

Leading Business School Departments: The Impact of Context, Authority and Autonomy

Neil Rothenberg^a and David Denyer^b

^aCranfield University School of Management, Cranfield, Bedford, MK43 0AL, United Kingdom
Ted Rogers School of Management, Ryerson University, Toronto, Ontario, M5B 2K3, Canada
nrothenb@ryerson.ca

^bCranfield University School of Management, Cranfield, Bedford, United Kingdom
david.denyer@cranfield.ac.uk

Abstract

There is growing interest within Organization Studies in the leadership that occurs beyond the practices of the formally appointed leader. Where organizations operate in contexts that are complex, uncertain and competitive and authority is shared with employees possessing high autonomy, individual models of leadership are less representative. One such environment is university departments. Whilst leadership researchers have studied shared and distributed leadership in this setting, few studies investigate how leaders and other organizational actors conceptualise the leadership process, examine authority relations and impact of high employee autonomy, or explore the contextual factors, conditions and mechanisms that enhance or constrain leadership processes. This study aims to help address this gap by means of an in-depth, ethnographic case study of a Canadian Business School in which designated leaders have limited legitimate authority, where authority is shared between department chairs and individual faculty members have significant autonomy. Data were collected from three departments each exhibiting different characteristics in terms of size, academic discipline, departmental culture and the chair's leadership style. By comparing and contrasting the salient features of the academic departments we reveal five sets of contextual factors that influence the leadership process. We also find that leadership activities undertaken by departmental members is driven by the members themselves (bottom up) rather than determined by the formal leader (top down) as is most commonly reported in studies examining distributed and shared leadership. We aim to contribute to the ongoing debate about leadership in universities and to the theoretical development of shared and distributed leadership.

Introduction

Traditionally, leadership research has concentrated on the formally appointed leader whose authority is often a function of their hierarchical position within an organization. Over the past 15 years, however, new perspectives such as complexity leadership, empowered leadership and team leadership and most prominently distributed and shared leadership have focused on the leadership processes and practices undertaken by organizational members other than the designated leader. Pearce and Conger, define shared leadership as an interactive influence process focused on achieving group and/or organizational goals, which may be a top down, lateral or bottom up process. The empirical research within the areas of shared, empowered and

team leadership tends to focus on settings where there is a conscious attempt to reorganize the hierarchical arrangements within an organization to distribute aspects of position-based leadership authority to subordinates.

Distributed leadership views leadership practice as a unit of analysis, which may or may not be related to the distribution of authority within organizations. There are two major theoretical streams within distributed leadership theory and both focus mainly on school settings. Firstly, Gronn identifies distributed leadership as both a process and an approach and draws on activity theory in developing his analytical framework. Secondly, Spillane draws on the theory of distributed cognition and believes that while distributed leadership is a powerful analytical tool, it has little prescriptive power.

While both theories acknowledge that leadership is shared within organizations, shared leadership tends to focus on the structural attributes of the phenomena, while distributed leadership incorporates both structural and process dimensions. This view on leadership as a process builds on Rost's notion that leadership is both a social and cultural construction. Therefore, leadership research needs to focus on what leadership is, rather than solely on how individual leaders behave. As such, this research draws upon and further develops the distributed, rather than shared, leadership framework.

Most of the studies in the nascent field of distributed leadership have been conducted in the educational and health sectors, which in large measure consist of professional employees who tend, as a function of their professional status, to have higher degrees of autonomy than other employee types. There is also a body of research examining the distribution of leadership within the primary and secondary schools, which often have hierarchical governance. A number of researchers have commented on the paucity of research examining the leadership process in academic departments, which has tended to focus on traditional perspectives such as competency, behavioral, contingency and transformational leadership and has failed to take into account the unique context of academic departments – in particular the governance structure, which features shared authority and decision making between designated leaders and departmental faculty members who possess significant autonomy.

Of the limited number of studies, that have used a distributive lens to examine leadership in academic departments, many of these studies have been undertaken in the United Kingdom, where the traditional collegial structures have been largely dismantled with the decline in tenured faculty. Further, few studies have examined leadership within Business Schools departments. This is surprising given the growing importance of Business Schools within the academy, over the past thirty years; Business Schools have experienced almost unparalleled growth and have become a success story in the academic world. By the beginning of the twenty-first century, Business Schools were awarding 20% of undergraduate and 25% of master's degrees in the U.S. The environments Business Schools are operating in are becoming increasingly competitive, to respond to the challenges of growth and increasing competition, business schools require strong strategic leadership and decision-making skills which can be especially difficult to exercise within the traditional academic governance structures that have been maintained in most North American Business Schools. The examination of leadership at the department level, where a majority of decisions are made can provide valuable insight toward an improved understanding of leadership processes in Business Schools.

Two research questions emerge from our review of the literature:

Within the Business School context:

- *What constitutes leadership at a department level?*
- *What impact does the leader's limited authority have on his or her ability to implement departmental strategic objectives?*

Methods of Data Collection and Analysis

The project comprises a qualitative design, in order to capture the nuances of complex social phenomena and multiple participant perspectives of the leadership process. The case study design employs a single organization (a Canadian business school) with three embedded units of analysis (departments), providing the opportunity to generate theoretical insights based on comparisons between the units. In total, seventeen interviews were conducted with department chairs and faculty members in three departments and senior administrators from the school. The semi-structured interview questions were aligned to the project research questions, whilst also ensuring that respondents were free to explore themes that were important to them. The interviews were recorded, transcripts and were coded using NVivo software. A multi-stage thematic coding process was adopted to build a systematic account of the recorded data. This inductive approach focused on terms used by participants connected to relationships, activities, processes and events.

While the initial coding focused on in ways in which the data were related to the research questions, care was taken to ensure that data and themes that did not have an obvious connection to the questions, or were clearly important to the respondents, were not ignored. Several iterations between data, codes and themes were undertaken in order to establish the final framework. At each stage of the coding process an extensive set of memos was developed to guide the development and revision of the coding system and to record analytical insights. In order to further examine and help validate the results, the findings of the project were discussed with a group of departmental chairs and faculty members from departments that were not included in the study sample.

Results

Participants conceptualised leadership as both a focused activity, in which the designated leader has some leadership authority, and distributed practice, where faculty members, play a significant role in the leadership process. The data indicated five sets of contextual factors that influence the leadership process: governance structure, leader (chair) factors, member (faculty) factors, department factors, and the nature of the leadership initiative. The findings also suggest that each factor has a number of relevant characteristics. These are explained in the following section.

Governance Structure

The leadership process is perceived within this environment to be shaped by the unique governance structure within academic departments and four distinct characteristics were identified by participants; member autonomy, shared authority, leader tenure and decision-making processes.

It is acknowledged that the significant autonomy possessed by faculty members, serves to limit the leadership power available to departmental chairs,

“You’re dealing with a large number of tenured faculty and they don’t have to follow and, and this is obvious and, ...there’s no real penalty if they don’t and, and I’ve seen a number of chairs, a number of senior administrators from presidents right down to chairs, the people you work with can absolutely create an environment where nothing happens.” (Senior Administrator)

Shared authority, in which decisions are made through a democratic process, was also described by respondents as an important influence on leadership processes. The democratic process requires leaders to secure the buy-in of faculty members and results in an iterative process through which most initiatives are thoroughly discussed and modified as part of the process.

“So I think there, there’s the issue of partnership and collegiality and the leader has got to get you on board as, as a respected partner not as a, as a subordinate. I think that in an academic environment, I think that, that’s something that I see.” (Faculty, Department 3)

The practice whereupon the chair returns to a faculty position upon the completion of their term as chair was also identified as distinct influence on the leadership process,

“You think very carefully about, about what you do and how you treat the chair and the chair thinks very carefully how he or she treats faculty and it’s like we’re all in this together. I happen to be the chair for these five years but then I came from the ranks; I’m going to go back to the ranks.” (Chair, Department 3)

The specific nature of the decision making process within this environment was identified as a characteristic of the governance structure. The nature of the process was described as having a number of distinct elements including, extensive process time, need for transparency and buy-in and its iterative, democratic and collegial nature.

“That was, we went through meetings and meetings, and there were different opinions about what were the skills that were applicable but eventually we worked through it. We worked through it as a group; it was a very collegial process.” (Faculty member, Department 2)

Leader (Chair) Factors

The chair was also identified as an important influence to departmental leadership processes. This factor included characteristics related to the chair’s change orientation, leadership style and use of power and influence. Chair’s tended to exhibit two types of strategic orientation. Some chairs are change agents who seek to foster and implement change. Other chairs were viewed as caretakers who seek to maintain the status quo and are primarily focused on the administrative aspects of the role.

“Because it varies depending on the, on who’s in that position from someone who is simply filling in forms and making sure that loading is done properly to actually moving the department ahead academically with innovative curriculum development and professional development and putting our own school, so to speak, on the map, right so it varies.” (Faculty member, Department 2)

The leadership style of the chair is also cited as an influence on the leadership process within the department. The styles indicated in the project sample fall into four categories: collegial, directive, encourager and transformational.

“So this comes back to the type of leadership that you have and I, I, I think, certainly in the School of Business, we probably have a normal distribution of type of leadership within departments.” (Faculty member, Department 2)

It is important to recognize that the data concerning leadership style do not reveal a style that is specific chairs to an individual and chairs can demonstrate multiple styles depending on the situation.

The Chair’s use of power and influence was extensively noted by respondents. These comments related both to the influence tactics used by the chair and the bases of power that the chair drew upon.

“And, and honestly sometimes there are decisions, when you have a really strong chair sometimes, when you have a really strong chair and you have a lot of junior faculty who don’t challenge things because they’re afraid, sometimes the chair can be quite directive. Sometimes decisions are made, look we need to make a decision and, and this is what makes sense and, and it’s kind of pushed through.” (Faculty, Department 3)

In a similar vein, a number of sources of power are identified as having influence on the leadership process. These sources can be categorized as either position based, such as legitimate, reward, coercive and information power or personal based, such as referent and expert. It is interesting to note that most of the discussion of position based power sources focused on how, as a function of the governance structure, chairs were unable to draw upon position-based sources of power.

“I think in academic departments whether it’s this departments or virtually any other department, the person in charge, the department head, the chairman of the school—whoever it happens to be tends not to have the authoritarian, the power to make something happen, there’s a word I’m looking for sorry I just can’t find it... the responsibility and the authority.” (Faculty member, Department 3)

Member (Faculty) Factors

Faculty members were identified as a third factor influencing departmental leadership processes. Characteristics relevant to this factor included departmental orientation and employment status. Departmental orientation consisted of three dimensions: individual focus, leadership involvement and resistance to change. Employment status focused on distinctions between faculty members who have tenure and other faculty members who have probationary (tenure track) or part-time status.

The departmental focus of a faculty member relates to the amount of time and effort concentrated on research and/or teaching activities and many interviewees revealed that they had neither the time nor interest to engage in strategic matters related to department level change,

“I don’t have to tell you that and I think the initial reaction should be, if you want to be successful in this business, is to say no to taking on extra work because you already have too much to do. If you want to make it as an academic beyond the institution, you’re instant response has to be to say no.” (Faculty member, Department 2)

On the other hand, many interviewees suggested that individual faculty members are often motivated to undertake departmental leadership initiatives. Faculty may also assume leadership roles in departmental initiatives initiated either by the chair or other faculty members. However, most of the examples of faculty involvement in department leadership initiatives involved activities that were initiated by faculty themselves:

“Because, like I said, so leadership is distributed by who has vision and passion and is willing into put energy into a given topic. For the most part, most of our initiatives, we have enough initiatives underway that on any given one, there’s only one person who wants to run with that.” (Chair, Department 2).

There was universal agreement that academic leadership in a department is shared to varying degrees between the chair and department members,

“But I think it really depends on the issue and but I do think that the reality isn’t departments, the chair tends to rely on a group of people that can take self-leadership roles if you want in certain areas, whether it’s curriculum, whether it’s student engagement, whether it’s research, whether it’s outreach. The chair can’t do it all.” (Senior Administrator)

Three respondents highlighted a third dimension of departmental orientation relating to resistance to change, where a small number of few faculty members, who were interested in maintaining the status quo, could effectively block change at the departmental level,

“We had three or four very vocal tenured faculty who said why are we doing that? We don’t need to do that. Let’s just keep it the way it is, we’re moving too fast, etcetera, etcetera.” (Chair, Department 3)

The findings concerning the impact of faculty employment status on the departmental leadership process had a number of dimensions with the suggestion that tenured faculty and probationary faculty could be treated differently,

“You have people who are dying to get tenured, you have people who are on two year contracts and hope to be renewed, you have people who are literally on no contract but teach from year to year so you have a very fragmented audience and the power over, the leader’s power is different depending on who is in the audience.” (Faculty member, Department 2)

In addition, the overall composition of the department faculty between tenured and probationary/contract faculty was cited as an important influence on the leadership process. In departments in which there were high percentages of probationary faculty, chairs tended to make greater use of position-based power and harder influence tactics,

“Well, an example I guess when it looks like it’s happening that way is when the department leader or the department chair forces stuff on people and, to a certain extent, I mean I think part

of the challenge is you've got in our department in particular, we have several untenured faculty members and few tenured faculty members." (Faculty, Department 3)

Departmental Factors

The data revealed a number of the factors that impacted on leadership processes related to departmental characteristics including organizational culture, decision processes, academic discipline and size.

Three distinct types of organizational culture were identified in the data: change, collegial and directive. Organizational culture within this context refers to the perceptions of its members as to collection of beliefs, values and norms that guide the organization. Each cultural type identified has specific implications for the leadership process within the department and each type of culture identified related specifically to a single department. However, it is important to note that organizational culture can be shaped by other contextual factors and can shift along with the changes in those other factors:

"I think that very much that's very personal to the department. So if you look at them and you asked me to discern that question, I think I would have some basics that might be similar but I think I could discernibly say there'd be eleven very unique ways of doing that. So there's the two extremes and I think we can find something in between, everything from the pure collective, those who dare do a thing without our approval all the way through to you know either trust you or don't care enough." (Senior Administrator)

While the decision process was previously identified as a governance factor, interviewees also suggested that there were decision processes that were unique to individual departments including the need for consensus and how proposals are developed. Although democratic decision making was common to all departments, there was indication that in some departments, a simple majority is not sufficient and that decision making required consensus among members,

"We've had area for a long time; it's definitely been very much a consensus decision making model. What does everybody think? What should we do?" (Faculty member, Department 1)

Although interviewees did not provide specific examples related to the departments within the project sample, they did indicate that the size of a department and the nature of the discipline could serve to influence departmental leadership processes.

Nature of Leadership Initiative

There was an indication that the nature of the initiative could also influence the leadership process within departments. The data relating to the nature of the initiative fell into four distinct categories: impact on faculty, importance to chair, and the source and the type of initiative. The impact that the initiative has on individual faculty workload can be a significant influence as to whether or not faculty members support a particular initiative. As previously noted, many faculty members are busy with their individual teaching and research activities and do not wish to get involved in projects or activities that would require additional work,

The importance an initiative has for the Chair is another factor that was cited as having an influence on the departmental leadership processes. Interviewees provided a number of examples

which demonstrated that, when dealing with items that are important to them, chairs may change their leadership style and draw more upon position-based sources of power and hard influence tactics.

“[B]ut I think the key difference between where the collegial process worked and when it didn’t work was when it was of strategic importance to the leader versus when it was just something that needed to be done.” (Faculty member, Department 3)

The source of the initiative may also have an impact on the leadership process. The initiatives cited by respondents can be categorized as generated either within the department or outside the department. With initiatives that are generated outside the department, particularly those in which school’s senior administrators are applying pressure, there appears to be a greater inclination for departments to make decisions in a timely manner,

“...and so as a result it, it’s not as difficult to get them to move towards change in the curriculum, might be if we didn’t have sort of a common desire to ensure that the students are ready for the (accreditation) bodies.” (Faculty member, Department 1)

The type of initiative can also have an impact on the leadership process within the department. Two basic categories of initiatives were identified by respondents: academic and administrative. The type of initiative may influence the source from which the Chair draws their power. While tenured faculty tend to frown upon the chair’s use of legitimate power in academic matters, the use of this power source appears to be more acceptable when it comes to administrative matters,

“There’s other service things over which the chair has some discretion or has some influence, maybe work, nature of teaching workloads or things like that.” (Chair, Department 2)

Discussion and Conclusions

The findings make a number of contributions to existing research on leadership in academic settings. The study confirms the importance of collegiality as both a structural and process element in Business School academic departments. Although there have been suggestions that Birnbaum’s contention concerning the influence of collegial, bureaucratic, political and anarchic factors on academic departments lacked empirical evidence, these findings support the importance of these factors.

There is also empirical support for Gronn’s suggestion that distributed leadership rarely exists in isolation of the leadership role played by designated leaders and most settings featuring distributive leadership can more accurately be labelled as hybrid leadership. While previous empirical studies on leadership distribution have focused on settings in which the shared leadership was driven top-down by the process of redistribution of authority between organizational levels, these findings suggest the distribution of leadership is primarily driven from the bottom-up and the extent and type of distributed leadership is determined by the interest and initiative of individual faculty members.

The project findings also point to the importance of context in understanding leadership processes within this organizational setting. The contextual perspective is based on the premise that leadership research which focuses solely on individual leadership behaviours, competencies

and styles is incomplete as there is an important connection between leadership and the social structures in which it operates. The findings also provide a richer examination of the contextual factors influencing leadership than previous studies that focused on specific variables such as career stage or faculty performance. Porter and McLaughlin, in their review of the importance of context in leadership studies between 1990 and 2005 identified seven types of organizational contextual factors. Though there are some classification differences between the factors identified in the aforementioned study and this project, some of the factors are the same including organizational culture, processes and structure and member composition.

In consideration of the project data and the above discussion, the following propositions emerge:

- P1 Leadership in academic departments consists of both focused and distributed elements.
- P2 The extent of the distribution of leadership in academic departments is primarily driven by organizational members.
- P3 The leadership process in academic departments is shaped by context including factors relating to governance structure, leader, member and department factors and the nature of the leadership initiative.

Managerial Implications

This research is the first step in the development of a model describing the leadership process in organizations in which authority is shared as a function of the governance structure between the designated leader and members. The findings can enhance the understanding of Business Schools and other Academic Chairs of the leadership process within their own departments and assist in their choice of leadership action and behaviour depending on the contextual circumstances within their departments.

The inclusion of a single business school can be viewed as a limitation and, as such, caution is advised against generalizing these results to a wider context. While the findings may provide insight to the reader, it is important to note that departmental organizational arrangements within different universities can vary significantly particularly in relation to the authority allocated to department leaders, which may limit the direct application of these findings to other settings.

Despite this limitation, this project makes an important contribution to the emerging body of research which challenges traditional approaches that focus on single individuals as the embodiment of leadership in organizations. The project integrates the distributed perspective of leadership with research related to the importance of context. This project also proposes that contextual factors are particularly important in settings where authority is shared between designated leaders and other organizational members.

References

- Burke, C. S., Stagl, K. C., Klein, C., Goodwin, G. F., Salas, E., & Halpin, S. M. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(3), 288-307.

- Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., & Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1217-1234.
- Plowman, D. A., Solansky, S., Beck, T. E., & Baker, L. (2007). The role of leadership in emergent, self-organization. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18(4), 341-356.
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4), 423-451.
- Ensley, M. D., Hmieleski, K. M., & Pearce, C. L. (2006). The importance of vertical and shared leadership within new venture top management teams: Implications for the performance of startups. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17(3), 217-231.
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2003). All those years ago: The historical underpinnings of shared leadership. In C. L. Pearce, & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership* (pp. 1-18). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Zepke, N. (2007). Leadership, power and activity systems in a higher education context: Will distributive leadership serve in an accountability driven world? *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10(3), 301-314.
- Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Harris, A. (2007). Distributed leadership: Conceptual confusion and empirical reticence. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10(3), 315-325.
- Rost, J. C. (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century* (Paperback. ed.). Westport, Conn.: Praeger.
- Brown, F. W., & Moshavi, D. (2002). Herding academic cats: Faculty reactions to transformational and contingent reward leadership by department chairs. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(3), 79-93.
- Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(6), 693-710.
- Gomes, R., & Knowles, P. A. (1999). Marketing department leadership: An analysis of a team transformation. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 21(3), 164-174.
- Gibbs, G., Knapper, C., & Piccinin, S. (2008). Disciplinary and contextually appropriate approaches to leadership of teaching in research-intensive academic departments in higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(4), 416-436.
- Gosling, J., Bolden, R., & Petrov, G. (2009). Distributed leadership in higher education: What does it accomplish? *Leadership*, 5(3), 299-310.
- van Ameijde, J. D. J., Nelson, P. C., Billsberry, J., & Van Meurs, N. (2009). Improving leadership in higher education institutions: A distributed perspective. *Higher Education*, 58(6), 763-779.
- Bolden, R., Petrov, G., & Gosling, J. (2008). *Distributed leadership in higher education: Rhetoric and reality* No. 07/19. Exeter, United Kingdom: University of Exeter.
- Schoemaker, P. J. H. (2008). The future challenges of business: Rethinking management education. *California Management Review*, 50(3), 119-139.
- Thomas, H. (2007). An analysis of the environment and competitive dynamics of management education. *Journal of Management Development*, 26(1), 9-21.

- Pfeffer, J., & Fong, C. T. (2004). The business school 'business': Some lessons from the US experience. *The Journal of Management Studies*, 41(8), 1501-1520.
- Bolton, A. (1996). The leadership challenge in universities: The case of business schools. *Higher Education*, 31(4), 491-506.
- Gioia, D. A., & Corley, K. G. (2002). Being good versus looking good: Business school rankings and the circean transformation from substance to image. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1(1), 107-120.
- Roberts, R. W. (2004). Managerialism in US universities: Implications for the academic accounting profession. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 15(4-5), 461-467.
- Miles, M. B. (1994). In Huberman A. M. (Ed.), *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.
- Ezzy, D. (2002). *Qualitative analysis: Practice and innovation*. Crows Nest, Australia: Routledge.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). *Qualitative research for education* (Second Edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- King, N. (2009). Template analysis. Retrieved August 18, 2009
http://www.hud.ac.uk/hhs/research/template_analysis/literature.htm.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Smart, J. C., & St John, E. P. (1996). Organizational culture and effectiveness in higher education: A test of the "culture type" and "strong culture" hypotheses. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18(3), 219-241.
- Hatfield, R. D. (2006). Collegiality in higher education: Toward an understanding of the factors involved in collegiality. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict*, 10(1), 11-19.
- Birnbaum, R. (1989). The cybernetic institution: Toward an integration of governance theories. *Higher Education*, 18(2), 239-253.
- Tierney, W. G. (2004). In Smart J. C. (Ed.), *A cultural analysis of shared governance: The challenges ahead* (XIX edition). New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers: Springer Science-Business Media.
- Gronn, P. (2009). From distributed to hybrid leadership practice. *Distributed Leadership*, 197-217.
- Kirkman, B. L., & Rosen, B. (1999). Beyond self-management: Antecedents and consequences of team empowerment. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 42(1), 58-74.
- Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P. Jr. (1987). Leading workers to lead themselves: The external leadership of self-managing work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32(1), 106-129.
- Osborn, R. N., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(6), 797-837.
- Creswell, J. W., & Brown, M. L. (1992). How chairpersons enhance faculty research: A grounded theory study. *Review of Higher Education*, 16(1), 41-62.

Peterson, M. W., & White, T. H. (1992). Faculty and administrator perceptions of their environments: Different views or different models of organization? *Research in Higher Education*, 33(2), 177-204.

Porter, L. W., & McLaughlin, G. B. (2006). Leadership and the organizational context: Like the weather? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 559-576.