 71). Blackwell's leadership was manipulative and devious. For instance, when he called Taylor at home to inform him of the creation of a search committee to select a new president, Taylor suspected Blackwell's motives were less than honest and "that he was about to be conned" (p. 239). Taylor had expected to be named the new president without the use of a search committee. When Taylor inquired about the apparent existence of a search committee, Blackwell said evasively:

It's true that it's never been done this way before. But times have changed. There's so much pressure of group participation . . . But after everything that's happened in the last few years, I don't think it would be wise to appear arbitrary. It's better to let as many members of the faculty and the trustees as possible feel that they're involved in the decision making. (p. 240)

President Garrett (Unholy Loves, 1979) was mentioned in the context of someone else wanting his position. There was not enough information to classify his leadership type.
Vice-president

There were eight vice-presidents in the novels of the study. Five of these characters were autocratic. There were no democratic, no participative, no delegative, no situational leaders in the category. There were three characters classified as "other," since either their behavior did not clearly demonstrate the criteria of leadership necessary in order to be classified, or evidence was lacking to describe their leadership behavior.

These characters were second-in-command to the president. They were often the "movers and the shakers" in the novels. The vice-presidents usually reacted procedurally, within the guidelines of the institution. All the vice-presidents, with the possible exception of Sister Aquinas, were noticeably ambitious.

Autocratic vice-president. Of the eight vice-presidents in the study, five (62%) were autocratic (high task/low relationship). There were no vice-presidents in the decade of 1950-1959. There were three vice-presidents in the decade of 1960-1969, and all three were autocratic. There were three vice-presidents in the decade of 1970-1979, and one of three was autocratic. There were two vice-presidents in the decade of 1980-1989s, and one was autocratic. The autocratic vice-presidents in the study were Mark Franklin Brattan (The Dollar Diploma, 1960), W. Denton Tate (The Long Gainer, 1961), George Hand (The
President (1964), Conrad Taylor, (A Man In Charge, 1979), and Alec Witt (The Dean's December, 1982).

Vice-president Mark Franklin Brattan (The Dollar Diploma, 1960) was viewed as a change-agent, and his ideas merged with President Thornton's toward the implementation of policy. Through the use of high task/low relationship methods Brattan performed a survey gathering information which would demonstrate to the board of trustees that a major fund-raising job was absolutely essential" (p. 56). Throughout the book, Brattan's high task/low relationship behavior persuaded the majority of the educators and the administrators to accept the new policies.

W. Denton Tate (The Long Gainer, 1961) was high task/low relationship with a bent toward taking over the office of the president. Tate knew "Doc" Rivers was "old" in the job and, after Rivers decided to run for the office of Governor, Tate expected to take over the running of the university. However, Rivers retained the power of the office because of his strong political base.

Tate was "despised" for his overbearing manner. At one disciplinary conference, while he was not the presiding officer, he took over the job. Dean Shoemaker, at first, tried to hold the meeting without Tate's knowledge to avoid his attendance. However, Tate arrived, and while he "declined to preside," he assumed "the brisk air of authority . . ." (p. 311). As the conference continued,
"his voice was biting," when he took her papers and leafed through [Dean Shoemaker's] report, "snorting" his disapproval (p. 311).

George Hand (The President (1964) was an autocratic leader, since the context of his decision making was generally procedural. Specifically, he had worked with the presidents and had "made the general policies and the multitudinous daily rulings that gave Wellford its character . . . during much of that time [the president] had set the tone, George directed the tune" (p. 26-7).

Conrad Taylor (A Man In Charge, 1979) was also an autocratic leader. While perceived as "haughty," by some of his associates, he used this as "a mask," since he was more comfortable with distance from others (p. 13). In his decision-making Taylor tried to arrange things and people. He saw himself as "a worldly man" and he defined this quality as being able to know:

how wide the range of possibilities is for each decision that may affect the future . . . how flexible, how unpredictable, how intuitive and subjective the decisions that bring about the shifts . . . so that he could go about rearranging the elements involved into an entirely different picture. (p. 17)

In action, Taylor autocratically handled an issue of plagiarism by one of the professors recommended for tenure, by calling the university printer and directing the best way
to identify the plagiarized book as a "translation" (p. 41-42). Taylor arbitrarily handled a leave-of-absence request by a homosexual professor, arranging for the professor to have time off to take a trip to France (p. 68-9). When faced with the possibility of a thief among his office staff, Taylor discovered his graduate assistant was the guilty person. He handled this problem through dismissal (p. 78-9). Finally, when a young man was refused entry into the university as a student and threatened Taylor with a gun, Taylor disarmed the man and directed a cover up (p. 268-271).

Vice-president Alec Witt (The Dean's December, 1982) was described as the university "strong man" (p. 195). He was autocratic (high task/low relationship) because he directed and ridiculed Dean Corde's leadership behavior. Witt wanted Corde to resign his position, because he felt Corde was inadequate, and unsuited to be dean. When Corde published several critical magazine articles without clearance from the college, Corde made his own dismissal easy for Witt. In these infamous articles Corde had attacked "politicians, businessmen, the professions" and "even the Governor" (p. 198).

In matters of administrative technique, Witt was described as a man with a "brutal infrastructure, which could not be covered up" (p. 198). He was:

One of the shrewdest operators that ever
lived... the up-to-date American strongman. You felt his muscle the instant you engaged him. No one was more smooth, more plausible, long-headed, low-keyed than Witt. A man of masterly politeness, ultra-polite, he had decided (elected in cold blood) to adopt the mild role. (p. 198)

Corde told his wife of Witt's successful autocratic technique in gaining [Corde's] resignation, saying Witt "maneuvered" the encounter in "short rushes. Each one of them pleasant," and [Witt] "executed this like a kind of angel. He bound me while he hit me" (p. 339).

Democratic vice-president. There were no democratic (high task/high relationship) vice-presidents in the study.

Participative vice-president. Of the eight vice-presidents in the study none were participative (low task/high relationship).

Delegative vice-president. None of the vice-presidents in the study were found to be delegative (low task/low relationship).

Situational vice-president. Of the eight vice-presidents in the study, none possessed a variety of behaviors to fit each situation.

Other vice-presidents. Of the eight vice-presidents in the study, three did not fit the criteria of the leader
types in the study. There were two in the decade of 1970-1979. There was one vice president in the decade of 1980-1989. These vice-presidents, classified as "other," were Sister Aquinas (A Certain Slant of Light, 1979), Waller (Unholy Loves, 1979) and Roberts (With Faith and Fury, 1985). Of these characters, none demonstrated leadership.

Sister Aquinas (A Certain Slant of Light, 1979) was prominent in the story, but not as a leader. She was the "side-kick" of her superior, Sister Francis, and Aquinas' behavior was modeled after her superior. An excellent description of Aquinas's behavior was: "After thirteen years of being in second place, (Aquinas) had developed a Pavlovian affirmative response to whatever her superior said" (p. 125).

Waller (Unholy Loves, 1979) and Roberts (With Faith and Fury, 1985) were mentioned only in the context of holding the position of vice-president.

Dean. The dean characters offered the largest group of leaders in the novels. There were 31 deans. Of these, the largest group was unclassifiable, since 14 of the dean characters mentioned, either did not offer enough evidence to demonstrate leadership, or the character behavior could not be classified as autocratic, democratic, participative, delegative, or situational.

The deans were often without first names and occasionally were without names at all. In this case, they
were often referred to as "Dean." For instance, in Purely Academic (1958) a professor said of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, "a proper name would specify too much, whereas this particular dean was mere deanliness" (p. 83).

There were nine autocratic, six democratic, two participative, no delegative, and no situational leadership types demonstrated in the study. Fourteen deans were placed in the "other category," because the characters either demonstrated "varied" leadership techniques, or were unclassifiable due to lack of leadership information.

**Autocratic dean.** Of the 31 deans in the study, 9 were autocratic. The autocratic deans were high task/low relationship in that they directed activity. These leaders were not open to feedback and they maintained set rules or norms along the lines of understood procedure. There was one autocratic dean in the decade of the 1950s, two in the decade of 1960s, two in the decade of 1970s, and four in the decade of 1980s.

The nine deans in the study who were classified as autocratic were Dean Aswell (The Searching Light, 1955), Dean Barnes (The Dollar Diploma, 1960), Gordon Finch (Stoner, 1965), Strutmyer (Klynt's Law, 1976), Oliver Byrne (Unholy Loves, 1979), Tony Thatcher (The Class, 1985), Hamilton S. F. Branniff (With Faith and Fury, 1985), and Deans Edward Fromme and Dean Anita Andrews, (Professor Romeo, 1989).
Dean of the Law School, Aswell (The Searching Light, 1955) was also high task/low relationship. He was directive with his colleagues, speaking "deliberately and with self-confidence" while preparing for a meeting with the president concerning the "communist threat" (81). Aswell strongly protested the "wording of the oath," insisting it was ambiguous and spoke of "other subversive organizations," which he believed represented "loose terminology" (p. 88). He said "a man with the most innocent organizational connections might easily label himself subversive under these terms" (p. 88). At first, he participated in the decision to join the non-signers of the oath, then he changed sides. Later, he brought information from President Blackwell which could undermine the non-signers resolve. This persuaded many of them to sign the loyalty oath. Finally, Aswell became an inquisitor for the Loyalty Board, thereby participating in the persecution of the faculty who were on the "black list" (p. 250).

Dean Barnes (The Dollar Diploma, 1960) was the Dean of students at Fox University. Barnes was autocratically opposed to "individualized education," because it required that professors hold discussions in class. He said: "Why should we expect a man who holds a Ph.D to waste his time listening to the opinions of his students" (p. 69). When a colleague answered, "He might learn something" Barnes replied, "Be serious . . . we're discussing education"
Later in the book, Barnes invited a speaker who offended everyone with an attack on American life. He also used money toward his own advantage and offended others through his dogmatic attitude. Barnes favored supporting football over individual academic achievement, saying:

If I were president... I'd take a second look at Individualized Education. It's a contradiction in terms. Whether we like it or not, education is too expensive to be anything but a mass process, like cattle breeding. (p. 32)

Dean Gordon Finch (Stoner, 1965) was autocratic (high task/low relationship). When Lomax threatened to "bring charges" against William Stoner, Finch said, "There will be no charges. I don't know how this thing is going to resolve itself, and I don't particularly care. But there will be no charges" (p. 172).

Later in the novel, when Lomax cuts Stoner's graduate schedule, Stoner begins teaching graduate curriculum to undergraduate students. Lomax appeals to Finch to do something about Stoner's class content, and Finch behaves autocratically, saying:

He's got you... You want me to do the job for you?... How do you think that would look---a dean meddling in how a senior member of the department teaches his classes, and meddling at the instigation of the department chairman himself? No sir. You take
care of it yourself, the best way you can. (p. 228)

Dean Strutmyer (Klynt's Law, (1976), was the new dean of humanities and he "allowed each full professor one hour" (p. 4). The dean did not like professor Tobias Klynt's parapsychology research, taking exception to the intent of Klynt's psychology courses, autocratically, telling Klynt to "think about the practical application" of his teaching. Strutmyer said, "What use will [the courses] be to your students later on? I'm speaking now only of practicality" (p. 80). Then he asked Klynt in a "freewheeling" manner about "psychology in hotel management" and psychology in driver education" (p. 81).

Finally, when funding was cut in the department, Dean Strutmyer told Klynt, "We'll have to phase out the parapsychology department. Really a question of space more than anything else" (p. 81). Registering Klynt's disappointment at his loss of appropriation, the dean directed, "At moments like these, it's often best to make a good hard assessment of oneself" (p. 80).

Dean Oliver Byrne (Unholy Loves, 1979) was autocratic, since he knew a professor he had appointed was "unreliable," yet he "intended to keep him . . . just the same." When "a number of his colleagues . . . wanted him fired, Oliver defended him and (did) not intend to back down. He never backs down. Any sign of weakness would immediately be taken advantage of by his enemies" (p. 83).
Dean Thatcher *The Class* (1985) displayed his autocratic leadership style when a new professor was called into the dean's office and told what to do about grades for athletes. A discussion ensued, wherein the new professor indicated he would not give the athlete a passing grade in Latin. The dean failed to persuade the new professor to compromise, and:

Finally, the dean addressed him in soft, paternal tones. "Ted, let me tell you what's going to happen. You're going to pass Chris Jastrow. And he, in turn, is going to pass for innumerable touchdowns—to the delight of our generous alumni. Now, of course, you and I are aware that the boy doesn't know the first thing about Latin. But we also know that in the scheme of things, it isn't all that important. What matters is that nobody rocks the boat. That way, everybody's future is brighter—including yours." (p. 352)

Dean Hamilton Branniff (*With Faith and Fury*, 1985) was distantly autocratic, sending memos such as the one sent to Rad Reid, Chairman of Philosophy:

This is to instruct you to inform . . . that his services to Algonquin State University will be terminated as of the last working day of March, 1961 . . . Kindly complete the termination form (enclosed herewith) and send it to the personnel office . . . Put inability to work with others' as the cause of
termination and put 'no' in the blank asking whether or not you would rehire the person in question. (p. 383)

Dean Edward Fromme (Professor Romeo, 1989) was also an autocratic high task/low relationship leader. For example, before a sexual grievance hearing concerning one of his professors, Fromme told a reporter, autocratically, "No Reporters." When he was challenged by the man he admonished, "You're out of line, young man . . . what's your name . . . I don't want to see your face here when we're through. Is that clear" (p. 241)? Then during the meeting, he was directive [the meeting was held in his office]. He interrupted a witness, saying, "We're sincerely sorry that you've had a rough time . . . and I wish we had more time so that you could finish your story. But I'm afraid we're running behind schedule" (p. 250).

Later, Fromme allowed the accused to ask a question out of order, "bringing forth a howl of protest" from the other dean, who was supposed to be directing the hearing. [Fromme] ignored the protest saying, "Make it brief" (p. 252).

Dean Anita Andrews (Professor Romeo, 1989) was also an autocratic leader. When confronted with skepticism concerning her new role as Dean of Women's Affairs, she said:

You think I'm some kind of window-dressing for administration image-makers . . . I'm talking sexual
harassment here. It's been allowed to metastasize for years because no man wanted to put anything in place to stop it . . . We're going to get an apparatus on line . . . we're working on a set of guidelines that will go out to every member of the faculty." (p. 139)

Later, Andrews directed a sexual harassment hearing, stating to the accused, "You will be permitted to ask questions and to present your version if and when it differs . . . but only after the witness has completed her testimony. In other words you may not interrupt" (p. 244).

Democratic dean. Democratic leaders are high task/high relationship, or "selling," in their leader behavior. Of the 31 deans in the study, six were democratic. Six of the deans were in the decade of 1950s, five of the deans were in the decade of 1960s, four of the deans were in the decade of 1970s, and no deans were in the decade of 1980s.

Of the six democratic deans in the study, there were three democratic deans in the decade of the 1950s, two in the decade of the 1960s, one in the decade of the 1970s, and none in the decade of the 1980s. Deans who were democratic leaders in the study were Henry Gaunt (The Spire 1952), Schoeffer (A Friend in Power, 1958), an unnamed dean of humanities Purely Academic (1958), Dean Seagram (A New Life, 1961), John Appleton (Elizabeth Appleton, 1963), and George Chambers (A Journey To Sahalin, 1971).

Dean Henry Gaunt (The Spire 1952) was a democratic
leader, demonstrating high task/high relationship behavior. When old Dean Markham resigned, because of what Markham considered to be changes in tradition of the college, Gaunt was appointed Markham's successor. Gaunt met with several of the professors, striving for a settlement of the dispute. In a discussion with an older professor, Gaunt said, "these apparent differences are just emotional, I think" (p. 159). Continuing Gaunt assured the man, "My interest in the welfare of the college is great, and I'd like to know what you think I might do . . . right now I dread the prospect of being dean. I should welcome advice" (p. 159). Dean Schoeffer (A Friend In Power, 1958) was democratic, because he was both directive and persuasive. He was said to be:

systematic always. . . a good administrator,
humane and kindly. He investigated his cases,
talked them over frankly with his subordinate administrators, satisfied himself that he had his finger on the situation's pulse, and up his mind, then moved in fast with his decision. (p. 47)

An unnamed dean of humanities Purely Academic (1958) was also democratic. This particular "unnamed dean" presided over a lengthy faculty meeting, through the use of Robert's Rules of Order (p. 84) and spent several hours urging for "compromise" (p. 89-95).

We were told that Dean Seagram, (A New Life, 1961) had
upset the English department with his plans for an election" of a new chairman (p. 273). Seagram was high task/high relationship, since he was open to suggestion and feedback from subordinates. While considering an open dialogue between "technologists" and the "liberal arts people," his response was:

... if we could get the right sort of group.

Maybe the approach should be to ask the Council of Deans informally to sponsor the project so that it doesn't look like a propaganda job of the Liberal Arts Service Division ... Drop by my office some time ... let's talk about it ... it's worth trying.

(p. 274-5)

Dean John Appleton (Elizabeth Appleton, 1963) helped "iron out" a "great big charley-horse" with discipline in the fraternities, by meeting with the council members and helping them arrive at a decision about expelling a member. He performed in a high task/high relationship manner, selling them on keeping the discussion in the meeting secret and guiding the members into settling the matter fairly (pp. 227-8).

Dean George Chambers (A Journey To Sahalin, 1971) believed that "there should be a system of redress for anybody who had a complaint--. . ." (p. 109). He disliked the "manipulation" and "administrative language" used by President Doran. When he was offered the vice-presidency,
Chambers knew:

to accept it would be to use his own reputation with the faculty . . . to [diplomatically] push through a program [the black studies program] stalled both by its problems and by a lack of confidence in the president's leadership. (p. 99)

Participative deans. Participative leaders share decisions with others and ask for feedback. These leaders were low task/high relationship, and they did not appear to favor making a decision without input from others. Of the 31 deans in the study, two demonstrated participative leadership. One of these participative leaders was female. Of the two participative deans in the study, one was in the decade of 1960s, and one was in the decade of 1980s. The deans who were participative were Dean Valentine (The Small Room, 1961), Dean Joe Dimbleson (Opening Nights, 1985).

Early in the novel Dean Valentine (The Small Room, 1961) was frowning and irritated, but later in the novel she becomes more conciliatory. Dean Valentine assumed an attitude of patience and control as she "waited" for "all things [to] happen in their own good time" (181). In the later session of problem solving, Dean Valentine quietly asked questions and participated in arriving at a solution, asking for responsible alternatives and fairness.

Dean of Arts and Sciences, Joe Dimbleson (Opening Nights, 1985) was an example of a "strong" participative
leader, since he did not lose control of the leadership function. During a meeting of an Equity Review Committee, Joe opened the discussion by saying:

a sex equity adjustment could not be made for Ms. Una Pendleton of the Music Department unless one was also made Ms. Ellen Chiesa of Italian. Harvey Nims pointed out, confirming, that the budget breakdown of Modern Languages showed an eight percent poorer record, sex wise, than Music. Oswald Link raised the issue of whether Ms. Chiesa's being half Sicilian put her in the minority category. Sam Whittle averred that she was not half Sicilian but married to a full Sicilian, which was not the same thing. Harvey opined that she was half Sicilian and married to a Sicilian. Sam evinced that if she were Sicilian she would be Eleena and not Ellen. Joe did not consider this conclusive. Harvey was appointed to look into it. (p. 26)

Delegative deans. Delegative leaders develop policy, put someone in charge of a situation, and move out of the picture. They trust others to do the work satisfactorily. There were no delegative deans in the selected novels of the study.

Situational deans. Of the 31 deans found in the selected novels of the study, none were situational.

Other deans. Of the 31 deans in the selected novels of
the study, 14 were found who did not fit the classifications of the study due to lack of information, or ineffective leadership. Six of the deans were unclassifiable in the decade of 1950s, 6 were unclassifiable in the decade of 1960s, and 2 were unclassifiable in the decade of 1970s.

The 14 deans under the classification of "other" were Frederick Markham (The Spire, 1952), John Abner (The Stones of the House, 1953), Deans Woodruff and McClure (A Friend In Power, 1958), Deans Harley St. John and Cartwright (The Dollar Diploma, 1960), Dean Feeney (A New Life, 1961), Elsie Shoemaker (The Long Gainer, 1961), an unnamed dean of the college (The Small Room, 1961), Royce Morgan (The President, 1964), Joshia Cleremont (Stoner, 1965), unnamed dean (Entertaining Strangers, 1977), Albert Corde (The Dean's December, 1982), and Dean Blickstein (Mickelsson's Ghosts, 1982).

Academic Dean Frederick Markham (The Spire, 1952) was introduced early in the novel as "the Dean" (p. 11). Markham was traditional and, stubbornly, refused to compromise toward progressive change in leadership. He resigned as academic dean because he said the new president was sacrificing the:

great ideals that have made our college—as well as our nation—great (p. 163). I am proud . . . to take my stand . . . If my action can even in the slightest degree help to remind this . . .
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institution of its great heritage I shall feel rewarded. (p. 164)

Dean John Abner (The Stones of the House, 1953) followed the leadership of President Aiken. Abner was not presented in the role of leader in the novel. He followed orders and implemented policy, and there was every implication that, as dean of students, he was probably effective (pp. 15-20).

Dean John Harley St. John (The Dollar Diploma, 1960) seemed to be a "prima donna, with a "one-man rule" of the law school at Fox University. When curriculum change was considered, St. John's egotistical style was evident as he refused to discuss the matter with anyone except President Thornton, who "appeared, prepared to listen to a fifteen minute lecture on his own lack of legal knowledge" (p. 60). Once this was accomplished, "St. John agreed to consider the possibilities of improving his offerings to the students" (p. 60-1).

The character of Dean Cartwright, the dean of the Undergraduate School at Fox University (The Dollar Diploma, 1960), offered little example of leadership behavior. While he vowed to fight for the retention of "individualized education" at Fox, there was little evidence of his involvement in leadership.

Elsie Shoemaker (The Long Gainer, 1961) appeared to be consistently a "weak" leader. In the first example in the
novel she was presiding over a disciplinary conference and was overruled by higher authority, which left her "too distraught to say anything" (p. 311), since she was afraid of being fired. In a later example, Shoemaker was asked about the matter and admitted she had been "overruled" by Tate, because he "thought we were being ridiculous" (p. 405). In decision making, she deferred to the opinions of others and these actions made her appear to be a weak leader.

Dean Feeney's (A New Life, 1961) character did not offer enough evidence to disclose his method of leadership. While the indication was that he was procedurally oriented, he was said to be "stingy." A veteran English professor lamented that both Dean Feeney and Chairman Fairchild were:

a conjunction of two constipated stars in the same constellation. For years they kept us dancing in our bare bones; as a result, this department is the lowest paid on the campus. (p. 98)

Dean Royce Morgan (The President, 1964) had a method of persuasion concerning policy that made him valuable to President Winfred Mooney. Morgan went about the campus and town exerting a positive influence, whenever Mooney was in need of money and/or when feelings needed mending, because Mooney had behaved impulsively. For instance, Morgan tried to persuade the librarian "to forget" President Mooney's disregard for her rules and authority, when he and a group
of students were caught eating in the library. Morgan was aware that the "conjectures he had to offer the poor woman could be no more than balm for an irremediable hurt" (p. 79). Morgan participated with President Mooney in his quest for the "prospects of Wellford's big future" (p. 181), and he "did what he could to foresee its shape and prepare for it" (p. 181).

Dean Joshia Cleremont (Stoner, 1965) was:

a small bearded man of advanced age, several years beyond the point of compulsory retirement . . . . his memory was nearly gone; [and] sometimes he became lost in the corridors . . . and had to be led like a child to his desk." (p. 44-5)

Other deans were seen through a window of activity, a circumstance which offered little in regard to leadership. For instance, the leadership activity of an unnamed Dean of Humanities in Entertaining Strangers (1979) was questionable, because the dean was called on vacation and asked for advice concerning the possible hiring of a part-time professor. He used diplomacy, when he said, "Check with the others . . . if the others who met him agree, give him a call. Make it clear the job is only part-time and for one term. If he comes, I'll handle Leo. But I can't imagine he'd come (p. 40).

There was evidence that Dean Albert Corde (The Dean's December, 1982) was "weak" and "non-assertive," when he
prepared for a visitor by directing his secretary, to: "Tell him you're squeezing him in between appointments" (p. 34).

Most of Corde's decision making was dictated by uncontrolled circumstances. He never asked for advice, and did not use either persuasion, or shared decision making. When Corde made a decision he was unsure of himself. He did not possess confidence, and his leadership was hap-hazard.

Dean Blickstein (Mickelsson's Ghosts, 1982) sent an incoming student with a problem to the philosophy department and asks the chair to take care of the student (p. 75). The dean then periodically checks on the student at cocktail parties, and when Mickelsson sent a letter of appeal to save a colleague's job, he expected the dean to send a persuasive "evenhanded letter of information." Mickelsson didn't expect very positive help. He anticipated that he would receive "views from the mountaintop" and "gentle presentations of the larger picture" (p. 382).

The remaining deans were mentioned in passing and did not take part in the academic society of the novel. While Woodruff and McClure (A Friend In Power, 1958) and an unnamed dean of the college in The Small Room (1961) were mentioned, no information was given concerning leadership.

Chairpersons

The role of chairperson indicates an individual in charge of departmental governance, instruction, faculty affairs, student affairs, external communication, budget and
resources, office management, and professional development (Tucker, 1981).

Of these 30 chairpersons, there were 10 (33%) autocratic leaders, 3 (10%) democratic leaders, no participative leaders, no delegative leaders, no situational leaders, and 17 (57%) unclassifiable leaders in the contents of the study. There were 28 (93%) male chairpersons and 8 (3%) female chairpersons in the study.

Of the 30 chairpersons found in the novels of the study, there were 11 in the decade of 1950s, five in the decade of 1960s, six in the decade of 1970s, and eight in the decade of 1980s.

**Autocratic chairperson.** Of the 10 autocratic chairpersons found in the novels of the study, all exhibited autocratic leadership. There were four autocratic chairpersons in the decade of 1950s, two in the decade of 1960s, one in the decade of 1970s, and three in the decade of 1980s.


Chairman Hagen (*Pnin*, 1953) had been responsible for
Professor Pnin's employment in the department, and Pnin now expected tenure after nine years. Instead Hagen, autocratically, described Pnin's future, telling him how his life would be for the next year, saying, "... since I know Bodo will not continue you in the German Department ... I spoke to Borenge, but the French Department here is also full up" (p. 169).

Professor Pnin replied, "It signifies that they are firing me?"

Chairman Hagen's response was:
Naturally you will get your salary for the Fall Term in full, and then we shall see how much we can obtain for you in the Spring, especially if you will agree to take off some stupid office work from my poor old shoulders, and also if you will participate vitally in the Dramatic Program in New Hall. I think you should actually play in it, under my daughter's direction; it would distract you from sad thoughts. Now go to bed at once, and put yourself to sleep with a good mystery story. (p. 170)

Edward Lundfest (Silas Timberman, 1954) was an autocratic leader (high task/low relationship), who in pointedly asking Silas [Timberman] how his [workload] looked for the semester, offered his opinion that in two weeks "a skillful teacher should have all of his problems catalogued and defined" (p. 18). Lundfest went on to question
Timberman's English class content, specifically commenting on how Silas made Mark Twain "the pivot of the whole matter." Lundfest said, "sometimes I feel that it becomes more a question of Mark Twain than of American literature" (p. 18). Lundfest further suggested that the use of Mark Twain's writings promoted the ideas of communism. He, autocratically, directed the entire English department to support a civil defense program, which was supposed to help them prepare for a war with the communists (p. 22-3).

Edwin Schneider (Purely Academic, 1958) arranged meetings with his subordinates to allow them to share in the departmental decision making. However, he knew in advance what he wanted to achieve, so he negotiated professional duty trade-offs with his subordinates in order to arrive at agreement. This manipulation of subordinates indicated a decidedly autocratic (high task/low relationship) leadership type.

Schneider fancied himself "democratic" because he sought affiliation with his colleagues. His monthly departmental luncheons had "carefully thought-out" agendas, allowing him to maintain complete control of the department activities (p. 39). Once during a luncheon, when a heated confrontation occurred, Schneider admonished, "Please no personalities. The issues we are dealing with this afternoon are scholarly interests; they are not personal interests" (p. 44).
Chairman Richard Nast (*Purely Academic*, 1958) controlled his graduate students and his colleagues in the Economics Department. The graduate students:

knew they would be taken care of if they won [Nast's] favor. They knew likewise that, if they failed to win it, they would not even get a degree, no matter how strong a dissertation they wrote. (p. 51)

Nast controlled the colleagues in his department through direction and promise of reward. Nast prepared carefully, before each departmental meeting. He had known before he called his department together precisely what he wanted. He had a well-disciplined department back of him and heavy patronage to back up the discipline. He had got his committee in record time and appointed commiteemen he could trust, since both (men) were definitely in the running for promotion, and sweetly reasonable. (pp. 55-6)

Chairman Orville Fairchild (*A New Life*, 1961) was also completely autocratic. He dictated the grammar text used in the department and stood in the way of curriculum changes and academic freedom. Professionally, Fairchild deplored what he called "aggressive pests" in the teaching profession "who upset other people's applecarts" (p. 35). His personal advice was directive also, as he told the new English
professor, Levin, "If you intend to stay on here, I recommend marriage" (p. 42). In a later conference with Levin, Fairchild to discussed Levin's activities to alter the textbooks in the curriculum and his decision to campaign for chairman of the department. He said:

I have asked you into this office not to protest your enmity to my grammar text—which is in its twenty-eighth year . . . nor your disrespect for Dr. Gilley, your immediate superior . . . nor your presumption in other matters which do not concern you . . . I warned you very strongly against that sort of thing, and I renew my warning. (p. 266)

Chairman Hollis Lomax (Stoner, 1965) was another autocratic leader. As Chairman of the English Department, Lomax was ruthless toward William Stoner, because Stoner did not support one of Lomax's favorite graduate students in an oral exam. After Lomax became chairman, he devised a vindictive way to retaliate. He altered Stoner's schedule, depriving him of graduate level courses, and spacing Stoner's freshman composition "at widely separated hours, six days a week." For over 20 years, Lomax never failed to give Stoner "a teaching schedule that even the newest instructor would have accepted with bad grace" (p. 221). He told Stoner he could not fire him, because of tenure, but that he wanted "to have nothing to do with him" (p. 177). Lomax said, "If you want to see me—on department business--
you will make an appointment with the secretary" (p. 177).

Chairperson Kaplan (Going Blind, 1977) was also autocratic in her leadership, as she fights the president to maintain her right to fire and hire. When she was told that President Vito had taken a professor in her department off the recommended tenure list, Chairperson Kaplan reacted, saying, "That decision rests with me as head of the department" (p. 179). She continued, "The President's interference is quite unwarranted. Of course, we knew that your vision was going, and nobody thought it was any of his business. I might add that the whole Department agrees with me" (p. 179).

English professor Paul Held explained her behavior, as he saw it based upon departmental and academic procedure:

As for Kappy, whose vote counted most, her support of me was in no way personal. She was defending what she considered a prerogative of her office. [President] Vito and she had never gotten along; in blocking my tenure he had slapped her--I was hers, not his, to make or destroy. (p. 179)

Chairman Tillson (Mickelsson's Ghosts, 1982), in his role as philosophy department chairman, autocratically assigns Mickellson to direct an incoming student, as a favor to the dean:

What I thought, Pete was that maybe you could run over Mr. Nugent's program with him--help him figure out
what he'll need . . ."  He raised his smile toward
Mickelsson again . . . and as if without knowing he was
doing it, began pushing Mickellson and Nugent gently
out of the room. (p. 12)

Chairman "Fat" Jack Petty (The Breaks, 1983) was
autocratic in his leadership of the English Department,
as he acquired someone to teach his section of freshman
English. When an inexperienced friend came into town and
phoned Petty, he demonstrated his total control of the
department when he declared, "I can throw you a section of
Freshman Comp and take you on as an adjunct. It's not much,
maybe twenty-five hundred for the term" (p. 140). When
asked how he could do that, Petty replied:

Hey, I'm the chairman . . . I can do anything
I want. . . they like me better after last term. I
only went twenty thousand over budget. The term
before I was over by thirty so I saved them ten
thousand. (p. 140)

Petty was directive as he laid a guilt feeling on Pete Mossi
to persuade him to stay and finish out his contract, saying,
"I'm not mad at you Pete. I'm kind of disappointed, if you
want to know the truth. New York 'll be there in January .
. . I mean you're kind of walking out on us" (p. 444).

Chairman Warren Burden, (The Elcholo Feeling Passes
1984), was an autocratic leader of the History Department.
When there was a teaching vacancy, Burden carefully prepared
the agenda and selected the members of the search committee. He picked members who would follow his lead, and observe certain guidelines which were predetermined by him. During the meeting, Burden zeroed in on the candidate he wanted appointed and displayed his full control of the search committee. He dismissed the strongest candidate by stating, one of his using one of his favorite phrases, "He just isn't one of us" (p. 405).

Democratic Chairpersons. Of the 30 chairpersons, 3 were found who exhibited democratic (high task/high relationship). Two were found in the decade of 1950s, and one in the decade of 1980s. The democratic chairpersons identified in the study were John Minot (The Search Light, 1955), Edward Tyler (a Friend In Power, 1958), Kiefer Maddox (With Faith and Fury 1985).

John Minot (The Search Light, 1955) demonstrated democratic (high task/high relationship leadership, when faced with protest against the loss of individual liberty at the university. He proposed a "general meeting," involving "careful thinking," and "a general faculty protest" (p. 50). Minot's entire personality was one of democratic action. It was "part of his leniency and genius with people not to impose or attempt to impose his authority on them" (p. 26).

Minot spoke out against the "loyalty oath" that the president and board of regents pressed the faculty to sign and worked democratically to defeat the "fascist ideas" that
would have crushed individual freedom of choice.

Edward Tyler (*a Friend In Power*, 1958) was a "proven administrator" (p. 22), who functioned in several committees throughout the novel. He saw this activity as "the price you pay for democratic government in a university" (p. 23). Judging from Tyler's performance throughout the book, he was a democratic type leader, since he exchanged information with others and sought to solve problems through discussion (p. 71). In fact, Chairman Tyler's demeanor throughout the novel was one of democratic action, and he was ultimately selected to be the new president.

Chairman of the Philosophy Department, Kiefer Maddox (*With Faith and Fury* 1985) was described, at his hiring, as "an ebullient pragmatist, a joiner of clubs, [and an] enthusiastic participant in committee work," In addition, he was considered "perfectly safe" to the anti-radical hierarchy of Algonquin State University. Later, when the department had grown under his leadership, Maddox displayed his true democratic leader behavior in requesting that Dean Hamilton Baniff "support him for a Harrington Grant . . . grant him a leave of absence . . . [and] appoint Rad Reid to run the department while he was gone" (p. 249).

**Participative chairpersons.** There were no participative chairpersons in the novels.

**Delegative chairpersons.** There were no delegative chairpersons in the study.
Situational chairpersons: Of the 30 chairpersons, none were found to be situational leaders.

Other: Of the 30 chairpersons found in the study there were 17 (57%) whose leader behavior did not fit the criteria of the study. Five were unclassifiable in the decade of 1950s, 3 were unclassifiable in the decade of 1960s, 5 were unclassifiable in the decade of 1970s, and 4 were unclassifiable in the decade of 1980s.

The chairpersons who were in the other category were Old Chairman McAdam (The Spire, 1952), Joseph Cardoza and Hulbert (The Searching Light, 1955), Milton (Purely Academic, 1958), Gerald Gilley (A New Life, 1961), an unnamed chairman (Pnin, 1961), Chairman of the French Department, Blorenge (Pnin, 1961), George Willett (The Department, 1968), Arthur Schonbrunn (Professor of Desire, 1977), Hochburg (Unholy Loves, 1979), Sister Maryann (A Certain Slant of Light, 1979), Evats (A Man In Charge, 1979). Hopkins (Sweet Death, Kind Death, 1981), Henry Dunster (The Class, 1985), Radamanthus Reid (With Faith and Fury, 1985), and Bruce Factor (Professor Romeo, 1989).

Old Chairman McAdam (The Spire, 1952) was a nice old gentleman, but as a leader he was not very effective. He was described as "a nice man, but perfectly futile as chairman . . . he likes everybody, bless his heart" (p. 10).

Acting Chairman Gerald Gilley (A New Life, 1961) sent
out official communications and invited everyone to "pitch in to keep things moving as usual" (p. 269). He directed that "the departmental elections . . . would take place as scheduled" (p. 269). Gilley lacked leadership qualities, but he was persuasive and manipulating in his actions, trying to convince his followers to elect him to the permanent post of chairman.

Chairman George Willett's (The Department, 1968) leadership behavior did not fit the criteria of the study, because his actions were aimed toward maintaining tradition in his department. When someone approached Willett with a question, or disagreement, toward his departmental policies, his reaction was that he "was an advocate of new thinking," but "he always dislik[ed] and distrust[ed] the new thinkers" (p. 226).

The character of Chairman Arthur Schonbrunn (Professor of Desire, 1977) was professionally obscure because his association with his subordinate was personal and revealed no professional leadership activity. The most promising example of leadership was contained in excerpts from two letters to a subordinate, explaining his wife, Deborah's, "blabbing" about the subordinate's private life at a dinner party (pp. 127-131). In the letters, Schonbrunn tried to place the blame for the breach of confidence on the subordinate. However, toward the end of the novel, Schonbrunn was revealed to be mentally unbalanced.
Chairman Hopkins in *Death In a Tenured Position* (1981) was present in the novel only through the dialogue of others and, therefore, could not be classified. For instance, early in the book a professor made the statements: "Our chairman is not exactly amenable to the idea of women's studies," and another commented:

Harvard is about to have a woman professor in the English Department . . . Hopkins, our ever-lovable chairman, is fit to be tied. He had just announced to the assembled English faculty that he thought the woman problem had peaked and we needn't worry about hiring one anymore. (p. 1)

Chairman Henry Dunster's (*The Class*, 1985) leadership type was difficult to classify, except to say that he was seen as a character of ridicule. He was depicted as "a middle-aged playboy," into his third marriage, and he "predictably made a sort of pass" at a new professor's wife, which "did not flatter her at all," causing her to remark, "God, what a creep" (p. 344). Professionally, evidence of leadership was rude and arbitrary, because when Dunster arranged a dinner for a visiting prospective professor, he excluded the newcomer's friend, who was also a faculty member. "No, Rob won't be joining us," Dunster said, "I thought an intimate dinner would be best for you to meet the senior colleagues" (p. 309).
Chairman Hochburg (*Unholy Loves*, 1979) was also difficult to classify as a leader, since he was described as "the author of several well-received scholarly books" with a "slow pontifical calm voice." He seemed to enjoy the role-play of a "slow-thinking country-headed good-natured oaf" (p. 29).

There was also no real evidence to classify Sister Maryann (*A Certain Slant of Light*, 1979) as a leader. She was an ineffective, since she failed to act when necessary. The staff expected her to intervene and come to the aid of a veteran teacher, when the teacher was threatened with loss of position due to her illness. However, Sister Maryann reacted to protect her own individual position. Sister Maryann possibly, had the freedom and position to act, but she did not have the leadership commitment.

Rhadamanthus Reid (*With Faith and Fury*, 1985) was affiliation oriented, but he was not a leader. He tried to warn Professor Adrian DeWolf to "change his ways," and "stop provoking the administration" (p. 336). To which the radical professor inquired: (1) whether or not he had the right of free speech, and (2) did he have academic freedom (p. 337). To these questions Reid replied:

To the first, yes, but institutions have rights too. To the second, yes, but by default i.e., we are free as long as nothing happens that causes political or public relations problems for the
administration. (337)

There was too little information on the remaining chairperson characters for a judgement to be made about their behavior. These charimen were: Joseph Cardoza and Hulbert (The Searching Light, 1955), Milton (Purely Academic, 1958), Edward Tyler (A Friend In Power, 1958), an unnamed chairman and Chairman of the French Department, Blorenge (Pnin, 1961), Evats (A Man In Charge, 1979), and Bruce Factor (Professor Romeo, 1989).

**Academic Issues In the Novels**

In the context of the selected novels, many of the fictional characters in the leadership positions selected for the study discussed the academic factors and concerns of their office. The academic factors or concerns were thought to be of interest, since they were identified as possible stereotypical occurrences in the academic novels of the study. These academic concerns were identified earlier in the study, from the literature, as possible universal concerns of administrators in academic novels. These academic concerns, generally, occupied the thoughts of the administrators. A listing of these concerns was included in the study, to offer insight into the image of academic administrators.

A sample of these expected concerns was selected, grouped, and discussed, using narrative technique. The following five academic concerns were thought to be of
interest and were listed accordingly: (1) annoyance or frustration with academic life, (2) attitudes toward the role of higher education in American life, (3) views of tenure, (4) evidence of a dualism of academe and society, (5) pragmatic vs humanistic education (curriculum).

Annoyance or Frustration With Academic Life

Problems with faculty were highly profiled in the novels of the study. Administrators were often concerned with personal as well as professional problems. For instance, the faculty of the English Department of Chairman Schneider (Purely Academic, 1958) clearly displayed annoyance and frustration with academic life. During group encounters they openly discussed their petty rivalry. Schneider manipulated them through scheduling and funding, and the faculty members, at times, appeared to have little control of their schedules and course content (p. 49). The administrators, especially the chairpersons, often held the academic future of selected faculty members at risk, due to the instability of academic contractual circumstance.

If faculty members felt uneasy and frustrated by academic circumstance, this feeling was also expressed by the administrators. For instance, President Norton, Sweet Death, Kind Death (1984) voiced a concern for the manner in which institutions are operated, saying:

Do you know what it is? Colleges and universities are being run now by administrators, and those faculty
they seduce, or persuade. Ideas have become foolish; we work on expense accounts and what will bring in the students and the donors. (p. 126)

Another concern of faculty members was the procedural or traditional behavior of the administrators. English Professor Robert Sanderling The Department, 1968) revealed a frustration toward the administrators' attitudes concerning new ideas and change, and he expresses an impression that the administrators are out of touch with reality.

Sanderling said:

When Willett (the chairperson) talks about the 'new thinking' he voices our fear. We aren't up to changes. It seems that unless we are new we are nothing—or at least we are ludicrous or impotent. . . . Our colleagues in the School of Education tell us that effective teaching methods are new, and by definition ours are old and futile; our administrators (whom we never see and don't know) announce to the world that we are engaged in significant and challenging new educational break-throughs . . . . We are amused to see that Willett is always an advocate of new thinking and always dislikes and distrusts the new thinkers. (pp. 225-6)

Sometimes the duties of administrator were apparently overwhelming. For instance, President Doran, Journey To Sahalin, 1971) expressed dismay and frustration concerning
the duties of his office, when he said, "When I took the presidency, I was innocent on a number of counts." Doran went on to explain, "I've been in administration, but on the high policy level . . . I hadn't realized how much of my effort here would be directed toward winning the vote in both the student and faculty precincts (p. 100).

Higher Education in American Life

The acceptance or threat of communism was an evident concern in American life in the 1950s, and this concern was reflected in several novels of the study: The Groves of Academe (1951), Silas Timberman (954), The Searching Light (1955). The concerns expressed in these novels were "academic freedom," and "oppression." The administrators in these novels were most often the villains, since they were carrying out oppressive policies, based on fear. Religion and academic freedom were concerns of interest in a few of the novels. The leaders of the institutions were, especially, concerned with the acceptance of the rest of society. In the novel With Faith and Fury (985) religion was a cause of concern, because of the fanaticism evident in the student population.

Misconduct was a prominent concern in many of the books of the study, again because of the image of the university or college involved. The administrators were invariable concerned with the reputation of the institution. In The Groves of Academe (1951); The Stones of the House (1953);
The Small Room (1961); A New Life (1961); The President (1964); The Fires of Arcadia (1965); Giles Goat-Boy (1966); A Journey To Sahalin (1971); Professor Romeo (1989); With Faith and Fury (1985) various problems were examined concerning misconduct, with such topics as: sexual conduct, cheating, racial unrest, college rivalry, and sexual harassment presented as major concerns of the leadership.

The criteria for grading and curriculum content were often mentioned in the context of academic necessity. In Purely Academic (1958), when professors in a faculty meeting revealed frustration with grades and university policy, they blamed both academic procedure and the administration for the literary shortcoming of students. The dialogue offers insight into the existence and maintenance of academic evaluation, as the professors offered the following discussion:

"So long as the student is allowed to elect what he likes, he occupies the privileged position of a customer, and the customer is always right."

"But you're saying," said Schneider, "that in the long run student opinion decides how much work and what kind of work students need do to get a degree."

"University policy is made by the President because the President has all the gravy to distribute. The President depends on the good will of the students."
"But the students don't elect the President. The trustees elect the President."
"Only if he is good at getting more and more students." (pp. 47-8)

Views of Tenure

Tenure was often a concern of the faculty as well as the administrators. Often the administrators could do very little to secure tenure for the professors. They were often at risk themselves. These problems were evident in such novels as: The Groves of Academe, (1951); Pnin, (1953); and Going Blind, (1975). For instance, Professor Pnin (Pnin, 1953) had worked nine years and expected tenure, only to be dismissed. Furthermore, there was little Chairman Hagen could do about it.

Often faculty members in the novels would hide a shortcoming in their ability until they secured tenure. For instance, Professor Paul Held (Going Blind, 1975) tried to conceal his approaching blindness until he could gain tenure. In like manner, Henry Mulcahy (The Groves of Academe, 1951) pretended to be a communist in order to force President Maynard Hoar to keep him employed (p. 58).

Occasionally, the content of the novel was obviously a "soapbox" for the views of the author. In The Groves of Academe, President Hoar digressed into a tirade of "verbal thinking" concerning the wisdom of tenure, lecturing to two
of this faculty, saying:

I've fought all my life for better teaching conditions . . . yet sometimes I wonder whether we're on the right track, whether as creative persons we shouldn't live with more daring. Can you have creative teaching side by side with this preoccupation with security, with the principle of regular promotion and recognition of seniority? . . . God knows, in the big universities, this system has fostered a great many academic barnacles. (p. 179)

The novel came to an end with President Hoar verbalizing grandeous gestures of academic sacrifice (p. 301).

Evidence of a Dualism of Academe and Society

Occasionally, a zealot would emerge in the novels and disclose that one of the characters had a special mission in life, such as the one of Sister Francis in A Certain Slant of Light (1979). Sister Francis thought her job was:

to hold back the tide of evil that threatened her young Catholic ladies and gentlemen, to forestall their entrance into the twentieth century for as long as possible, while still providing them with that near-extinct commodity, a liberal arts education. (p. 31)

Pragmatic vs humanistic education

The competition between pragmatic and humanistic education was evident in several of the novels, most notably: The Dollar Diploma, 1960); A Man In Charge, (1979);

Vice-president Conrad Taylor (A Man In Charge, 1979) saw himself as:

a defender of the values of a general undergraduate education against the narrowing pressures of graduate school demands for specialized preparation. A defender of the college against the vain criticism of elitism. (p. 19)

The overall evidence in the novels indicated that the personal issues of concern in the academic administrative novels of the decades of the 1950s and 1960s were: personal misconduct, academic freedom, scandal, ethics, scandal, tradition, and the struggle for power emerging as the vital concerns of the decade. These concerns were faced through the need for group action, with little communication between individuals. Also, the individual was often the victim of group activism and group injustice in the earlier novels, standing alone and suffering.

Several of the issues of topics of concern in the academic administrative novels of the earlier novels were similar to those in the latter novels.

The concerns were of misconduct, academic freedom, scandal, tradition, and personal relationships between faculty and administrators, were prominent in the earlier novels, with individual ethical behavior and women's rights
emerging as the additional vital concerns of these latter decades.

Conclusion

A description of the sample and analysis of the data were presented in this chapter. Demographic data was presented, along with a representation of the leadership activity in narrative form. Finally, other information of interest was presented, including concerns of interested discussed in the novels, in order to depict the image of academic administrators in the American fiction selected for the study.

There was evidence that the administrative action in these novels moved from attempts to control individual performance in group action, to attempts by individuals, in groups, to control individual action. The operative administrative action in the novels was control.
Chapter Five
Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Chapter five presents a summary and discussion of finding as well as conclusions and recommendations for further study.

Summary

There were 40 novels examined in this study, selected from over 400 academic novels considered. The majority of the administrative characters in the novels offered insight into the leadership of higher education, which was the purpose of the study. The administrative characters in the novels, were often not well-rounded or major characters; never-the-less, the characters offered a useful image of the administrative leadership of higher education in the United States during the past 40 years.

Furthermore, the categories of the positions selected, as well as the leadership criteria selected from each novel, allowed a subjective review of the academic administrative leadership types in the novels. This review of leadership types addressed the second question of the research.

Leadership Positions

The first research question was concerned with leadership positions. Of the four positions selected for study (president, vice-president, dean, and chairperson),
all were plentiful in the novels, with one exception. There were noticeably fewer vice-presidents than any other administrators. Of the 97 leaders in the study, there were only eight vice-presidents. The three remaining leadership positions were almost equally represented with 28 presidents, 31 deans, and 30 chairpersons.

President. Presidents were represented more in the early novels of the study, than in the latter novels of the study. For instance, 10 (36%) of the presidents were in the novels of the 1950s, eight (29%) were in the decade of the 1960s, eight (29%) were in the decade of the 1970s, but only two (7%) were found in the decade of the 1980s. When comparing the position of president from the first score of years (1950-1969) to the last score of years (1970-1989), 18 (64%) of the presidents were in the first, and 10 (36%) were in the last score.

Vice-president. As stated earlier, the position of vice-president was represented least in the novels of the study. This position was entirely unrepresented in the novels in the decade of the 1950s, and there were only three vice-presidents in the novels in the decade of the 1960s, three in the novels in the decade of the 1970s, and two in the novels in the decade of the 1980s. Since there were so few vice-presidents in the novels, the findings were considered non-conclusive.
Dean. The position of dean was well represented, since there was a total of 31 deans in the novels of the study. Nine of the deans were in the decade of the 1950s, 11 were in the decade of the 1960s, three were in the decade of the 1970s, and eight were in the decade of the 1980s. These percentages revealed no significant pattern by decade. However, when considering the novels of the first score of years of the study (1950-1969) compared with the novels of the last score of years of the study (1970-1990), 20 (65%) of the deans were in the first score, and only 11 (35%) were in the last score.

Chairperson

The position of chairperson was represented with a total of 30, a number which indicated that 31% of the leaders in the study held the position of chairperson. Nine of the chairpersons were in the decade of the 1950s, six were in the decade of the 1960s, six were in the decade of the 1970s, and nine were in the decade of the 1980s. The representation of chairpersons remained stable throughout the novels, with a decline in the representation of chairpersons from the decade of the 1950s to the 1960s followed by a stabilization through the 1970s and a slight increase in the final decade under review.

Leadership Types

The second research question was concerned with the
leadership type found among the educational administrators as depicted in the academic novels of the study. There were 97 leaders depicted in the novels reviewed, with 60 (62%) classified according to the five leadership types defined in this study. Thirty-eight (39%) were categorized as "other". The leadership characters were classified as "other" either when the character did not fit the criteria of the leadership types of the study or the dialogue in the novels was insufficient to permit a clear classification.

**Autocratic.** Among all leaders represented in the study the "autocratic" leadership type was the most prevalent. There were a total of 97 leaders. Thirty-nine (40%) were autocratic leaders. This indicated that autocratic leadership (high task/low relationship) was the image of the majority of the academic leaders in the study.

Presidents were represented as autocratic more than any other leader position, with 15 (54%) of the 28 presidents represented as autocratic. Chairpersons were the next most represented, with 11 (37%) of 30 chairs autocratic. Deans and vice-presidents followed with nine (29%) out of 31 deans represented, and five of eight vice-presidents, respectively.

Of the 40 autocratic leaders in the study, 12 were in the decade of the 1950s, 14 were in the decade of the 1960s, 6 were in the decade of the 1970s, and 8 were in the decade of the 1980s. When considered over a score of years, 26
were in the first two decades and 14 were in the last two decades, thereby indicating a decline in autocratic leadership representation in the novels of the study from the first 20 years to the last 20 years.

Democratic

The second highest leadership type represented in the study was "democratic," with 14 (14%) of all leaders demonstrating this leadership type. In the total democratic leaders of the study, five were presidents, two were vice-presidents, six were deans, and three were chairpersons.

Eight of the democratic leaders were in the decade of the 1950s, four were in the decade of the 1960s, one was in the decade of the 1970s, and one was in the decade of the 1980s. When considering the percentages of the democratic leaders found in the first two decades, compared with the last two decades, there were 12 (86%) democratic leaders in the first two decades (1950-1969) and two (14%) democratic leaders in the last two decades. This represents a difference in a total of 10 (72%) from the first two decades to the last two decades.

Participative, Delegative and Situational Leadership. When considering the representation of participative, delegative, and situational leadership, these types are under-represented. Participative leadership represented 4% of the leadership types in the study, and
delegative leadership types represented only 2%, while situational leadership type was untreated in the novels of the study.

Other. The final classification, "other," contained 38 (39%) of the leader characters. As stated earlier, these characters either did not fit the leadership criteria or did not offer enough leader behavior to be classified. When represented by position, four of the presidents, 14 of the deans, and 17 of the chairpersons were classified as "other". Three of the vice-presidents were in this classification, however, since this position was significantly untreated in the study, a comparison of this data to other data was considered non-productive.

When comparing the representation of the position of "other", from the first decade to the last decade: nine were in the 1950s, 12 were in the 1960s, nine were in the 1970s, and eight were in the last decade. When considering the representation the first score of years (1950-1969) with the representation during the last score of years (1970-1989), 21 (55%) of these leaders were in the first and 17 (45%) of these leaders were in the last.

Conclusions

An examination of the numbers of administrative positions in the novels of the study, indicated that there were fewer academic administrators in the latter novels than there were in the early novels of the study. In the first
score of years (1950-1969), there were 61 academic administrators; while, in the last score of years (1970-1989), there were 36 academic administrators in the novels of the study. Considering the representation of characters by position, 75% of the presidents were in the first score of years (1950-1969), and 25% of the presidents were in the last score of years (1970-1989). Thirty-eight percent of the vice-presidents were in the first score of years (1950-1969), and 63% were in the last score of years (1970-1989). Sixty-eight percent of the deans were in the first score of years (1950-1969), and 35% of the deans were in the last score of years (1970-1989). Fifty-three percent of the chairpersons were in the first score of years (1950-1969), while 43% of the chairpersons were in the last score of years (1970-1989).

The trend in leadership representation in the novels saw the representation of presidents decline 50%, the representation of deans decline 28%, and the representation of chairpersons decline only 10% from the beginning novels of the study to the latter novels of the study. These findings led to the conclusion that the overall trend in representation of leadership positions declined during the time frame of the study. There appeared to be a trend toward less administrative representation in the academic fiction of the study.

Further examination of data indicated that the largest
percentage (40%) of the leadership types represented were autocratic. However, in considering the trend by decades, the leadership was 31% autocratic in the 1950s, 37% in the decade of the 1960s, 15% in the decade of the 1970s, and 17% in the decade of the 1980s, indicating a slight decline. When considering autocratic leadership trend from the first score of years (1950-1969) to the last score of years (1979-1989), 41% of the leaders were autocratic in the first and 36% were autocratic in the last. These findings led to the conclusion that the trend in leadership in the fiction appeared to be toward autocratic leadership throughout the novels of the study.

The concern examined by the third research question pertained to the image of the administrator in academic fiction. The past 40 years have brought about many changes in higher education. These changes were evident in the novels of this study. The indication was that the issues concerning the leaders in the early decades were: academic freedom, politics, and hiring practices. These were also the issues of concern in the latter decades, with women' rights emerging as a vital concern in the last decade.

The activity in the novels, throughout the study, revealed the human behavior problems of: misconduct among professors and/or students, religious fanaticism, jealousy, ambition and suppression as vital concerns. These problems were presented in the context of group discussion as well as
in the context of individual struggle.

Considering leadership issues, the novels of the decade of the 1950s and 1960s saw groups of administrators, in meetings, expressing their concerns over issues; while in the latter decades of the study, the leaders were depicted in a more private examination of the problems, with the leadership concentrating on the rights and needs of the individual. The action trend of the novels seemed to be less toward the plight of groups and more toward the plight of the individual. The academic administrators throughout the study demonstrated a regard for academic procedures and former precedent, along with a general need for acceptance and continued influence on American society. The administrative images in the novels ranged from individuals executing blind bureaucratic controls and/or procedural due process, to concerned action and justice for the individual.

Many of the academic leaders in the study were satisfying a need for power, while some of the academic leaders viewed the activities of their positions as a service to mankind. Most of the administrators depicted in the novels understood and used the power of their positions. They often made demands on professors, offering to provide rewards, and exerting a strong influence on the lives and activities of their subordinates.

The positive image of these leaders was, generally, one of guardianship, or fierce protector, of the procedural
order of academe. The leader characters were also negatively represented in that they were not champions of liberal or humanistic values. Furthermore, the administrative characters were not portrayed as creative. In fact, they were, generally, adversaries of creativity, since the maintenance of ideas such as "academic freedom" and "humanistic values" were not the concern of the administrators in these novels.

The image of the administrators was autocratic throughout the novels. However, the image of administrators in the novels of the 1950s and 1960s depicted the administrators amid various group action and political power struggles. The novels of the 1970s introduced problems of an personal nature, reflecting and abstracting the difficulties of the characters, often putting academic problems in the background. The novels of the 1980s continued along this personal reflection, presenting violent confrontations and universal problems of a legatious origin.

While the major characters (who were most often professors) of these novels created an acceptance of the formal, "position," leadership of the autocratic administrators in the novels, the result was often one of sarcasm toward the leadership role. The administrators continued to maintain "position power," and the reader was led to feel that if each administrator did not follow a carefully orchestrated procedure, he/she could be easily
replaced by a character who would.

Another consideration concerning the autocratic image of the administrators in the selected novels, might be that many of the novels were written by professors.

Recommendations

Since few academic administrative leadership studies examining leadership trends depicted in novels have been conducted, this topic warrants further examination. What is depicted in novels often mirrors current issues and events and may, further, contribute to shaping the public's image of education and educational administration.

Specific areas warranting investigation include a more comprehensive examination of the literature in regard to higher education leadership and administration, as well as literary reviews focused at all levels of education. Studies examining the impact of literature on shaping beliefs and images should also be conducted.

It is suggested that studies be completed involving the examination of leadership in higher education showing the treatment of problems, such as: academic freedom, student unrest, and civil rights. Also, a study examining the background of the authors of academic novels might be enlightening, or a study of the leadership characters in academic novels depicting negative and/or positive images of various administrative leadership positions in academic novels. Foreign novels should also be examined in an
effort to discover the image of academic leadership in the novels of other countries.

Academic mystery novels could be examined to discover the roles of administrators. In Amanda Cross's two books included in this study, the administrators were sketchy, with no physical identity. According to VanderMeer (1981), research on the academic mystery has also been neglected. Lyons (1962) did not revere the mystery novel as worthy of serious consideration, however, "Boys (1946) believes that the mystery story, although it may be amusing . . . has probably done more to present a false picture of college life than all the rest of our fiction put together" (p. 385). A study of these academic novels could help support, or dispel these ideas.

Another genre which merits research is the nonfiction novel, such as, Uncle Tom's Campus (1968), Letter To the Alumni (1970), and Exit the Rainmaker (1989). These types of academic literature offer a major source of information about the image of leadership in higher education, and deserve to be considered for serious research.

Other possible sources are short stories and drama. Short stories, such as: O'Conner's, "Campus On the River" (1964), and Oates', "The Hungry Ghosts" (1974), offer a wide range of resource material for further study.

The examination of the novels of this study indicates that the bulk of the fiction writing on academic leadership
depicts the leaders in autocratic behavior, despite the advances in leadership method. Also to be found, were academic leaders who were jealous, vindictive, pompous, and a few who were gentle and courteous mentors. A few of the novels revealed the fast paced, fragmented, character of the administrative task. In fact, some of the action in the novels captured the intricacies of leadership, depicting the school leaders almost as business executives. However, this characteristic was most notable in the roles of the vice-presidents.

Another recommendation might be that since good academic leadership must be both an intellectual and a creative process, examining this genre of fiction in various academic leadership training sessions might lead to a better understanding of how academic leadership is viewed.

Futurists project that American higher education will be even more important in this society in the years to come, and the autocratic image of leadership in higher education, found in this study, could be a mitigating factor, leading to the acceptance of the introduction of important new leadership ideas, values, skills, and other innovative action needed for leadership improvement.

If the image of academic leadership found in the selected novels of this study is accurate, the findings suggest that the introduction of various leadership methods in education is warranted in order to effect the leadership
ability of administrators and, thereby, improve the leadership performance of educators and, eventually, improve the leadership image of academic administrators in American society.
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Data From the Novels In the Study

1950 - 1959

   Location: midwest
   Type Institution: Jocelyn College (private)
   Major Character: Henry Mulcahy (English professor)
   Leader Position(s) & Type(s)
   President Maynard Hoar - autocratic

   Location: unknown
   Type Institution: Womens College (private)
   Major Character: Camille (English professor)
   Leader Position(s) & Type(s)
   President Robbins - democratic

   Location: Vermont (Northeast)
   Type Institution: Wynwood College (private)
   Major Character: Henry Gaunt (Chairperson, English)
   Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
   President Gidney - autocratic
   Dean Markham - other
   Dean Jenks - other
   Chairperson NcAdam - other

4. Pnin. (1953). Nabokov, V.
   Location: midwest
   Type Institution: Waindell College (private)
   Major Character: Pnin (language professor)
   Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
   President Poore - other
   Chairperson Hagen - autocratic
   Unnamed chairperson - other
   Chairperson Blorenge - other

   Location: unknown (New England)
   Type Institution: Rowley University (private)
   Major Character: Andrew Aiken (Acting President)
   Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
   President Aiken - autocratic
   Dean Abner - other
6. **Silas Tmberman.** (1954). Fast, H. M.  
Location: Indiana (midwest)  
Type Institution: Clemington University  
(private college)  
Major Character: Timberman (English professor)  
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):  
President Cabot - autocratic  
Chairperson Lundfest - autocratic  

7. **The Searching Light.** (1955). Dodd, M. E.  
Location: Northeast  
Type Institution: Penfield University (public)  
Major Character: John Minot (Chairperson, English)  
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):  
President Alexander Blackwell - autocratic  
Dean of Law School Aswell - other  
Chairperson Minot - democratic  
Chairperson Cardoza - other  
Chairperson Hulbert - other  

Location: South  
Type Institution: Terranova College (private)  
Major Character: Jonathan Dorsey Tower (President)  
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):  
President Tower - autocratic  

Location: New York  
Type Institution: Enfield University (private)  
Major Character: Ed Tyler (Chairperson, English)  
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):  
President Vaughn - democratic  
Dean Woodruff - other  
Dean McClure - other  
Chairperson Tyler - democratic  

10. **Purely Academic.** (1958). Barr, S.  
Location: Eastern  
Type Institution: unnamed university (public)  
Major Character: Henry Schneider  
(Chairperson, English)  
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):  
President Pomton - autocratic  
Chairperson Schneider - autocratic  
Chairperson Nast - autocratic  
Chairperson Milton - other
Novels of the 1960s

   Location: midwest
   Type Institution: Fox University (private)
   Major Character: news director
   Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
   President Wells Thornton - delegative
   President Rynsford - other
   Vice-President Brattan - autocratic
   Dean Barnes - other
   Dean John Harley St. John - other
   Dean Cartwright - other

12. The Small Room. (1961). Sarton, M.
   Location: New England
   Type Institution: Appleton (female, private)
   Major Character: Lucy Winter (English professor)
   Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
   President Blake Tillotson
   Dean Valentine - democratic
   Unnamed dean - other

   Location: Northwest
   Type Institution: Cascadia College (public)
   Major Character: S. Levin (English professor)
   Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
   President Marion Labhart - autocratic
   Dean Seagram - democratic
   Dean Feeney - other
   Chairperson Fairchild - autocratic
   Chairperson Gilley (English) - other

   Location: New England
   Type Institution: State University (public)
   Major Character: Adam R. (Doc) Rivers (President)
   Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
   President Rivers - autocratic
   Vice President Tate - autocratic
   Dean Elsie Shoemaker - other

   Location: Pennsylvania (northeast)
   Type Institution: Spring Valley College (Presbyterian private)
   Major Character: John Appleton (dean)
   Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
   President McAndrew - autocratic
   Dean Appleton - other
Location: midwest
Type Institution: Wellford College (private)
Major Character: Royce Morgan (dean)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
President Winfred Mooney - democratic
Vice-president George Hand - autocratic
Dean Morgan - other

17. Stoner. (1965). Williams, J.
Location: Missouri (midwest)
Type Institution: University of Missouri (public)
Major Character: William Stoner (English professor)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
Dean Gordon Finch - autocratic
Chairperson Hollis Lomox (English) - autocratic

Location: midwest
Type Institution: Arcadia College (private)
Major Character: Peter Lowe (English professor)
Leader Position(s) and Type(s):
President Stewart Orr - autocratic

Location: unknown
Type Institution: New Tammany College (public)
Major Character: George Giles (student)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
President Lucius Rexford - autocratic

20. The Department. (1968). Brace, G. W.
Location: Boston (northeast)
Type Institution: university (public)
Major Character: Robert Sanderling (English professor)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
Chairperson Willett (English) - autocratic

Novels of the 1970s

Location: unknown
Type Institution: Brangwen University (public)
Major Character: George Chambers (dean)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
President Doran - delegative
Dean Chambers - democratic
22. **Endzone.** (1972). DeLillo, D.
Location: West Texas (south)
Type Institution: Logos College (private)
Major Character: Gary Harkness (student)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
President Wade - delegative

23. **Gate of Heaven.** (1975). McInerny, R. M.
Location: midwest
Type Institution: St. Brendon's College
  (catholic - private)
Major Character: Hoyt (president)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
President Hoyt - autocratic

Location: unknown
Type Institution: unnamed university (public)
Major Character: Tobias Klynt
  (psychology professor)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
Dean Strutmeyer - autocratic

25. **Entertaining Strangers.** (1977). Gurney, A.
Location: northeast
Type Institution: institute of technology (public)
Major Character: Porter Platt (English professor)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
Chairperson Leo Swartz - other
Dean (unnamed) - other

Location: New York (northeast)
Type Institution: New York University at Manhattan
  (public)
Major Character: Paul Held (English professor)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
Chairperson Culpernia Kaplan - autocratic
President Vito - autocratic

27. **The Professor of Desire.** (1977). Roth, P.
Location: California (west)
Type Institution: Stanford University (private)
Major Character: David Kepesh (English professor)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
Chairperson Schombrunn - other
28. **A Man In Charge.** (1979). Philipson, M.
   Location: unknown
   Type Institution: University (public)
   Major Character: Conrad Taylor (Vice-president)
   Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
   President Gregory Blackwell - other
   Vice-president Taylor - autocratic
   Chairperson Evats - other

29. **A Certain Slant of Light.** (1979). Bonanno, M.
   Location: unknown
   Type Institution: Catholic College (private)
   Major Character: Sarah Marrow (English professor)
   Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
   President Sister Francis - autocratic
   Vice-president Aquinas - other
   Chairperson Mary Ann - other

   Location: New York (northeast)
   Type Institution: Woodslee College (private)
   Major Character: Bridgett Stott (English professor)
   Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
   President Garrett - other
   Vice-president Clay Waller - other
   Dean Oliver Byrne - autocratic
   Chairperson Warren Hochberg - other

**Novels of the 1980s**

   Location: Cambridge, Massachusetts (northeast)
   Type Institution: Harvard University (private)
   Major Character: Kate Fanster (English professor)
   Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
   Chairperson Hopkins (English) - other

32. **The Dean's December.** (1982). Bellow, S.
   Location: Chicago (midwest)
   Type Institution: University of Chicago (Public)
   Major Character: Albert Corde (Dean)
   Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
   Vice-president Witt - autocratic
   Dean Corde - other
Location: New York (northeast)
Type Institution: State University of New York (public)
Major Character: Peter M. Mickelsson (philosophy professor)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
Dean Blickstein - other
Chairperson Tillson - autocratic

34. **The Class.** (1983). Segal, E.
Location: Vermont (northeast)
Type Institution: Canterbury College (private)
Major Character: Ted Lambros (English professor)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
Dean Tony Thatcher - autocratic
Chairperson Henry Dunster - other

Location: northeast
Type Institution: college (public)
Major Character: Peter Mossi (English professor)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
Chairperson Jack Petty - autocratic

Location: northeast
Type Institution: Clare College (women's, private)
Major Character: Kate Fanster (English professor)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
President Norton (female) - participating

37. **The Elcholo Feeling Passes.** (1985). Barton, F.
Location: California (west)
Type Institution: University of California at Los Angeles (public)
Major Character: Richard Janus (student)
Leader position(s) & Type(s):
Chairperson Warren Burden (history) - autocratic

Location: Georgia (south)
Type Institution: Magoor College (public)
Major Character: Shaara Soole (theater professor)
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):
Dean Joe Dimpleston - participative
Location: midwest  
Type Institution: Algonquin State University (public)  
Major Character: Manley John Plumwell (student)  
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):  
President McGilvary - autocratic  
Vice-president Roberts - other  
Dean Braniff - autocratic  
Chairperson Maddox - democratic  
Acting Chair Reid - other

Location: Cambridge, Massachusetts (northeast)  
Type Institution: Harvard (private)  
Major Character: Jacob Barker (psychology professor)  
Leader Position(s) & Type(s):  
Dean Fromme - autocratic  
Dean Andrews - autocratic  
Chairperson Factor - other
LEADERS BY TYPE AND DECADE

Presidents:

Autocratic
1. Gidney (The Spire) - 58
2. Aiken (Stones of the House) - 53
3. Cabot (Silas Timberman) - 54
4. A. Blackwell (Searching Light) - 54
5. Tower (Eggheads in the Endzone) - 57
6. Pomton (Purely Academic) - 58
7. Rivers (Long Gainer) - 61
8. Labhart (New Life) - 61
9. McAndrews (Elizabeth Appleton) - 63
10. Orr (Fires of Arcadia) - 65
11. Rexford (Giles Goat-boy) - 66
12. Hoyt (Gate of Heaven) - 75
13. Vito (Going Blind) - 77
14. Francis Ann (Certain Slant of Light) - 79
15. MacGilvary (With Faith and Fury) - 85

Democratic
16. Hoar (Groves of Academe) - 51
17. Robbins (Pictures of an Institution) - 52
18. Vaughn (Firend in Power) - 58
19. Tillotson (Small Room) - 61
20. Mooney (President) 64

Participative
22. Doran (Journey to Sahalin) - 71
23. Norton (Sweet Death, Kind Death) - 84

Delegative
24. Thornton (Dollar Diploma) - 60
25. Wade (Endzone) - 72

Other
26. Poore (Pnin) - 57
27. G. Blackwell (Man in Charge) - 79
28. Garrett (Unholy Loves) - 79
29. Rynsford (Dollar Diploma) - 60

Presidents By Decades:
1950 - 10
1960 - 8
1970 - 8
1980 - 2
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Vice-Presidents:

**Autocratic**
1. Brattan (Dollar Diploma) - 60
2. Tate (Long Gainer) - 61
3. Hand (President) - 64
4. Taylor (Man in Charge) - 79
5. Witt (Dean's December) - 82

**Other**
6. Aquinas (Certain Slant of Light) - 79
7. Waller (Unholy Loves) - 79
8. Roberts (With Faith and Fury) - 85

Vice-presidents by decades:
1950 - 0
1960 - 3
1970 - 3
1980 - 2

**Deans:** (N = 31)

**Autocratic**
1. Aswell (Searching Light) - 55
2. Barnes (Dollar Diploma) - 60
3. Finch (Stoner) - 65
4. Strutmeyer (Klynt's Law) - 76
5. Byrne (Unholy Loves) - 79
6. Thatcher (The Class) - 86
7. Baniff (With Faith and Fury) - 85
8. Fromme (Professor Romeo) - 89
9. Andrews (Professor Romeo) - 89

**Democratic** (N=6)
1. Gaunt (Spire) - 52
2. Schoeffer (Purely Academic) - 58
3. Unnamed (Purely Academic) - 58
4. Seagram (New Life) - 61
5. Appleton (Elizabeth Appleton) - 63
6. Chambers (Journey To Sahalin) - 71

**Participative** (N=2)
1. Valentine (Small Room) - 61
2. Dimbleson (Opening Nights) - 85

**Delegative** - 0

**Situational** - 0
Other (N = 14)
1. Markham (Groves of Academe) - 52
2. Abner (Stoner) - 53
3. Woodruff (Purely Academic) - 58
4. McClure (Purely Academic) - 58
5. St. John (Dollar Diploma) - 60
6. Cartwright (Dollar Diploma) - 60
7. unnamed (The Small Room) - 61
8. Feeney (New Life) - 61
9. Shoemaker (Long Gainer) - 61
10. Morgan (President) - 64
11. unnamed dean (Entertaining Strangers) - 79
12. Corde (Dean's December) - 82
13. Blickstein (Mickelsson's Ghosts) - 82
14. Cleremont (Stoner) - 65

Deans By Decades:
1950s = 9
1960s = 11
1970s = 4
1980s = 7

Chairpersons: N = 30

Autocratic
1. Hagen (Pnin) - 57
2. Lunfest (Silas Timberman) - 54
3. Nast (Purely Academic) - 58
4. Schneider (Purely Academic) - 58
5. Fairchild (New Life) - 61
6. Kaplan (Going Blind) - 77
7. Lomax (Stoner) - 65
8. Tillson (Mickelsson's Ghosts) - 82
9. Burden (Elcholo Feeling Passes) - 84
10. Petty (Breaks) - 83

Democratic
1. Maddox (Faith and Fury) - 85
2. Minot (Search Light) - 55
3. Tyler (Friend in Power) - 58

Participative - 0
Delegative - 0
Situational - 0
Other

1. Hopkins - 81
2. Hubert - 55
3. Cardoza - 55
4. Milton - 58
5. Evats - 79
6. Unnamed - 61
7. Blorege - 61
8. Schombrumm - 77
9. Hochberg - 79
10. Factor - 89
11. Dunster - 85
12. Gilley - 61
13. Mary Ann - 79
14. Swartz - 77
15. Reid - 85
16. Willett - 68
17. McAdam - 52

Chairpersons by decade:
1950 - 9
1960 - 6
1970 - 6
1980 - 9
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