

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University  
Microfilms  
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



8417894

**Kinchen, James Benjamin, Jr.**

**A FRAMEWORK FOR HIGHER EDUCATION LEADER PERFORMANCE BASED  
ON FRAMEWORKS OF ERVING GOFFMAN AND SEYMOUR B. SARASON**

*The University of North Carolina at Greensboro*

**Ed.D. 1984**

**University  
Microfilms  
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

**Copyright 1984**

**by**

**Kinchen, James Benjamin, Jr.**

**All Rights Reserved**



A FRAMEWORK FOR HIGHER EDUCATION LEADER PERFORMANCE  
BASED ON FRAMEWORKS OF ERVING GOFFMAN  
AND SEYMOUR B. SARASON

by

James Benjamin Kinchen, Jr.

A Dissertation Submitted to  
the Faculty of the Graduate School at  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Education

Greensboro

Approved by



---

Dale L. Brubaker,  
Dissertation Advisor

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Advisor *Dale L. Brubaker*  
Dale L. Brubaker

Committee Members *Joseph E. Bryson*  
Joseph E. Bryson

*Dwight L. Clark*  
Dwight L. Clark

*Ronald A. Crutcher*  
Ronald A. Crutcher

March 28, 1984  
Date of Acceptance by Committee

© 1984

JAMES BENJAMIN KINCHEN, JR.

All Rights Reserved

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am appreciative to the members of my doctoral committee for their support: Dr. Dale L. Brubaker, my advisor and chairman of the committee, and I have spent many hours reviewing manuscripts and discussing ideas. The writing of this dissertation has been a process of giving birth; he has been the midwife, helping to bring this work to life. Dr. Dwight L. Clark has been my "higher education mentor." His thoughtful remarks, provocative questions, gentle prodding, divergent perspectives, and always lucid and conceptually coherent discussions of higher education issues have meant a great deal to me. Dr. Joseph E. Bryson, always gracious and considerate, has also been influential, particularly in challenging me to think deeply about the legal, moral, and philosophical aspects of educational leadership. Dr. Ronald A. Crutcher has been my cognate representative. I am grateful for his having consented to serve on my committee and for the contributions of my fellow musician to this phase of my study. To each of you, I am grateful.



I am sincerely appreciative to the three academic leaders and persons within their offices and institutions who so graciously hosted me during my practicum: Dr. Thomas Mullin, Dean of the College, Wake Forest University; Dr. Nathan Sims, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical University; and Dr. Patricia Sullivan, Academic Dean, Salem College. Thanks to each of you for giving me the opportunity to see such competent leadership from so intimate a vantage point. Your contributions were invaluable.

I am grateful to Ms. Anita Hawkins of the Department of Educational Administration office who, in her usual positive and considerate way, gave me less to worry about by attending to some of the details of the dissertation phase such as coordinating dates, people, meetings, and the like.

Finally, I want to thank all of my teachers -- especially those here at the university -- but also any and all who have contributed to the success of this paper (however long ago) by sharing with me a portion of themselves and, thus, making an investment in my "becoming." Most of all, I am deeply indebted

to my mother, Mrs. Bertha Kinchen Graham, and my father,  
the late Reverend J. B. Kinchen, Sr.; they were my  
first teachers.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Description of the Study (Methodology) ..	4
Purpose and Significance of the Study ...	19
Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation .....	20
II. SELECTED REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .....	22
Erving Goffman: A Dramaturgical Frame- work .....	23
Other Books by Goffman .....	37
Seymour B. Sarason: A Framework for the Creation of Settings .....	44
Summary .....	56
III. ANALYSIS AND REVISION OF THE GOFFMAN AND SARASON FRAMEWORKS .....	60
An Autobiographical Analysis .....	61
A Heuristic Analysis .....	85
An Investigative Framework .....	98
Summary .....	102

IV. APPLICATION OF THE GOFFMAN-SARASON FRAME-	
WORK .....	104
Learning From the History and Culture of	
the Setting .....	104
The Core Group .....	109
Growth and Change Within the Setting ....	113
Resources .....	118
The Leader -- Privacy and Growth .....	120
Performance Obligations and Impression	
Management .....	122
The Aesthetic Dimension .....	131
Summary and Guidelines .....	135
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
FOR FURTHER STUDY .....	145
Conclusions .....	148
Recommendations for Further Study .....	152
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	155

KINCHEN, JAMES BENJAMIN, JR. A Framework for Higher Education Leader Performance Based On Frameworks of Erving Goffman and Seymour B. Sarason. (1984)  
Directed by: Dr. Dale L. Brubaker. Pp. 157.

The purpose of this study was to provide a framework that will help higher education leaders and scholars better understand and give leadership in college and university settings.

Two major investigative methodologies were employed. The first was analytical/synthetical in nature and entailed the analysis of frameworks of Erving Goffman and Seymour B. Sarason, the revision and integration of those frameworks with the writer's autobiographical understandings, and the creation of a new framework -- a framework for higher education leader performance. The second was that of a case study in which the framework was applied to the observed performance of three chief academic officers. The observations were made by the researcher during the course of a higher education administration practicum. A detailed journal of those observations was kept and used as the major resource for this portion of the study.

The frameworks of Goffman and Sarason, upon which in large measure the new framework was based, were reviewed in detail. The two frameworks were felt to be especially significant to the study of higher education leadership because they address the two areas of leadership which, regardless of such variables as personality or situation, are crucial to the success and effective-

ness of efforts to give leadership to higher education settings. Goffman's framework covered the theatrical nature of what occurs when persons come in contact with each other and interact with each other within a setting. Such encounters serve to influence others. Administrators must give leadership to countless such "performances" each day. Sarason's framework dealt with how a leader might best bring people together into sustained relationships and in pursuit of certain goals. Administrators must provide such leadership in a way that considers realistically the potential problems and impediments.

Coming out of the framework were guidelines for higher education leader performance and recommendations for further exploration of the ideas presented in the study.

CHAPTER I:  
INTRODUCTION

Much importance has been attached to the study of leadership in higher education. A sizeable and ever growing body of literature exists on the subject. Much research has been done and continues to be done in the field, resulting in the formulation and testing of hypotheses, the creation of theories, the generation of new knowledge, and the constant refinement of that which is already known. There was a time when higher education administrators were principally persons with training and teaching experience in their respective academic disciplines upon whose shoulders fate caused to fall the mantle of leadership. These persons had no formal training in administration.

Today many have such training due to the large numbers of higher education administration programs offered by universities across the nation. The Graduate Programs and Admissions Manual 1981 - 1983 Volume D, which is compiled by the Graduate Record Examination Board and the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States and is published by the Educational Testing Service, lists 406 institutions offering graduate study in some aspect of educational administration (1981). The same publication indicates that 119 of these programs offer doctorates. Many of these programs provide study op-

portunities for persons interested in higher education administration as well as those whose primary concern is providing leadership in public school settings. The existence of such programs is itself ample testament to the increasing importance attached to the study of leadership in higher education.

Numerous efforts have been made to better understand leadership in higher education. Scholars, practitioners, theorists, educators, and others have sought to develop meaningful and helpful frameworks for viewing the behavior of higher education leaders and those factors which motivate it. Such efforts have resulted in different approaches and perspectives. For example, some have constructed frameworks which seek to explain leadership behavior in terms of a leader's personality traits and native attributes. Others have analyzed leadership effectiveness as a function of the situation. Still others view leadership behavior as the result of transactional factors -- the interaction of person and setting. Additionally, some believe that leadership can be viewed along two dimensions, dimensions which they feel are essentially present in any setting to which one would attempt to give leadership: the need to get the job done (goal achievement) and concern for those who must do it (group maintainance). Terms and labels often associated with frameworks of this sort include goal emphasis and



support, system orientation and person orientation, task and relationship, instrumental activities and expressive activities, work facilitation and interaction facilitation, nomothetic and idiographic, initiating structure and consideration, and so on (Hoy and Miskel, 1982). These attempts to analyze and explain leadership have resulted in a greater understanding of leadership behavior in higher education settings. Yet much is still either unknown or not fully understood about providing appropriate leadership in higher education.

This dissertation will provide a framework that will be helpful in further understanding higher education leadership behavior and providing useful guidelines for those who will give leadership to others in college and university settings. Such a framework will not ignore existing learnings. However, the dissertation will go beyond the customary consideration of personality factors (those related to the leader and others within the setting) as an explanation of leadership behavior. Instead, a broader perspective will be taken and the challenge sought of integrating contributions from the humanities (such as the theatrical nature of social interactions and the aesthetics of creating settings) with certain aspects of the social sciences (such as the use of observational research in social systems inquiry) in offering a fresh and instructive way of looking

at higher education leadership behavior. The resulting framework will be a promising addition to what is already known about understanding and providing such leadership. The framework will have descriptive and programmatic value. It will give insight into describing and understanding the performance of self and others in settings in which persons give leadership. It will also provide a basis for guiding that performance as persons seek to give leadership to planning, organizing, staffing, directing, decision-making, communication, instructional, and evaluative activities within higher education settings.

#### Description of the Study (Methodology)

The first methodology employed will be that of framework analysis and revision. Two existing frameworks are analyzed. One is that of sociologist Erving Goffman as presented in his book, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (1959). The other is found in Seymour B. Sarason's book, The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies (1972). (These will be elaborated upon in the next chapter.) I will then integrate the two with each other and with my own autobiographical understandings in creating a new framework.

The resulting framework will be applied to the leader-

ship performance of chief academic officers at three institutions of higher learning: Salem College and Wake Forest University, both of Winston-Salem, and North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University of Greensboro. This phase of the research will take the form of a case study in which the writer functions as a participant/observer. The data were collected during a practicum in which I had the opportunity to observe the performance of these three administrators and to take part in certain activities at each institution and within each office. This practicum took place during the 1983 fall semester. The framework will give shape and focus to what I experienced and observed during the course of the higher education practicum.

The practicum was a highly significant experience and proved to be seminal in the choice of dissertation topic. The practicum was set up in consultation with and under the direction of Dwight Clark, who coordinates higher education activities in the Administration Department of the School of Education at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. After several conferences, we selected the three institutions. Clark felt that the chief academic leaders at each of the schools would be exemplary persons to observe and work with. My subsequent experiences corroborated his wisdom.

Initially, I met the leaders in their offices. Each

meeting was rich both in terms of what was said and also "expressions given off." (The latter term will be explained in the next chapter.) We agreed upon the structure that the practicum would take (what kinds of activities I would be involved in and when I would be at each institution). I was present at each school one day per week. My activities varied from setting to setting and, often, from day to day. In one institution, I was given a project which consumed most of my time. It resulted in the drafting of a student questionnaire to evaluate opinions and perceptions of adult education at the school. In another institution, I was asked to draft correspondence, advertisements, and notices concerning a newly established distinguished professorship in the history and philosophy of science. But this responsibility was not very time-consuming and I was able to engage in many other activities there. At this school and the third one, my activities tended to vary, providing better opportunities to understand what is expected of the respective chief academic officers and also to view their performance. For example, I had several opportunities to observe them participate in and give leadership to meetings.

The practicum covered most of the fall semester. The academic leaders and others within each setting were very helpful during its course. The academic officers took time from their busy schedules to talk with me and answer my

questions. Others (assistants, secretaries, etc.) were remarkably generous in giving of their time, sometimes going far out of their accustomed ways to make my experiences positive and pleasant ones. I maintained a journal of the practicum in which I chronicled the experiences of each day in such a way as to preserve not only the factual nature of what I had done and seen, but also to capture something of the color and tone of the interactions in which I had been a participant and to which I had been privy. This log, which I kept with the understanding that it would be shared with Professor Clark, is the major record of my practicum, and hence, will serve as a major resource in the writing of Chapter III.

As was previously stated, I functioned in this phase of the study as a participant/observer. I also labeled this participatory observation as a kind of case study. L. R. Gay, in her book, Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis & Application (1981), suggested five categories of educational research by method: historical (studying, understanding, and explaining past events), correlational (determining whether, and to what degree, a relationship exists between two or more quantifiable variables), causal-comparative ("ex post facto" research in which the researcher attempts to determine the cause, or reason, for existing differences in the behavior or status of groups of individu-

als), experimental (which involves manipulation of an independent variable to see if, and to what extent doing so makes a difference in outcomes), and descriptive (which determines and reports the way things are). In this latter category she included case study, which she defined as "the in-depth investigation of an individual, group, or institution." It is, in a sense, a status report. But Gay also said that a case study should say why as well as what. Also, Sarason cautioned that a case study "is not a collection of facts, if only because facts do not necessarily tell the truth, but rather a description of events which are considered important according to some conception or theory about how things work and develop."

Gay distinguished between the case study method and participant/observer research based on the role which the researcher takes in each. In the former, the researcher maintains objective distance only by watching and reporting on the action. In the latter, the researcher becomes a part of the action. While such distinctions may be helpful in knowing the conditions under which the research took place, there are some who suggest that the lines between researcher and research should not be so sharply drawn. They argue that in any case, participation is inevitable. Ross L. Mooney (1975) made such a point. He viewed research as a kind of drama in which the research-

er is very much a part. Several of Mooney's key ideas on the involvement of self in research are now examined as they are essential to understanding and appreciating the approach that I have taken and the basic assumptions which underlie it.

Mooney believes that there exist some very unfortunate wrong assumptions about the involvement of researchers in their research. Many of these erroneous views result from an ignorance on the part of those who consume research of the "inner drama" of research as they give attention only to the finished product. Such consumer attitudes profoundly affect the way in which researchers operate and, indeed, the way in which they perceive their roles. Many researchers and consumers also fail to realize that "research is a personal venture which, quite aside from its social benefits, is worth doing for its direct contribution to one's own self-realization" (Mooney,p.176). Mooney noted other prevalent misconceptions about researchers and research from a researcher's perspective.

1. It is improper for me (the researcher) to include myself in the research process. I must be impersonal. "I am to...leave myself out."
2. "I am to look for truths which exist on their own account, independent of me." (An objective reality)

3. Hence, "if my research is to report on truths which are independent of me, then I must not participate in the events from which my judgments of truth come....I am to observe, but not to participate." [emphasis added]
4. "I am not to be influenced by what I value."
5. "I am not to be concerned with what is 'good,' only with what is 'true.'"
6. "I am to let findings speak for themselves."
7. "I am to depend on logic and testable demonstration, not on feelings and imagination."
8. "I am to use procedures approved by scientists, not my own unproven ways of doing things."
9. "Science stresses commonality, principles that run through everything, facts that abide whether man wants them or not, proof, security, reliability, basic truth on which man can build. The arts and humanities stress the unique, the unusual, the individual instance, the events on the inside of people, their feelings, dreams, imaginings, values. What is appropriate to the arts and humanities would be ruinous to science .....Therefore, I would use the scientific method, not the methods of the arts and humanities."
10. Compared to the vast accumulation of scientific knowledge, "my own personal experience is small indeed...untested and fragile." Therefore, "I



am to recognize that my experience has little worth compared to the accumulated and tested experience of science."

11. "I am to select a problem in relation to what science needs to know, not in relation to what I need to know."
12. "I am to get my pleasures from the reliability of my procedures and not from the nature of the content with which I deal."
13. "There cannot be truth in science if there is error....I must avoid making mistakes."
14. "Basically, man adjusts to nature....My job, as a researcher, is, therefore, to achieve that separation from nature which allows me most clearly to see nature's truth so that I and other men can fit ourselves to that which has to be outside of me and man."  
(Mooney, pp.177-180)

A view of research which holds these assumptions is appealing to many researchers and consumers of research because the kind of dualism which it advocates through the separation of researcher from research is familiar and comfortable. It is deeply rooted in the heritage of our Western culture and draws upon quite old perceptions of discreteness between the physical and the spiritual. Mooney writes that medieval man had notions of "a primary split between man and

the supernatural" (Mooney,p.180). After the Renaissance and Reformation, it was commonly held that such a split existed between man and nature. To a large extent, Mooney wrote, such dichotomous thinking still persists.

Not only is such an artificially polarized view of the research process comfortably ingrained in our cultural traditions, Mooney also holds that such conceptions "provide a psychological place for the scientist to be!" It sets the researcher apart from other mortals and gives him or her an appropriate aura of mystery:

Like the [ancient]witch doctor, the scientist is normally being human among all the rest, but, by donning suitable ceremonial garments (typically a white coat), by uttering suitable incantations, otherwise meaningless (mysterious formulas and technical jargon), and by carefully following ceremonial procedures (scientific methodologies), he can invoke truth out of a mysterious beyond.

(Mooney,p.181)

This kind of polarity is also fundamental to our schooling process in which we tend to set up a student versus subject dichotomy -- one in which "the self of the learner is separated from the subject to be learned" (Mooney, p.185).

Mooney advocates a shift in thinking from such a dualistic frame to a perspective "which makes it possible to integrate the pursuit of science and research with the acceptance and fruitful development of one's self"...for "science and self can be one integrative action" (Mooney, pp.187-188).

Such a shift will be accompanied by changes in the as-

sumptions researchers and research consumers hold for researchers and their research. Mooney shared some of these new assumptions, again, from the researcher's point-of-view:

1. "Whatever I realize of the universe, I realize from where I am, and no other being realizes life from where I am. This is my uniqueness, my being."
2. "I am an intimate inclusion within all." I belong!
3. "Life is a constant birth." I am becoming!
4. "Research is inescapably a personal formation."
5. "The world a man knows is a world created within his experience and not apart from it." This is not to say that "nothing exists independent of man, but rather to say that when a man relates to any event which he takes to have been previously independent of him he is involved at the point of relating....Truth is his truth and how universal it comes to be depends on how universal his connectedness becomes."
6. "Since I participate when I observe, it is nonsense to try to split me and say I can 'observe but not participate.' " [emphasis added]
7. As a participant one can assume an attitude which

fosters "the careful searching of possibilities on the horizon beyond him" or can give attention to what goes on in a setting so as to encourage a state of mind which permits the "aggressive grasping and shaping of what has already named as wanted from among the possibilities. The former is akin to 'observing' and the latter to 'participating'; in neither case, however, is the actor himself removed from the action."

8. "To be asked to 'not be influenced by my values' is to be asked not to be influenced by my bonds of belonging or my tentacles of becoming. It is to ask the impossible, for what I am is involved in these."
9. "I see 'good' and 'true' as reciprocally fused in one rhythmic stride through life."
10. Findings do not speak for themselves. "It is man who speaks; data are a man's formations."
11. I must often feel my way along and trust my feeling to guide me into moves that only later can be given a logical maplike form. "Rather than scorn feelings and imaginings, the productive researcher gives these aspects of himself a full and challenging place."
12. The researcher who depends upon the scientific method and the artist share much in common:

- a. both are direct experiencers
- b. both are map-makers
- c. both seek to extend themselves into universality
- d. both are creators
- e. for both there is a formative period which precedes the formulation of testable hypotheses

13. "The problem I create to work on is to be a problem of importance to me personally.... This means that I am also deeply interested in the content of my problem" and am not merely concerned with "the reliability of my work in carrying out the right procedures." I seek reliability of procedures as a necessary part of wanting to be certain that I am not deceiving myself in matters important to me.
14. I will make mistakes. This is inevitable. "The 'big thing' is not 'not to make mistakes' but progressively to integrate and use mistakes as means in the progression of moving from 'amissness' to completeness.
15. My orientation will be essentially a wholistic one. "Life evolves in the effecting of connections between what is structuring on the inside as emptiness or need and what is structuring on the outside as suitably matching potentiality for fulfilling need."

(Mooney, pp.190-198)

The basic approach that I have chosen is one that is in consonance with Mooney's concept of research as an integrative, self-centered, self-fulfilling activity. Accepting Mooney's assumptions, there is no contradiction or incongruity in conducting a case study in which one functions as both participant and observer.

Others have given support to this kind of conscious and open involvement of self as an inevitable and natural part of creative, productive endeavors. Maxine Greene (1975) supported the idea that a writer's experience is integral to his or her creative output and that when one creates, there takes place "a gradual growth of consciousness into expression." She views literature as "a conscious effort on the part of an individual artist to understand his own experience by framing it in language." To an extent, it is not vastly different with any expressive and/or creative endeavor, even research. We come to grips with something which has become a part of our consciousness. We are aware of that something only in relation to our other awarenesses and can relate our awareness of the something under consideration only in terms of who we are.

Dale L. Brubaker is another strong advocate of the use of one's autobiography as a means to self-understanding and as a way of understanding how we perceive and experience settings (1982). He suggests that our perspectives,

perceptions, and actions are guided by numerous "tapes" or messages from the past which are played and replayed in our heads. Getting in touch with these tapes, attempting to make sense of them, and identifying their sources is important to researchers, leaders, teachers, and others. Admitting (and accepting) that these autobiographical tapes mediate our experiences and our perceptions of these experiences is equally important. Hence, there will be running through this dissertation a strong autobiographical strand. I will not divorce myself from my research or writing.

In addition to the role of participant/observer elaborated upon above, I shall also function as evaluator. It will be necessary for me to evaluate what I have observed and experienced in light of the framework which shall represent a synthesis of Goffman, Sarason, and my own autobiographical perspectives. It was stated earlier that while there should be no attempt to separate the participatory dimension of the research from the observational aspects of it, a researcher may vary his or her attitudinal orientation on a continuum which ranges from a passive level of involvement to one which is more intense and aggressive. The evaluative function requires less aggressive involvement (which places one in the position of actively influencing outcomes in the direction of a desired outcome) and more of

an ability to pull oneself back from the center of action, watch, and appraise what is happening. In other words, to be successful in this portion of the research, I must be able to at once be a part of what I am giving attention to while being apart from it.

My evaluative attentions will be focused on three main objectives or activities: The most obvious of these encompasses the performers and performances which I will observe, describe, and report on. The second focus of evaluation (one not so obvious, but of equal importance, especially given the research assumptions that have been accepted by the writer) is self. The third objective is that of meta-evaluation -- an evaluation of the research and evaluation process employed in the writing of this dissertation. This latter focus serves a quality control function (Johnson, 1983).

Michael Scriven, in his Evaluation Thesaurus (1980), stated that evaluations may be formative or summative. The former denotes an ongoing process of appraisal. The latter refers to a final or "wrap-up" evaluation. (In his Thesaurus, Scriven quoted Bob Stake, who, Scriven wrote, illustrated the difference between these two types of evaluation quite clearly and colorfully, as saying, "' When the cook tastes the soup, that's formative; when the guests taste the soup, that's summative.'") The evaluations described above will be formative through the completion of this dissertation,



at which point they will become summative.

At the conclusion of Chapter IV, performance guidelines, the purpose of which is to assist leaders in effective self-presentation in higher education settings, will be given. These guidelines will be based on the framework analysis and revision of Chapter III and the case study findings presented in the fourth chapter.

At a very early stage in the writing of this dissertation, my advisor and I discussed the merits and drawbacks of using the first person. We decided (as the reader might already have surmised) to use the first person for the most part. This decision is justified on three counts:

1. Use of "I", "me", "my", etc. gives the writing a ring of authenticity consistent with the Goffman framework.
2. Such usage is consistent with the Mooney research assumptions presented above.
3. Such usage could enhance the impact and directness of expression without necessarily detracting from the scholarly and serious quality of the writing.

#### Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purposes of the study are the following:

1. To analyze frameworks of Erving Goffman and Seymour B. Sarason as stated above. (Analytical)

2. To revise the frameworks, integrate them with my own autobiographical understandings, and create a new framework for viewing leadership behavior. (Synthetical)
3. To use the resulting framework to describe and make sense of the performances of three chief academic officers. (Descriptive)
4. To generate guidelines that might be helpful to leaders in higher education settings. (Programmatic)

The significance of the study lies chiefly in these attributes:

1. Its uniqueness: it undertakes to do something not previously done.
2. Its heuristic nature: it will employ a qualitative research methodology for exploratory purposes.
3. Its worthwhileness: it has the potential for making a meaningful contribution to existing learnings about leadership behavior.
4. Its potential for self-realization: it provides a meaningful opportunity for my own self-fulfillment and growth.

#### Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation

The basic organizational plan for the rest of this

dissertation will be as follows: Chapter II will consist of a selected review of related literature. Works of Goffman and Sarason will be given exclusive attention. The framework analysis and revision will be done in Chapter III. It is in Chapter IV that the new framework will be applied to the performance of three academic leaders as observed by the writer. Guidelines will also be presented. The final chapter will contain summary, conclusions, and research recommendations.

CHAPTER II:  
SELECTED REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In Chapter I, I presented a rationale for the dissertation -- I said why it is important, significant, and worth doing. I also presented a mission statement and map for the dissertation -- I explained what would be done and how it would be accomplished. The present chapter will review those writings which will provide the conceptual foundations of the dissertation.

Reviews are customarily broad in their scope, sampling from many different sources ideas related to those broad subject areas considered to be germane to the particular dissertation topic. As this dissertation took shape and its focus crystallized, and as my advisor, Professor Brubaker, and I shared in its unfolding, it became increasingly clear that rather than drawing from traditional concepts of leadership, leadership behavior, and how that behavior affects, and is affected by organizational dynamics (as such dynamics are customarily viewed and understood), this dissertation breaks new ground by employing ideas and concepts outside of the corpus of traditional leadership thinkings and learnings. Thus, it is appropriate that this review should look beyond traditional leadership writings. As stated in the previous chapter, frameworks of Erving Goffman and Seymour B.

Sarason will be integrated with the writer's own autobiographical understandings to form a new framework. Accordingly, the scope of this review will be less broad and considerably deeper than is the case with most reviews as the writings of Goffman on the theatricity of interactions (and other related writings by him) and those of Sarason on the creation of settings are examined in detail.

### Erving Goffman: A Dramaturgical Framework

Canadian sociologist Goffman's book, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (1959), offers a cogent framework for viewing and understanding how people come across (and are expected to come across) to others in social situations. His framework employs the metaphor of theatrical performance and is a product of his own observations and analyses. Much of his work is based on anthropologic studies of social interaction made by Goffman during a year's residency on one of the smaller of the Shetland Isles.

I have often found metaphors (which are essentially attempts to remove something from its original frame and place it within another) to be deficient when examined closely and analytically -- especially when used to explain some complex concept, activity, or system. That is to say, they seem to hold up only to a point before it becomes apparent that they cannot fully or credibly explain that which

they purport to explain. It becomes apparent that the equation is not really an equation. This is always a danger when seeking to perceive, understand, and explain one thing in terms of another. In fact, one might argue that such equations are metaphysically impossible. Yet, well constructed metaphors can be very helpful in looking at and making sense of certain activities, systems, and ideas. For the person approaching an unfamiliar subject, they can provide a necessary foundation -- a basic conceptual framework within which later learnings and experiences can be organized. For the person seeking to know and understand more about something with which he or she is already familiar, appropriate metaphors can provide fresh perspectives and new and deeper understandings. As a metaphor, the Goffman framework is exceptionally sound and unusually complete. It has integrity. While Goffman deserves much credit for being able to see the relationship between theatre and social interactions, for analyzing it so thoroughly, and for using the metaphor with such skill, a close look at theatre and real life reveals another reason for the metaphoric strength of his framework: one draws directly from the other. One attempts to imitate the other. The aim of one is to create such a sense of the other that those who give themselves over to its deception are pulled into its fantasy so fully and completely that it becomes, if only for a moment, their own reality. Goffman has dis-

covered in social life some of the very characteristics which theatre reproduces from it. His book represents his attempt to examine and explain the theatrical aspects of how people live with and relate to each other.

Several basic assumptions and essential premises undergird his effort, including the following:

1. All interactions consist of performances.
2. We try to control our performances so as to come across in certain ways -- ways that are advantageous to us.
3. Our performances will vary from audience to audience.
4. Others expect us to act in certain ways -- ways consistent with the role we assume and the audience for which we perform.
5. Verbal communication is but one part of a performance, and is generally neither the sole nor the decisive element of the drama that dictates how we come across -- i.e., what expressions we give off.
6. We must often perform in conjunction with (and in collusion with) others. They become our team.
7. Fronts -- the theatrical equivalent of which are props, costumes, make-up, and mannerisms -- serve to help define the situation by functioning as

identifiers. Fronts tell who we are and what we are about.

8. Performances are selective presentations. We emphasize what we want others to see and hear while deemphasizing or concealing other information.
9. Performances may be disrupted -- we can lose control.
10. The audience should believe the sincerity of the performance and ought to sense that the actor(s) believe(s) in what he/she/they are/is doing.
11. There are times when the performance moves backstage, away from the audience. It is then that the performers say or do things that they would not or could not say or do in front of the audience without endangering the impression they wish to make or have already made. This includes the sharing of secrets.
12. Persons who have no business at a given performance -- outsiders -- can ruin the show.
13. Persons who possess information about the performance which is out of keeping with their function within or access to the performance may adversely affect the performance. Such persons may be said to play "discrepant roles."



14. Separateness (spatial or otherwise) must be maintained between the performer(s) and audience.
15. Performances have moral implications. (pp. 1-255)

Goffman defined interaction as "the reciprocal influence of individuals upon one another's actions when in one another's immediate physical presence." He defined performance as "all the activity of a given participant on a given occasion which serves to influence in any way any of the other participants." Interactions and performances are similar in that in each efforts are made to influence others. The distinction between Goffman's definitions of interaction and performance is chiefly this: the first takes into consideration attempts by all individuals present to influence each other. The latter term, performance, concentrates on the efforts of a single participant (or a group of participants working as a team) to influence another or others. But inherent and integral to all interactions, as defined by Goffman, is the concept of performance. All interactions consist of performances. Someone is trying to influence someone else.

"Regardless of the particular objective which the individual has in mind [how he/she wishes to influence others] and of his motive for having this objective [why the person

wishes to do so], it will be in his best interests to control the conduct of others," (p.3) especially how others respond to him or her. This control is achieved by getting others to agree with the performer's definition of the situation and to act in voluntary accordance with his or her own plan. In order to so "sell" the audience, it will be necessary for the performer to be enough in control of his or her performance -- i.e., expressions given off as well as rhetoric -- so as to come across in ways that will convey to others the impression which it is in his or her best interests to convey. Thus, the performer must act with what Goffman calls "expressive responsibility." He or she must successfully manage a hoped for impression. This management also involves an evaluative component. The performer must be aware enough of his or her performance and detached enough from it to know how he or she is coming across and to be able to make necessary adjustments.

Performers should "foster the impression that their current performance of their routine and their relationship to their current audience have something special and unique about them" (p.49). This impression can be achieved through what Goffman refers to as "audience segregation," in which the performer "ensures that those before whom he plays one of his parts will not be the same individuals before whom he plays a different part in another setting," (p.49) and the "personal touch," which is designed to show "the

uniqueness of the transactions between performer and audience"(p.50). Clearly, it is in the best interests of the performer to tailor his/her performance to the particular audience.

One of the major factors which makes it necessary to "play to the audience" is that of expectations -- what others expect of the situation and of the performers. Others expect the performers to be who and what they purport to be. They also expect those who perform to make them feel that the performance is uniquely the audience's -- that it is just for them. Goffman sees expectations playing an even larger role in the matter of performances. It is expected that a performance will conform to certain norms and affirm certain values. Performers respond by idealizing the impression they seek to foster. In this way certain aspects of the performance are highlighted in order to show the audience what it expects and wants to see. And co-performers -- team members -- expect certain things of each other. They expect and depend upon each other to sustain a certain definition of the situation. Those who endanger the performance -- "performance risks" -- are not welcomed. Team members must be loyal, possess dramaturgical discipline, and exercise a certain amount of circumspection. These things are expected of them.

Front consists of the "equipment" that supports the performance. In theatre such supporting elements are

referred to as sets, props, costumes, make-up, mannerisms, and the like. As in the case of stage sets and costumes, the front helps to define the situation and assists the performer in impressing or influencing his/her audience in the desired fashion. Goffman divided front into two major components. The first he called "setting." Setting refers to the physical, scenic aspects of the performance which provide it with visual context. The dramaturgical equivalents of setting are sets, scenery, and props. And as in a dramatic presentation, these setting elements help to set the stage for the performance. The other component Goffman calls "physical front." Physical front consists of those items of expressive equipment "that we most intimately identify with the performer himself and that we naturally expect will follow the performer wherever he goes" (p.24). So while setting involves features of the physical surroundings which define the situation, personal front encompasses those features of expression --"sign vehicles"-- which relate to the individual performer. Goffman suggested that two stimuli comprise personal front: appearance and manner. Appearance stimuli inform us of the performer's social status and include insignia of rank or office, clothing, age, sex, race or other ethnic characteristics, and physical characteristics. Manner stimuli give some clue as to what can be expected of the performer -- what his/her interaction role will be in the oncoming situation.

They include posture, speech patterns, facial expressions, and bodily gestures. Personal front is to the performance what costumes, make-up, and mannerisms are to stage plays.

The importance which Goffman attached to the need for the performer to control the impression he/she wishes to make has already been stated. This control entails giving emphasis to that which he/she wants others to notice and downplaying or even hiding that which would disrupt the definition of the situation. Goffman uses the term "dramatic realization" as a label for this selective highlighting of certain aspects of the performance. Likewise, other things will be deemphasized or concealed if the drama is to be satisfactorily realized. Any aspect of the performance that might serve to contradict the definition of the situation must be hidden from view or downplayed.

The use of verbal symbols is but one limited and narrow dimension of the performance. The performer can usually control the expressions he/she gives or his/her verbal assertions rather easily and the audience knows this. Because of this awareness of how readily talk can be manipulated, "the others may then use what are considered to be the ungovernable aspects of his [the performer's] expressive behavior as a check upon the validity of what is conveyed by the governable aspects" (p.7). Hence, of greater concern to the performer is that broader and more complex dimension of self-presentation. For, how he/she comes across to others

is more dependent on "expressions given off" than on what he/she says. This thesis is central to Goffman's framework. But if the non-verbal realm of the performance is fraught with pitfalls and potential for dramatic frustration, it also presents opportunities for getting certain information across to the audience which talking does not afford. Make-work (the appearance of being busy even when there is nothing to be done) and the dramatization of "hidden costs" (aspects of the job which are not readily visible but which it is to the advantage of the performer to make visible) are examples of how "expressions given off" can be used to control or foster certain impressions.

As was earlier stated, control of the dramatic situation is essential to the success of the performance. The performer attempts to maintain control but is not always able to do so. Losing control, even if only for a moment, disrupts the performance. Unmeant gestures -- misacts and miscues -- can result in a loss of control. This is also true of information which slips out or is given out to the audience that is disruptive or discrediting to the performance. The escape of destructive information represents another aspect of loss of control. Secrets are potentially destructive information and revelations to the audience of backstage behavior can cause the performer to lose control of the performance. And while human behavior is characterized by inconsistency, such vicissitudes are best

saved for backstage, for, Goffman reminds us, as characters put on for an audience...we must not be subject to ups and downs" (p.56).

Goffman also stated that if a performance is to come off, those who witness it must, by and large, be able to believe the sincerity of the performers. The performance must be convincing and credible in that the audience must sense that the performers are genuine in what they are doing. This sincerity may be real or it may be contrived or feigned (as in the instance of one who perpetrates a confidence game). Goffman pointed out that the sincerity of a performance is determined by the extent to which performers "believe in the impression fostered by their own performance" (p.18). Goffman suggested that "when the individual has no belief in his own act and no ultimate concern for the beliefs of his audience, we may call him cynical" (p.18).

Also essential to Goffman's framework is his concept of regions and regions behavior. He defined region as "any place that is bounded to some degree by barriers to perception" (p.106). The "front region" is the place where the performance takes place. It is that part of the "stage" visible to the audience. "The performance of an individual in a front region may be seen as an effort to give the appearance that his activity in the region maintains and embodies certain standards" (p.107). These standards of dramatic conduct are politeness (which concerns the performer's

demeanor while verbally engaged with the audience) and decorum (which has to do with "the way in which the performer comports himself while in visual or aural range of the audience but not necessarily engaged in talk with them") (p.107). Politeness and decorum help the performer emphasize or over-communicate certain aspects of the performance. "It is clear that accentuated facts make their appearance in what I have called a front region; it should be just as clear that there may be...a 'back region' or 'backstage' where the suppressed facts make an appearance" (p.111). The backstage is often physically partitioned off from the performance area. "In general, of course, the back region will be the place where the performer can reliably expect that no member of the audience will intrude" (p.113). In the privacy of backstage, performers can relax and get "out of character." It is here that "the impression fostered by the performance is knowingly contradicted as a matter of course" (p.112). It is here that secrets -- some of them "dark secrets" -- can be shared among confederates and absent persons can be discussed in a way that could not or would not be done in their presence.

Important to this concept of regions and regions behavior is the consideration that situations can break down when persons are out of place. It is generally inadvisable to have audience members backstage or to have in the audience persons who know the intimate details of the perfor-



mance. It is also usually not in the best interests of the performance for persons who belong neither on stage nor in the audience --"outsiders"-- to infiltrate the performance area. This is especially true if their arrival is unexpected. Regions must be controlled and performances must be properly scheduled. Social distance, which provides "a way in which awe can be generated and sustained in the audience," helps reinforce spatial separation between performers and those performed to. (In real-life theatre, not only is the audience prohibited from being on stage or going backstage during the performance, but well-wishers, admirers, and autograph seekers are treated courteously but not intimately when they go backstage seeking contact with the performers after the show. In other words, it is the rule that social distance is maintained.) Goffman warned that performance problems can occur when persons are out of place. Informers (traitors and spies) are persons who join in the performance by pretending to be a part of the team. Shills act like regular audience members but are really agents of the performing team. Spotters, like shills, have an intimate knowledge of the performance, but use their hidden sophistication on behalf of the audience. These are all examples of persons who are out of their proper regions and who, because of the discrepancy between who they are and where they are, can do harm to the performance.

A final, but not at all unimportant consideration of Goffman's framework is the moral implications of performances. He holds that "any projected definition of the situation also has a distinctive moral character" (p.13). Two principles derive from the moral nature of the immediate performance -- the attempt to project a certain definition of the situation: first, in our society, "any individual who possesses certain social characteristics has a moral right to expect that others will value and treat him in an appropriate way" (p.13). Secondly, "an individual who implicitly or explicitly signifies that he has certain social characteristics ought in fact to be what he claims he is" (p.13). Moral obligations between performer and audience are reciprocal. Performer and audience must cooperate within the context of this "moral contract" if the performance is to come off in a manner congruent with societal values. This leads to a second moral consideration, one which deals with what the larger society considers to be right and proper:

When the individual presents himself before others, his performance will tend to incorporate and exemplify the officially accredited values of the society, more so, in fact, than does his behavior as a whole. To the degree that a performance highlights the common official values of the society in which it occurs, we may look upon it...as an expressive rejuvenation and affirmation of the moral values of the community. (p.35)

It is expected that the performer be attuned to, and act in congruence with, accepted values. It is expected that the performance underscore those values.

Other Books by Goffman

The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life was the first in a series of books by Goffman on the basic theme of how people relate to each other. In a sense, his subsequent publications tend to explicate, amplify, and elaborate upon many of the principles -- stated and implied -- of his 1959 opus. They provide the reader with a deeper and more detailed understanding of human social behavior as manifested in interactions.

The first of these books is Encounters (1961), and consists of two papers, "Fun in Games" and "Role Distance." In it Goffman concentrated on the kinds of face-to-face interactions that occur during encounters, which he also called "focused gatherings" and "situated activity systems." He contended that interactions may be unfocused, as is the case whenever persons communicate (although not necessarily in a verbal manner) by virtue of simply being in each other's presence, or focused, which takes place "when people effectively agree to sustain for a time a single focus of cognitive and visual attention." (e.g., a conversation, a game, a meeting, etc.) He further contended that even as focused interaction takes centerstage, unfocused interaction is also taking place.

Goffman suggested that encounters have microcosmic

properties -- they become self-contained realities for the interactants. Other realities, realities external to the encounter, are sifted and ordered -- a process which he calls transformation -- to conform to the rules of the encounter. Games are encounters. All encounters, like games, have certain rules of play, involve the making of moves, utilize players, and may involve teams or sides. Encounters, like games, involve the meshing of obligatory involvements (playing by the rules; doing what is expected) and those involvements of a more spontaneous sort, involvements in which one becomes truly caught up in the activity. A certain tension, which may vary in intensity, results. Incidents, planned or unintentional, may occur to heighten that tension. To go back to terminology from his previous book, the accepted definition of the situation may be disrupted; the performance may be disturbed. Goffman suggested that the resulting tension may be handled in different ways. Participants may respond differently to the intrusion or introduction of other realities into the encounter. Success in the encounter can be defined in terms of a person's ability to control him/herself relative to role expectations (and the possible attendant conflicts due to role overlaps) and the internal and (potentially intrusive) external realities of the encounter.

Behavior in Public Places (1963) seeks to define an

interactant's "involvement obligations" -- that is, how much of one's self, of one's concerted, attentive presence, should one give up and how much should one hold back when in social settings. Goffman argued that a "social order" -- "the consequence of any set of moral norms that regulates the way in which persons pursue objectives" (p.8) -- governs involvement, as used in this sense. This social order concerns itself not with ends, but with means; not with the objective of the interaction, but with how it is handled. What results from this social order are rules of propriety -- a system of etiquette, so to speak -- which governs "the allocation of the individual's involvement within the situation, as expressed through a conventionalized idiom of behavioral cues" (p.243). Goffman stated that some involvements are "main involvements" and are central to the encounter or social gathering. Others he called "side involvements" because of their subordinate nature.

Goffman concluded that we may analyze such interactions in this way:

We look within an act for the involvement it seems to express; we look to the involvement for the regulations by which it is bound; and we look to these regulations as a sign of what is owed to the gathering and its social occasion as realities in their own right....What the individual thinks of as niceties of social conduct are in fact rules for guiding him in his attachment to and detachment from social gatherings....More than to any family or club, more than to any class or sex, more than to any nation, the individual belongs to gatherings, and had best show that he is a member in good standing. (pp.247-248)

Goffman continued his study of interactions in Interaction Ritual Essays in Face-to-Face Behavior (1967). This book is a collection of his essays published under single cover and employing the unifying theme of interactive behavior. He called it a study of the "sociology of occasions." Goffman defines the boundaries of the subject in such a way as to distinguish the concern of his book from other social themes (such as social relationships, little social groups, communication systems, and strategic interactions) and from the study of "the individual and his psychology." What he addressed are those behaviors which occur "whenever persons come into one another's presence" and the "syntactical relations among the acts" of persons so gathered together. Goffman discussed face-work ("the actions taken by a person to make whatever he is doing consistent with" what he/she feels and others in the setting expect that he/she ought to be about), demeanor and deference (the importance of behaving, treating others, and being treated appropriately to the success of certain symbolic reaffirmations of the moral and social order), and the nature and role of embarrassment (which can be socially therapeutic and, thus, functional) in social organization. Additionally, he spoke to those factors which hinder or help along the maintenance of spontaneous

involvement in interaction, mental symptoms as they relate to public order, and risk-taking (actual, controlled, or vicarious) as it relates to self-control and character.

Goffman's book, Frame Analysis: An Essay of the Organization of Experience (1974), assumes a somewhat different focus. In this work he sought to provide a conceptual and analytical basis for answering the question, "'What is it that's going on here?'" by examining situational definitions and their underlying organizational principles. He said, "My aim is to try to isolate some of the basic frameworks of understanding available in our society for making sense out of events and to analyze the special vulnerabilities to which these frames of reference are subject" (p.10).

His first discussion is of primary frameworks, which is a way of interpreting or organizing some part of experience so as to make sense of it without having to depend upon "some prior or 'original' interpretation." He suggested that people apply such frameworks to things observed or experienced almost unwittingly. Goffman classified primary frameworks as natural or social. "The primary frameworks of a particular social group constitute a central element of its culture" (p.27) and help us understand relationships within it. Social frameworks can help answer the question, "'What is it that's going on here?'"

Goffman went on to suggest that reality can be excerpted -- strips of experience can be extracted from the

larger experiential context -- and that these excerpts or strips can be transformed so as to make vulnerable particular frames. Keying is one example of such parenthetical behavior that is meaningless in terms of a larger framework. Keying refers to the transformation of serious action into something playful or less serious. Fabrication is another type of transformation. Fabrication is "the intentional effort of one or more individuals to manage activity so that a party of one or more others will be induced to have a false belief about what it is that's going on." Additionally, such excerpting of experience from its accustomed frame may be illusory (other-induced) or delusory (self-induced). In the remainder of his book, Goffman built upon or expanded these concepts of frame. He discussed theatrical frame and contrasted it with radio and novelistic frames. He also dealt, in some detail, with structural issues in fabrications, activity which occurs outside of the main story line (subsidiary types of activity), vulnerabilities of experience, the disruption of frame, and the organization of meaningful utterances.

Goffman's latest book is Forms of Talk (1981). It deals with the theatrical nature of talk and is an assemblage of five papers which were written between 1974 and 1980. Goffman called the first three of these analytic and programmatic; the last two, he said, are "substantive applications of notions developed" in the first papers. He



admits that, their pronounciative tone notwithstanding, they are all exploratory in nature. Unlike his first book, Forms of Talk gives attention to the verbal aspects of social interaction and considers such concepts as ritualization ("the movements, looks, and vocal sounds we make as an unintended by-product of speaking and listening" which acquire for each person a "specialized role in the stream of our behavior"), participation framework (which considers participative reaction to the spoken word), and embedding (which addresses the fact that our utterances are often not our own).

Goffman said that talk is a mental and social unifier: words unite the speaker and hearer into a common focus of attention and interpretation. Conversation consists of utterances usually designed to elicit a response (a statement) or to respond to an elicitation (a response). He dealt with conversations -- dialogs and exchanges -- and the ritualistic constraints which social order places upon them.

Goffman also gave attention to blurtings, self-talk, imprecations, and response-cries within the context of social interaction. An essay is devoted to interactive alignments -- footing -- and the kinds of parenthetical behavior which accompanies a temporary shift of gears or change of footing. Goffman suggested that lecturing or public speaking is not only a vehicle for the transmission

of information, but is also a ritual -- a performance in which the lecturer makes him/herself available to the audience for scrutiny. This scrutiny involves not only what is said, but how it is said and how the speaker comports him/herself. In this structured, face-to-face interaction, the speaker may make and validate certain claims about him/herself. The person can also act in a manner that is acceptably modest and self-effacing. In the final essay, Goffman concerned himself with broadcast talk and its similarities and dissimilarities to other unstructured or less structured interaction.

Seymour B. Sarason: A Framework for the Creation of Settings

Sarason's book, The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies (1972), is a product of his fascination with what happens when "two or more people come together in new and sustained relationships to achieve certain goals." In it he seeks to analyze and understand, by way of his own experiences and observations, why new settings succeed or (as is so often the case) fail. His examination is careful and comprehensive. What results is a sensible and useful framework for the creation of human settings.

Sarason was not hampered by the apparent lack of statistical data on or objective writings about the creation of new settings, a paucity which he readily acknowledges. And

he cautioned against assuming that such information can be gained through the study of "chronologically mature settings" or the retrospective examination of their origins. Accurate, objective, and complete accounts of the pre-history and formative phases of such settings -- accounts which might help us clearly understand why they succeeded or failed -- cannot be obtained in that way. In support of this contention he quoted Freud: "To study the childhood of an adult is not the same as studying childhood itself" (p.27). So, Sarason looked to his own experiences -- settings of which he had intimate knowledge or in which he was involved as member or creator -- as an empirical basis for his analyses. Yet, such foundations, however personal, do not lessen the significance of what Sarason has to say (in large part because one has the feeling that he has pulled himself back emotionally from his experiences enough to be sufficiently objective) or the provocative potential of his message. I say "provocative potential" because he invites all who read his book to think seriously about why new settings so often fail and, having lain the problem before us, he challenges us to change the way we think and act as leaders and creators of human settings.

Several important themes occur and recur in Sarason's book, including the following:

1. The need to avoid preoccupation with the "narrow present." The past is important and must be confronted. Creators of settings must possess his-

torical understanding. The future is also important. Conflicts and problems and their consequences must be anticipated. "What may kill us is what we did not know but could or should have known." And means must be established for handling these conflicts and problems.

2. The importance of values as guides to thought and action. Although to view the problem "exclusively in terms of values obscures and even misses the point that consensus about values does not instruct one in how to create settings consistent with these values."  
[emphasis added]
3. The erroneous belief that positive emotions (hope, enthusiasm, missionary zeal, goodwill, etc.) will overcome reality.
4. The implications of core group formation and its impact upon leader-core member relationships as well as those of core members to each other.
5. The need for those within the setting to get as well as give; to be served as well as serve. There is deficiency in evaluating a setting solely in terms of its end product (the quality and quantity of what was done for others) without looking at "what happened to those who created and manned the setting (how they were affected and changed by the history and conditions of the setting)."

6. The importance of establishing and maintaining an environment in which persons can grow and change.
7. The myth of unlimited or adequate resources and how it affects the definition of and approach to problems.
8. The leader within the setting: how his/her fantasy develops and is contradicted by reality and how the resulting conflicts are often handled thus affecting relationships and behavior within the setting.
9. The effects of boredom and loss of challenge on performance within the setting.
10. The distractive potential of new buildings on the creation of settings. "Creating the physical structure can become such an absorbing, challenging, time-consuming process that one is distracted from other and more important issues."
11. The creation of settings as an art. "Creating a human setting is akin to creating a work of art."  
(pp.1-284)

This list is not exhaustive but reflects what I see as major themes of Sarason's work. Such a list (or the kind of brief elaboration on some of these themes which will follow) does not do justice to Sarason, but should provide some sense of his perspectives and basic assumptions.

As was earlier stated, a setting can be defined as the coming together of two or more people in "new relation-

ships over a sustained period of time in order to achieve certain goals." Sarason gives two examples of settings creation: he calls marriage the smallest and revolution the most ambitious instance of the creation of settings. Having given us a readily accessible frame-of-reference for understanding what he calls a setting, he warns that those impulses which often give rise to the creation of such settings -- agreement on values and objectives and the motivation to succeed, in the case of revolution, and love, in the instance of marriage -- are insufficient to sustain them. Something else is needed, and it is this "something else" to which Sarason devoted his book.

Sarason illustrated his point by citing as examples the Bolshevik and Cuban revolutions (instances where settings failed to attain their stated and intended objectives) and the American Constitutional Convention, which succeeded because its delegates realized that revolutionary fervor and enthusiasm, a sense of mission, an agreement on values and goals, and a desire to succeed were not enough to sustain a new nation. The framers of the Constitution were acutely aware of both the past and the future. They were not captives of the "narrow present." They were realistic (rather than optimistic) in their views of human behavior; of human strengths and weaknesses. They were conscious of and freely explored what Sarason called the "universe of alternatives." The "Founding Fathers" were aware that

several possible solutions existed to any one of the numerous problems which they encountered as they worked to create a new setting. And they did not assume (as do so many settings creators) that their work would endure unchanged. They made provisions for orderly change. They anticipated problems and consequences. The men who framed the Constitution did so aware of the "something else" that it would take for a new nation to withstand the forces which work against new settings.

Sarason emphasized historical awareness as an essential ingredient in the creation of settings. First, there is a more specific, local history of which one must be aware. A creator of a setting must be aware of and able to cope with the conflicting ideas and forces at work in the prehistory of the setting. "The before-the-beginning period contains organizational dynamics which tend to work against rather than for the setting in the sense that its heritage is marked by conflict, real or potential." Secondly, there is a broader, social history to which one must also be attuned. Insensitivity to the "historical relationship between settings and social forces" results in a belated recognition of social changes and a tendency to react rather than act.

Values are important in defining the tasks and goals of a setting. While values in and of themselves do not speak to the specifics of implementation (how one goes about doing those tasks or attaining those goals), how

and what one does will almost certainly not be in defiance of one's values. We think and act upon our values. Sarason sees two dimensions of a setting's performance in which prevailing values play a crucial part. One can be described as an external, production-oriented dimension: what the setting does for others. The other can be called internal and facilitative: it is seen in the commitment of those within the setting to help themselves grow, change, and learn. If a setting's tasks and goals are so narrowly defined as to emphasize the former and ignore or deemphasize the latter, then problems will almost certainly ensue. Boredom, a sense of stagnation, divisiveness within the setting, and an emphasis of personal goals over common goals are some of these problems. Sarason feels that for both leaders and setting members, learning and changing is "a continuous obligation and, therefore, always the primary value, especially in the case of a new setting which almost never intends merely to replicate existing settings."

Not only are values important in defining what a setting is supposed to be about, but they are also crucial in determining how the leader and members of the setting will view and make use of resources. Do they perceive scarcity or do they feel that resources exist in adequate or unlimited amounts to do the job? Sarason feels that these perceptions of the availability of resources will, in turn, help shape perceptions of task and goals. Essentially, Sarason observed that settings are



seldom conceived in ways that anticipate resource shortages. Instead, settings are invariably set up as if there will always be enough people and money to do what needs to be done, or, the settings are created with the feeling that the new setting can do what existing settings failed to do because it will be able to meet human needs with adequate material, monetary, and human resources. This fallacious view causes problems to be formulated chiefly in terms of "If only we had!..." It also creates a climate in which resource availability becomes a major concern and the source of division among core group members as they compete for resources. Confronting resource limitations forces people to make choices and set priorities.

Those who create settings must choose a core group: a handful of people closest to him or her interpersonally and statuswise. This core group will be responsible for helping the leader get the job done and will answer to the leader. It seems obvious that choosing persons for core group membership entails effecting a match of task and talent; an optimum coupling of assignment and ability. The leader knows what must be done, so he/she chooses the right person(s) to do it. But Sarason reminds us that such choices also involve forming new relationships which will encompass more than simply "doing the job." The core members will need to be compatible with the leader (at least to some extent) in terms of personality, styles,

goals, and needs. Yet, the compatibility issue is often unraised. Questions which go beyond competence, training, and skills frequently go unasked and unanswered. Leaders fail to anticipate problems and consequences of core group interrelationships and fail to appreciate that "ground rules" can be formulated to deal with (though not eliminate) these problems and conflicts. To look ahead in this fashion is not "a panacea" but is a much more effective way of leading a setting than denying that the potential for these problems exists, saying nothing about the matter, and simply hoping for an untroubled future. Sarason also felt that the concept of a society "based on law" being preferable to one "based on men" must apply to the creation of new settings. Some sources of difficulty or conflict between the leader and core group and among core members which Sarason mentioned include the following:

1. The basis and order of recruitment
2. The absence of problem-anticipating and problem-resolving vehicles
3. The myths of unlimited resources and an untroubled future
4. Specialization of function
5. Competition among core group members for resources and for influence on the leader
6. The pull of present realities which encourages the postponement of dealing with, or the ignoring of, the crucial past and future

Sarason also wrote about the gulf between the leader's

fantasy -- his private ambitions, thoughts, perceptions, feelings, dreams, and self-doubts -- and the reality of the setting and how this conflict affects the setting. The leader has a different perspective. "The creation of a setting looks different from the standpoint of the leader and it is a fateful difference, both for the setting and the leader." Also, the same leadership aspirations that are encouraged in the child, who openly acknowledges them (and for whom the "benefits of material gain are secondary to the imagined good he can do for others by virtue of the power that comes with leadership"), must be expressed in a more modest and acceptable way by the adult with leadership ambitions. The adult leader cannot make public or candidly share with others in the setting all that motivates him/her to lead. Hence, the child's fantasy remains, but in the adult "it becomes increasingly private and elaborate and its previously unselfish content is now associated with more 'selfish' themes of material gain, personal aggrandizement, domination, competitiveness, and omnipotence." Leaders want to present themselves in ways that fit socially acceptable norms. Others want to believe that leaders are above petty passions and human foibles. So, there is only a small part of him/herself that the leader can and, probably, will share with others. There results a tension between the leader's public rhetoric (doing good for others -- altruism) and his/her private thoughts (self-satisfaction -- narcissism). What is

crucial is how the leader reconciles and handles his/her needs and perceptions and that sense of "psychological ownership" which creators of settings tend to feel, relative to the needs and perceptions of other in the setting.

Toward the end of his book, Sarason spoke to the matter of utopias --"the future societies." Specifically, he engages in a rather extensive critique of Skinner's ideas on creating new, futuristic settings as found in the reknown psychologist's Walden Two (1962), and reinforced in his later book, Beyond Freedom and Dignity (1971). Sarason seems to respect Skinner, whom he sees as being in the humanist tradition (a designation which others of Skinner's critics might not so readily make), but thinks that his contribution toward the creation of settings as expressed in Walden Two is "far less than he [Skinner] believes." But despite what Sarason perceived as inadequacies and deficiencies in Skinner's work, Sarason praised him for having made "a bold effort to grapple with the most important issues confronting society." Specifically, Sarason's criticisms were these:

1. "Skinner's principles of behavior [he claims that all behaviors are externally motivated and controlled] stem almost exclusively from studies of individual organisms" (p.259). His psychological explanations of individual behavior do not explain the social factors which affect behavior. His studies, which

are conducted in environments specially designed for observing and influencing behavior in single organisms, are not responsive to the problems of "individuals interacting in a social matrix in which everybody is part of everyone else's environment" (p.258).

2. Skinner did not confront the issue of leadership behavior in discussing his scientific basis for designing new and better cultures nor does he deal with the corruptive potential of power. Sarason charged that Skinner failed to recognize that "over the centuries one of the reasons people have adhered to the myth of freedom is their experience with leaders and their knowledge of the facts and consequences of power" (p.261).
3. The state of affairs in which individuals willingly surrender their own needs and goals to ensure the well-being and survival of society, which is a distinguishing feature of Skinner's utopia, is not really utopian at all. Sarason argued that a similar reordering of priorities frequently takes place in the early life of newly created settings.
4. The behavior and success of Frazier, the founder and leader of Skinner's mythical Walden Two, is not really attributable to or readily explained by Skinner's princi-

ples of behavior. Instead, Sarason suggested that Frazier succeeded because he avoided the most common pitfalls of new settings, namely, "simplistic notions" that consist of unlimited optimism, good intentions, and a failure to accept the existence of present or future conflict.

5. Sarason contended that Skinner's "principles of [individual] behavior have no relationship to his view of society....His principles tell us nothing of the structure of human society, and what he tells us about human society is obviously not derived from his principles" (p.270). Skinner, by Sarason's account, avoids such real life issues as the acquisition and abuse of power, unmet goals, hostile environments, or deviant people.

Finally, Sarason made the point that the creation of a setting, which he calls "one of man's most absorbing experiences," can be likened to creating a work of art. "To say that the creation of a setting can be like a work of art is to say that it can involve in an organized way the most productive attributes of the human mind."

### Summary

The review examined in depth the frameworks of Goffman and Sarason. Throughout his book, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life, Goffman examined interactions

as theatrical performances. When persons seek to influence others in their face-to-face interactions, actions will almost certainly speak louder than words. Words can be carefully chosen; the use of non-verbal language is not nearly so well regulated. Others are aware of this and will therefore look to "expressions given off" to determine if performers are indeed who they claim to be and if the situation is really what the performers want their audience to believe it is. So, performers must be in control of their actions. This need for control also includes the physical setting of the stage and the various expressive adornments used in the presentation as well as who has access to the regions of performance. To be fully effective, the performance must appear authentic. Also, the performance ought to comply with certain moral expectations.

Goffman's other writings presented in greater detail various elements of his dramaturgical framework. His books of the 1960's gave analytical attention to interactions as basic social activities. In them Goffman examined the elements which comprise interactions and what happens when interactions take place. He sought to reveal what is expected of persons at social gatherings and he looked at other aspects of interactive behavior. Into the seventies and eighties, his emphases seem to have shifted somewhat. In Frame Analysis Goffman analyzed ways of organizing and interpreting experience within a social context. His most

recent book deals with talking as theatrical interaction, a focus which is diametric to that of his first book.

Sarason's book, The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies, was his attempt to address the question, "Why do so many new settings fail?" While much of Sarason's writing is clearly applicable to public service agencies (which abounded during the decade of the sixties), the ideas expressed hold profound implications for the creation of any setting -- domestic, educational, political, or whatever. Time and again, Sarason stressed the importance of looking beyond the "narrow present." Historical sensitivity is urged. Past conflicts must be appreciated; future problems must be anticipated. Ground rules must be established for dealing with future conflict. The future cannot be left to chance or human caprice. Nor will hope, enthusiasm, a sense of mission, or good intentions -- however abundant they may be -- ensure that there will be no problems or that problems will be satisfactorily resolved. The way in which the leader chooses his/her core group has profound ramifications for the success of the setting. The way in which the leaders and core members view resource availability will shape the way in which problems are defined and approached. Values determine how the setting's tasks will be defined. The way in which the leader looks upon the setting is important -- whether that person sees it as his/her "baby", designed to



get the job done and satisfy his/her own psychological needs or as an environment in which others can grow and develop. The leader entertains a fantasy. Much of the new setting's success depends on how the leader reconciles his/her private thoughts and dreams with the reality of the setting. Finally, at its best, the creation of a setting can be an opportunity to create a work of art.

CHAPTER III:  
ANALYSIS AND REVISION OF THE  
GOFFMAN AND SARASON FRAMEWORKS

In the previous chapter, I reviewed the frameworks of Goffman and Sarason in detail and presented the essence of their ideas. In this chapter, I will analyze, integrate, and revise their frameworks, and create -- out of the synthesis of their ideas and my autobiographical understandings -- a framework for leadership in higher education.

Analysis provides a useful means of looking closely and critically at ideas. While it is true that frameworks such as those of Goffman and Sarason ought to have integrity -- and they do -- and while it is true that the ultimate test of their worth is their completeness, consistency, and trueness, it should be useful to examine closely their several parts. Asking appropriate questions about the ideas of Goffman and Sarason is one way of accomplishing this analysis. Such questions can be valuable heuristic tools which serve as catalysts for deeper understandings. The first part of this chapter will be devoted to questions about the frameworks of Goffman and Sarason concerning their relevance, cogency, and authenticity in light of my own experiences.

The remainder of the chapter will address questions which arise from the frameworks themselves and from a few key ideas taken from traditional leadership literature. (While this dissertation will not follow traditional paths by drawing upon traditional learnings and writings on leadership as its conceptual basis, it is not my intention to ignore these ideas. So, questions which seek to determine if components of the Goffman and Sarason frameworks corroborate or contradict what some others have written about leadership, leadership personality, and the interaction of leader behavior and organizational dynamics will add a useful dimension to this writing.)

The first question addressed is: "Do the Goffman and Sarason frameworks make sense in light of my autobiographical understandings?"

### An Autobiographical Analysis

All the world's a stage,  
And all the men and women merely players:  
They have their exits and their entrances;  
And one man in his time plays many parts....

While Shakespeare's immortal lines from As You Like It carry Goffman's concept of presentation of self as theatre to the extreme, my own life's experiences confirm the spirit of the playwright's observations and the essence

of Goffman's contentions. Goffman's framework rings true! As I recall various events and episodes in my development from this dramaturgical perspective, I realize that I have presented, participated in, and been privy to many performances. Many of them I did not recognize as such at the time. Some others were clearly so, even though I did not then have the benefit of Goffman's framework to provide a perceptual and conceptual handle for what I was experiencing or observing.

One of my very earliest memories was of a performance at which I was expressively irresponsible. I was no more than three at the time and the occasion was the funeral of the man who lived behind us, "Mr. Joe." I recall the incident very vividly. My parents had taken me to the funeral. (It occurs to me, in retrospect, that my parents trusted me as a performer on many occasions, for, it was their custom to take me with them to a variety of functions. Rarely did they leave me in the care of someone else.) At the point in the service where the remains were viewed (a custom at that place and time), I recognized a neighbor lady who was always extremely nice to me. In fact, I called her "Aunt Waddell," even though she was no relation. She had always greeted me with a smile, a cheerful "Hello," and, often, a big hug. I thought that this time would be no different. So, I waved and said, rather audibly, "Hello, Aunt Waddell." She did not respond in

kind. After the funeral, my parents explained to me that what I had done was not appropriate to the occasion. Their reproof was gentle and loving. They understood my faux pas, for, I acted out of childish ignorance. The audience was tactful. My parents were tolerant. They used this as an opportunity to teach me something about performances. I learned that there are times when persons at a performance need to control their actions in certain ways. How one acts depends on the occasion. The way that a person behaves in front of one audience will not necessarily be consistent with his/her behavior in other settings. I learned a valuable lesson.

My father was a preacher. At home he was "Daddy." But for certain audiences he became "Reverend Kinchen." The difference between his backstage behavior (for home is essentially a back region) and frontstage presentation was obvious to me, and the transformation quite dramatic, taking on, in the eyes of a child, something of a magical quality. A native of rural, agrarian southwest Georgia (not too very far from Jimmy Carter's Plains), he was also a farmer at heart. So, he did a good bit of farming where I grew up, raising an assortment of vegetable crops, pigs, poultry, and keeping a mule for plowing. It was fascinating to see my father come in from the fields and put the mule up about one o'clock, shed his dusty, sweat-soaked clothes, bathe, put on his suit and tie, and leave

the house, immaculately dressed with Bible in hand, to officiate at a three o'clock funeral. The performance of the man who stood in the pulpit on Sundays was quite different from that of the man who commanded the mule to "Gee" and "Haw" between tall, tassled rows of corn and who called me "Bubba" around the house. My father was a performer of consummate skill. He knew his audiences and regions well.

Another performer of great skill paid a visit to our house each year. I never got to see him on those occasions, but nonetheless, greatly anticipated his coming and rejoiced after each visit at the evidence of his brief housecalls which he so generously left behind. Of course, I speak of Santa Claus. I later learned, as I suppose everyone does, that Santa is really not a person but, rather, a myth -- a myth in the sense that the symbol, Santa Claus, conveniently embodies a dynamic complex of tradition, folklore, ritual, mystery, generosity, and goodwill. But Santa Claus -- the invisible, secular "star" of Christmas -- is also a performance. A vast team of players -- parents, relatives, and certainly, the legions of department store "Santas" -- join forces and share backstage secrets to maintain his character on frontstage for children at Christmas time. Care is taken, as my mother and father took care, to ensure that the performance has credibility and authenticity. The members of Santa's team are not cynical. They care very

much that their juvenile audiences believe the performance. In the process, important values are affirmed.

One essential tenet of Goffman's framework is that performers may damage the performance if they deliver similar performances for different audiences. The same consequences may occur if the performer gives contradictory performances for the same audience. This happened for me when I quite innocently discovered my first grade teacher smoking a cigarette. (I say "innocently" because she did not intend for me to see her nor was it my intention to do so.) At that tender age, I thought smoking to be bad. My parents did not smoke and taught me that it was wrong to do so (a teaching which I was not always to heed). It was quite a shock to see my teacher, whose only performance I had witnessed was that of teaching, smoking. Of course, in the broader scheme of things, it was a small and inconsequential shock, for I continued to love and respect her and now look back on her contribution to my life with profound gratitude.

Goffman pointed out that performers can say or do things that endanger or disrupt the definition of the situation. The performer momentarily fails to control his/her actions and is "found out." I learned this lesson the hard way quite a few years ago when I was on a rather friendly basis with two young ladies. They did not know of each other or suspect that I had been putting on simi-

lar performances for both of them. I felt it to my advantage that things remain this way. One night, shortly after I had fallen asleep, I received a telephone call from one. I talked with her for several minutes before she asked the question that jarred me into full consciousness: "Who do you think this is ?!" Needless to say, my performance was utterly destroyed! I had given one audience a performance intended for another and had been "found out."

Musical presentations are performances. Of the fifteen continuous years spent in school from first grade to the receipt of my baccalaureate degree, ten of those years were spent singing in public school or university choral groups. My involvements included solo roles and opportunities to conduct at concerts. These experiences gave me a deeper sensitivity to performances, performance roles and behaviors, and regions than might otherwise be the case. As an undergraduate voice major, I was forced to think about what a performer ought to do, and ought to refrain from doing, in a performance. While I did not fully appreciate the implications of what I did as a singer for other aspects of my presentation to others as I do now, this pervasive aspect of my life has nonetheless caused me to be more conscious of my expressive responsibilities and the dramatic potential of interactions with others.



Teaching is also a performance. As a twenty-year-old beginning teacher teaching teenage students, some of whom were almost as old as I, and some of whom knew me as "Kinchen," their older brother or sister's friend or former classmate, I learned quickly the need for performance control. I had to act and use all elements of front at my disposal in such a way as to mobilize the kind of impression which said to them, "I am a teacher." I feel that I succeeded quite well in this regard. As a teacher/performer -- as is true of all performers -- I needed to get offstage and slip into the back region from time to time. For many teachers, the lounge is such a backstage area. It is there that teachers say and do things that would be impermissible while performing for students, and where they share secrets and let their hair down. I have never been one for teacher lounges. But I did not need the lounge for a back region. My backstage was the office of my friend, the band director who had commenced his teaching career at that school in the same year as I. It is there that I would escape the rigorous demands of the performance. We would talk, smoke a cigarette (which I did at that time), and be ourselves. If it is possible for rooms to retain what has been said within them, then that office holds its share of let-off steam, vented frustrations, high hopes, deep disappointments, plans for progress, unflattering assessments of

higher-ups, and other shared secrets.

The demands of that first job were considerable and work conditions were just shy of intolerable. While I thoroughly enjoyed what I did, loved my students dearly, derived great satisfaction from my work, and look back on those years with a fondness not shared with any other time, I have often since said that if asked to do such a task now, I would have sense enough to know that it could not be done, and so, would not even try! The costs, in terms of energy, effort, and great personal sacrifice, were quite high. Concerts and other public appearances presented me with an opportunity to dramatize the hidden costs. My principal knew, all too well, the unfavorable conditions under which I labored. Everytime my students sang in public, appeared on television (as they did several times), or received laudable ratings at contest, the message that went out to him and to others who really knew my situation was that so much was being accomplished, even at such great costs. Of course, I did what I could to further highlight the dramatization.

Later, when I married (a relationship that did not last), I discovered that, in a way different from when one is a child at home, the home is an important back region. Sharing this private region with a team-mate -- a wife -- can have obvious advantages and pleasures. It can also be a time for tension and conflict. Whatever the quality of

backstage experiences or the nature of secrets shared, these ups and downs cannot be displayed before the various audiences to which the couple must play. When an unexpected telephone call or ring of the door bell interrupts a backstage moment -- whether amorous or argumentive -- the performers are expected to come out ready to sustain the accepted definition of the situation. Marriage demands many and varied performances.

I have always been fascinated by politics, and at one point, before I chose to become a music educator, I entertained serious notions of practicing law and entering public service. But my interest in politics has continued. Political activity is a series of performances, a point underscored as many persons on the local, state, and national level vie for public office in this election year. Presidents are very dependent on skillful performances (by themselves as campaigners, speakers, conductors of press conferences, participants in summit meetings, and the like, and by others who are members of their teams). They depend on good (loyal, disciplined, and circumspect) team performances. But, presidential administrations seem to have no shortage of risky performers. Often those team members who spoil the show are important, highly visible members of the team. A recent and notable example of such a person is James Watt, Reagan's former Secretary of the Interior, whose now infamous crack about a study commission

having "a Black, a woman, two Jews, and a cripple" cost him his job. His ill-chosen remark was just one in a series of poor performances by him. A rather humorous example of a supporting cast member ruining an impression occurred during a trip by former President Carter to Poland in 1977. This team member was an interpreter. As the President expressed sincere wishes for closer relations with Poland, Carter could not help but wonder why the facial expressions of his hosts ranged from quizzical to absolutely amused. He later discovered that the translator had rendered his remarks in such a way that the Polish people were told that Carter had abandoned Washington to come and tell them that America lusted for an intimate relationship with them. Another performance bespoiled! And how many poor performances did Carter's brother, Billy, turn in?

The news media abound with examples of irresponsible or unusual performances. Two prominent American men named Jackson come readily to mind. One of them is the popular singer, Michael Jackson. A large cola company reportedly paid him and his brothers several millions of dollars for taping a commercial, in the process of which, Michael's hair caught on fire. But even in the hospital, the award-winning singer never really left frontstage, for all the while he continued to wear the one white, sequined glove that has become a Michael Jackson trademark. That

was an unusual performance. The other man is presidential candidate, Jesse Jackson. What he thought was his backstage actually turned out to be his frontstage and a dark secret was leaked to the press. It seems that he had made some unsavory and very insensitive remarks to persons present (whom he undoubtedly mistook for team members) about Jews in New York City. He ended up in a New Hampshire synagogue apologizing for his unfortunate remark. That was an irresponsible performance.

Some interesting performances occur in church. A congregation for which I provide musical services is seeking a pastor. A pastoral search committee has identified eight persons as candidates for the pastorate. These persons are currently being invited at a rate of about two per month to preach to the congregation. It is understood by the ministers and the membership that each guest appearance is an audition of sorts -- a trial performance to help determine whether or not the preacher will be able to sustain the desired definition of the situation as a regular performer. It is interesting to see how fully the prospective pastors appreciate the self-presentation they are being asked to make. One of the more memorable church performances that I have witnessed, however, involved a singer, not a preacher. The occasion was a church program at which I had been asked to bring a very talented voice student of mine to sing a couple of selections. Also on the

program was a tall, dignified, distinguished looking gentleman who also sang. He was introduced after a rather lengthy and impressive-sounding resumé of his experiences had been read. He prepared to sing. When the first sounds came out of his mouth, I was appalled. His performance -- specifically his singing -- was so incongruous with the situation that had been so well defined that it seemed to be a joke. I checked about for hidden cameras or some glimpse of Alan Funt. By telepathic agreement, my student and I did not look at each other. We did not dare. One glance would have betrayed our true feelings and caused us to lose control.

Perhaps the most audacious performance of which I had personal knowledge occurred at a college at which I worked. A young man was hired to teach and chair an academic division. I met him as the head of the institution was giving him a tour of campus on the day of his interview. He was very pleasant and articulate. Almost a year after his appointment, it was discovered that he was an imposter. He had done, by all accounts, an excellent job. Students regarded him favorably. Peers were very impressed with his work. Superiors rated him highly. He had managed to sustain a fraudulent performance in a very skillful manner. He was in such control that even those with whom he shared his discipline -- and hence, to some extent, his back region, although he obviously did not share all

secrets -- did not suspect that he was not who or what he claimed to be. The impression was wrecked when a frequently promised and long overdue transcript did not arrive in the appropriate office and suspicions were aroused. He was soon "found out." (It is humbling and sobering for the writer, for whom this dissertation represents a partial fulfillment of requirements for the doctoral degree, that the good "doctor" had only an associate degree from a junior college!) He claimed certain characteristics. Others valued him based on those claims. The moral contract was broken with much acrimony when it was discovered that his performance was false. The world (or at least his world) discovered that the emperor wore no clothes!

The most sinister performance that I have known to take place within an educational setting occurred about a decade and a half ago in a large, southern school system. It was a clandestine operation -- quite literally a case of a wolf in sheep's clothing -- and is a classic example of what Goffman called discrepant roles. A newly appointed superintendent came to town somewhat in advance of his official "report-to-work" date. Unknown to most persons within the system, who had not even seen his picture, he donned overalls and began an intelligence-gathering operation, incognito. He spent time performing (or appearing to perform) maintenance chores around certain schools. When he had seen and heard enough, he went public. The

ostensible reason for his undercover work was, of course, to uncover incompetence and corruption within the system. Given the results of his probe and other circumstantial and historical facts which will not be discussed here, I strongly suspect that the hidden agenda was to discredit black principals, who were, with a few token exceptions, the focus of his investigation, at a time when desegregation appeared inevitable. The black principals had, in most cases, more seniority than their white counterparts, and, in many cases, more education. Also several lack schools would be closed or downgraded. These closings and status changes would have been more difficult with the senior black principals occupying positions of leadership. The superintendent pretended to be someone that he was not. But the results -- for him and the majority of the county's residents -- were quite satisfactory. Those who were burnt by his pretense were powerless to do anything about his false presentation.

I am also able to corroborate the trueness of Sarason's writings to portions of my own experiences. My first teaching assignment was an effort to create a setting. (At the beginning of each school year or semester, all teachers engage in the creation of settings, for, they join with others in new and sustained relationships in pursuit of the attainment of certain goals.) As I stated earlier,



my first teaching job was less than ideal. It took place at an inner-city high school, one of thirteen high schools in a large, southern city. I began teaching in the aftermath of a massive desegregation order which had closed several previously black schools (or demoted them in status) and made this school (which was once a leading, all-black, comprehensive high school) a vocational high school. The conversion was make-shift, a charitable description of the wholly inadequate job of equipping the school that had been done, and, in retrospect as then, I doubted very much the serious intentions of any of the planners that it would succeed as a setting. Technically the school was integrated. In reality, the student population was about 99 per cent black. Cosmetically, efforts were made to attract "quality" students from all over the county to attend the school. Actually, persons within the system and the situation conspired to keep high-achieving students away. Some junior high school guidance counselors advised motivated black and white students to stay away and lesser-motivated black (never white) students to enroll. Senior high school principals from suburban schools constantly sent discipline problems to our school, transferring many such students in the middle of the school year. Our school had the deserved reputation as the toughest in the county.

When I arrived, I found that the chorus room had been converted to a cosmetology lab and the auditorium partitioned off to accommodate commercial arts, carpentry, and plumbing pipe fitting shops. The stage, on which I was to conduct class, was littered with broken furniture and debris. One evening, a friend and I hauled away the junk, cleaned the dirt and filth away, and set up chairs and risers. What had been the chorus (a misnomer, for one veteran college choral director hearing them sing the year before had declared that in all his years of experience, it was the first time he had ever heard a group sing "Z minor" chords) was really a free-lance recreation opportunity. The former teacher sat in an office reading the newspaper while students banged on the piano, shot "crap", smoked marijuana, or explored dark corners of the stage with persons of the opposite sex. No music (so to speak) was made and no teaching or learning (or at least not the kind with which schools ought be concerned) took place. Clearly, I had to create a new setting.

My knowledge of the history of the setting (the chorus, the school, the school system, and the community) was invaluable. I spoke with and listened to many persons, including other teachers and students. I had a good grasp of the realities of the setting. I was optimistic, yet realistic. I expected that many students would want an opportunity to experience fine choral singing in a setting

that emphasized learning, excellence, and aesthetics. I also knew that there would be serious impediments to my efforts to create such a setting. My awareness of what had preceded me in that setting caused me to act in ways that guaranteed the later success of the new setting. I made and enforced strict rules. I did not begin providing learning experiences for the students as if I were teaching at "Suburbia High." I started with them at a point at which they could relate to what I was asking them to do and then I brought them along. For about six weeks, we did not touch scores nor did we attempt any of the "master works." We learned musical discipline and basic choral techniques from simple part-songs. We learned music by rote, much of it "Gospel" or Gospel-styled, because for many of them, this was the only singing experience they had had. Gradually, octavos were introduced. Gradually, complexity and difficulty were increased. Gradually, compositions from the standard repertoire learned.

I felt a need to allow for individual musical growth and development within the group. Without entering into a discourse on vocal and ensemble singing techniques, suffice it to say that it is possible to put voices together in such a way as to maximize ensemble effectiveness but practically destroy vocal individuality or, conversely, to allow for a full range of individual singing styles and techniques -- an abundance of vocal freedom -- to such

an extent that any sense of ensemble is all but impossible to attain. One might say that a continuum exists with full freedom on one end and total discipline at the other extreme. Better choral groups tend to operate somewhere between the two extremes. I sought to encourage students to develop vocally, which requires a measure of freedom, while maintaining a fairly disciplined approach to putting the parts together. E pluribus unum was certainly a goal, but not at the expense of the individual. In other respects, I probably could have done more to promote growth and change within the setting, although overall, I feel very good about what I did to assist and facilitate my students' total development.

I also had to contend with resource issues. I organized a very effective parents-boosters club which was quite successful in fund-raising. But, some resource problems were never resolved. Despite numerous promises and several floor plans for better facilities, we remained in the auditorium. On the positive side, the partitions were eventually removed, shop classes relocated, and the auditorium restored, which improved our lot considerably. I was able to define or redefine problems in ways that permitted us to work around resource shortages and still get the job done.

Yet, my attempts to give leadership to settings have not been so consistently successful. When asked to teach

and direct choirs at a prestigious, private college while the regular choral director was on leave, I did not fully know nor fully appreciate the history or culture of that setting. Obviously, I did not anticipate the problems and conflicts that such ignorance would engender. The experience was not one of my more pleasant ventures.

A few years ago, I had the opportunity to give leadership to a short-term setting on three successive summers. I was asked to direct a summer CETA program on a certain college campus. The program involved five to eight core group members and 80 to 90 students. The first summer was an uphill struggle as I had been asked to replace a director who had suddenly resigned. I did not know much about the setting or its problems. The core group was not mine. We experienced many problems. The performance of some core members was completely unsatisfactory. There were some morale problems due to glaring inequities in pay and work done. Student payrolls were often inaccurate and student paychecks invariably late. Persons in the institution's business office were uncooperative. Somehow, we managed to make it through that first summer. The succeeding summers were markedly improved. I knew the history of the setting. I formed effective, more compatible core groups. I anticipated problems and planned, with other core members, ways of working around them or dealing with them. Staff salaries were equalized. Lazy or

ineffective core members from the first summer were not rehired. Student payrolls were met in a more timely manner, although we had few allies in the business office.

Much of my experience with settings comes from my involvement in churches. Churches are interesting settings. Christendom is replete with examples of settings creations. The Great Schism of 1054, the German Protestant Reformation out of which came the Lutheran Church, the Swiss Calvinist movement, and the squabble between Henry VIII and the pope which marked the beginning of the Church of England are all notable instances of new religious settings being created. New churches, denominations, and sects also appeared in America. One such setting, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints -- better known as the Mormon Church -- was embroiled in controversy during much of its early life. The early Mormons had to travel west, migrating from New York to Missouri and finally, to Utah, before escaping the numerous problems and conflicts within the larger community which worked against the creation of their new setting.

Doctrinal differences, political squabbles, and Divine revelations were responsible for a large share of these new religious settings. But, social issues such as slavery and racial bigotry prompted some religious leaders to form new settings in the larger, denominational sense as well as congregationally. Richard Allen organized the African

Methodist Episcopal Church in Philadelphia after a particularly distasteful scene during worship services at a white Methodist church. The A.M.E. Zion and Colored (now "Christian") Methodist Episcopal Churches were also formed out of an existing setting -- the Methodist Church -- as a result of racial issues. As slavery ended, many black Baptists sought to worship in freedom and dignity, a virtual impossibility in many of the white Baptist churches of the time. So, in cities and towns all across the south, blacks either withdrew from white congregations and built their own churches or, not as frequently, white congregations left their old sanctuaries to black worshippers and built new places of worship for themselves. In each case new settings were being created.

New religious settings are still being created under a number of circumstances. One set of circumstances with which I have some personal acquaintance are those in which conflict and controversy within the existing setting (sometimes of a doctrinal nature, but more often involving personal disagreements, factional clashes, or differences over goals and methods of reaching them) become so great that some members feel that they can no longer continue to worship with the others. Those members pull out of the old setting and form a new church. One such instance involved a good friend of mine who was pastoring a large Primitive Baptist congregation in a major southern city.

Problems arose -- or perhaps, surfaced. Much of the controversy centered around disagreements over church doctrine and scriptural interpretation, although it is likely that this particular problem was simply the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back. My friend resigned his pastorate. Some church members made a stormy exit from a heated church meeting and subsequently set about to organize themselves into a new congregation. My friend provided guidance to their organizational efforts, in absentia. Although his involvement at this phase of creating the setting was unofficial, it would be fair to say that his influence was considerable. When the initial organizational efforts were completed, the new church issued an official call to my friend to become its pastor. He accepted. He then began to give leadership to this new setting as its preacher, spiritual mentor, and chief administrator. That was three years ago. To date, the church appears to be healthy, vital, and growing. Present membership is close to 500.

My friend was not familiar with the writings of Sarason. But, it seems that the apparent success of his church to date is based, in part, on several factors that are congruent with Sarason's framework (although there was definite agreement on values, a desire to create something unique, a sense of mission, and lots of optimism). First,



there was a considerable amount of historical awareness. My friend and others were quite conscious of the conflict and problems that plagued the existing setting. He also knew of some problems encountered by other mature church settings that he and others wanted to avoid. His, and other organizers' preoccupation with the pressures of the present -- to get things going, to secure adequate financial resources, a worship house, etc. -- was not so great that they did not learn from the past or anticipate the potential for future problems. Church policies were set up in such a way as to provide a basis for dealing with or warding off problems of the sort that caused the original schism. In other words, certain ground rules were put in place. It was agreed that there would be regular rotation of many core group members who held church offices. This effects a sense of challenge and novelty, allows more persons to make contributions to church operations in positions of responsibility, fosters a greater sense of egalitarianism, and helps to prevent the kind of grappling for power and possessiveness which so often occurs when persons stay so long in one position. Very fortuitously, the new congregation found an old church facility which it purchased from a congregation that had recently completed building a new church. So, my friend was not distracted from his task of giving leadership to the new setting by the demands of constructing a new

building in which to house it.

Other aspects of my friend's new setting are in agreement with Sarason's framework. Often churches define the success of their ministries in overly ambitious terms that require ever increasing financial resources, thus placing inordinately great demands on members for increasingly larger offerings and increasingly more auxiliary fundraising activities. While admitting (appropriately) that faith plays a role in financial planning, my friend and members of his core group try and seem to succeed in planning realistic budgets. Their projections of church income are generally accurate; their perceptions of available resources are realistic. Besides, they seem to build enough flexibility into the budgetary process to deal with contingencies. There is an awareness within the setting of resource limitations.

Great emphasis is placed on the growth and development of those within the setting. Youth activities provide opportunities for young persons within the fellowship to grow and develop. Additionally, married couples and single ministries have been added to the church's program as a way of helping those within the setting to change.

My friend has visions of what the church can become. Some of these are shared with core members in monthly staff meetings and will probably become concrete long

and short range plans. Other dreams are shared only with his wife. I do not know whether or not this causes a sense of uneasiness within the setting. I suspect that it does not. It seems to me that ministers, who enjoy frequent "other-worldly communion," are permitted more of this kind of distance and privacy than are leaders of other types of settings. In short, my friend's new setting seems to be succeeding for many of the reasons that Sarason gives in his book.

In conclusion, my answer to the question, "Do the Goffman and Sarason frameworks make sense in light of my autobiographical experiences?" is a definite YES! The frameworks serve the higher education administration scholar well by presenting a way of looking at and understanding self-presentation and the creation of settings that is true to life.

#### A Heuristic Analysis

Other questions emerge from the Goffman-Sarason frameworks and from my understandings of the frameworks, as expressed in the autobiographical essay in the first part of this chapter, questions that aid the higher education leadership scholar in further exploring the ideas of Goffman and Sarason. These questions will bring into integrated

focus the ideas of Goffman and Sarason and the autobiographical understandings of the writer. The questions will be presented in outline form with discussion.

1. Are the frameworks of Goffman and Sarason compatible? Yes. While examining different aspects of social behavior (Goffman analyzed what happens when people come together to interact with and influence each other and Sarason looked at what takes place when they come together in sustained relationships seeking to reach certain goals), the two complement rather than contradict each other. Also, both emphasized the sociologic aspects of and social influences on the behavior of people in interactions and settings as opposed to seeking to explain this behavior solely in terms of individual psychology. The two frameworks, when integrated, provide helpful insights into how administrators might best give leadership to settings and settings interactions, and what problems and threats to the success of settings and face-to-face encounters within those settings might be anticipated or avoided.
2. Is the resulting integration of these ideas useful to the higher education leader? Yes. All higher education leaders are concerned with guiding successfully the collaborative efforts of persons who want to achieve certain goals and who must sustain relationships over time to do so. All leaders are

working with free, decision-making individuals who must ultimately be persuaded that certain choices -- individual and institutional -- are most desirable. The leader is constantly trying to influence others. More than any heavy-handed exercise of positional and traditional authority, it is the ability of the leader to influence others to redefine their perceptions of the situation in terms more like his or her's that determines how successful his or her performance will be.

3. Is the Goffman-Sarason framework control-oriented? No -- at least not in the sense that it gives leaders license to control others. Self-control is stressed. Influencing events and, ultimately, the success and fate of the setting, as opposed to allowing historical circumstances and human capriciousness to control the destiny of the setting, is emphasized. What is presented is not a blueprint for manipulating others. It is rather a guide for understanding the complex forces affecting organization of and interaction among group members and what the leader may do to influence those with whom he or she works.

- 3.1. Is it mechanistic? Again, no. Both Goffman and Sarason seem to care very much about people. Their works show compassion and respect for human values. Yet, by way of their own observations and analyses, they have arrived at

cogent and consistent explanations for certain aspects of social behavior.

- 3.2. Is it deterministic? Not really. It is a fact that certain tendencies exist when people come together. For example, some of them will fall in love and create long term relationships; others will become antagonistic toward each other. Some will say one thing but act in quite another way -- and others will notice and respond accordingly. Most will, at some time or another and for a variety of reasons including love, come together in the pursuit of certain common objectives. Some of these efforts will succeed while others will fail. Goffman and Sarason have simply taken a critical look at what is, and why, and, in sharing their findings with us, have enhanced, rather than diminished, our ability to choose how we will act and to understand better the probable consequences of our choices.

4. Goffman used the terms "teams" and "audiences."  
Are the two always clear-cut? No. Although the theoretical distinction between the two is quite clear, it seems possible that teams and audiences can overlap in reality. What is one's team for a given performance may become an audience for another performance by the leader and vice versa.

- 4.1. Is Goffman's "team" and Sarason's "core group" one and the same? No. While a

group can be a team, it does not have to be. A core group may, at one moment, be a team, truly collaborating in the presentation of a performance and, at other moments, may become an audience to which the leader performs. Nor are all teams groups. Groups -- within Sarason's settings context -- are extended relationships and interrelationships united by common goals. Teams may consist of loosely allied individuals and can be quite transient, existing solely for the presentation of a particular performance.

5. Might it be possible to enhance leader-core member relations through increasing backstage rapport? (e.g., inviting others into the leader's back region, sharing secrets, etc.) Yes. But in the presence of an ulterior motive, the backstage may very easily become a front region in which the leader tries to influence others by seeking to create an impression of informality and comradery.
  
6. Is Sarason's "creation of a setting" limited to newly organized and formed relationships, organizations, groups, agencies, etc.? No. While it is such settings to which Sarason gave attention in his book, it can be argued that the removal of any person(s) from or the addition of any person(s) to an existing setting is a "creation" in that what exists after the change is not quite the same as what existed before. So, new settings

are being created when the two 19 year-olds (who tended to discuss assigned readings) drop the seminar class and the 37 year-old community student (who wants to share a lot of her own experiences with the class) adds it, or when a baby is born to a couple, or when an older family member who has been living with the younger, nuclear family dies, or when a new academic dean comes on board, etc.

6.1. How much of Sarason's framework is applicable to existing or mature settings?

Much of it. For example, much of what a creator of a setting should know about its history and culture would also stand in good stead the person who would lead the mature setting. The age of a setting does not guarantee its success. (Old governments can be overthrown; old marriages dissolved.) Sarason's framework is helpful to those who would give leadership to any setting.

7. How does the Goffman-Sarason framework square with some other leadership thinkings and writings? Frameworks, such as the Goffman-Sarason, are not the particular concept, activity, or system being described -- they simply provide ways of making sense of that to which they are applied. Goffman-Sarason is no more a statement of how or what leadership behavior is than Gestaltist or Behaviorist theories say definitively how or what psychology is or the writings of Karl Marx provide the explanation of history, society, and change. Instead, the framework is an explana-



tion of, a way of looking at and understanding a very complex, multi-dimensional thing -- leadership behavior. As such, it does not automatically invalidate other theories and perspectives. Rather, it provides another way of perceiving and thinking about what leaders do and should do to be more effective.

7.1. Does the Goffman-Sarason framework allow for uniqueness -- differences in personal styles? Yes. Some leadership writer/scholars, such as Brown (1973), stress the importance of personal traits and styles in leadership performance. Each person brings to a leadership position a personality that is substantially formed and, while subject to gradual modification over time (as indeed, everyone changes during the course of a lifetime) will probably not change radically or drastically. Obviously, certain personal qualities and interpersonal skills are desirable. But the personalities of leaders will vary from person to person. Goffman and Sarason present elements of providing leadership that are basic, constant, and universally applicable. The Goffman-Sarason framework speaks to the predictable aspects of giving leadership to settings and interactions: expressive control must be maintained; reflective and anticipative planning must take place. Regardless of a leader's personality, if expressive responsibility is not maintained, the leader's

performance is jeopardized. Credibility is lost. This would be true of Mother Teresa or Attila the Hun. An Abraham Lincoln not considering the history and culture of a setting or the need to carefully select a core group would fail as a setting creator/leader as would an Adolf Hitler who made similar mistakes. Other flaws and deficiencies might well result in a leader's failure, but ignorance of the principles of self-presentation and setting leadership as presented in the framework almost certainly will.

- 7.2. Does the framework allow for situational variables? Yes. Fiedler (1976) and others have stressed the transactional or situational aspects of leadership. They have pointed out that successful leadership does not depend solely on the traits and qualities of the one providing leadership, but also on the characteristics of the setting to which one gives leadership. Goffman-Sarason provides constant guidelines for leaders regardless to situational variables. But these guidelines also encourage situational sensitivity. The melding of one's performance to audience and region is an example of this kind of sensitivity. It is reasonable that there will be some performances in which the leader cannot behave in a manner that is true to his/her true feelings and beliefs. It is possible that a leader will simply not be able to give a consistently

authentic performance in a certain setting. In other words, leader and situation will not be optimally matched. Knowing the history of a setting is another example of situational assessment and responsiveness. Benezet and others (1981), in a study of college presidents, corroborate the importance of being sensitive to the situation: "If the new executive is to grow into a leader, he or she will do well to study the setting, including its recent as well as its founding years, intensively and soon."

7.3. Does it encourage leaders to promote the self-actualization of those within the setting -- to assist persons within the setting to fully realize their potential for growth?

Yes. Some leadership writers have underscored the importance of organizational settings meeting relationship, participative, and productiveness needs of people (Gorman, 1963), and also the importance of human needs and values being given priority over organizational concerns (Knowles, 1970). Even Hersey and Blanchard (1977), who see the leader as an applied behavioral scientist, admit that self-actualization is important. This framework is very human centered. Essential to Sarason's writings is the importance of providing an environment within the setting in which people can grow and change. Goffman's emphasis on sincerity and authenticity are evidence of his concern for human values -- an

essential orientation for a setting in which there is a commitment to human growth and self-realization.

7.4. Are there research findings that are consistent with Goffman-Sarason? Yes. For example, the report by Benezet and others on the Presidency Project -- a study of higher education chief administrators at selected institutions -- is consonant with the framework in many respects. Some points which are made in the report are:

- a. presidents must be frontstage most of the time
- b. the president's team members suspend or conceal their own differences with him/her to be loyal to the team
- c. presidents employ the personal touch -- "pseudo-gemeinschaft" -- in relating to different constituencies or audiences
- d. core groups are formed with care
- e. social distance from others on campus is often maintained
- f. a sense of alienation from others tends to increase with time
- g. others' perceptions of the leader's privacy increases a sense of tension within the setting
- h. some leaders leave the setting after the sense of novelty and challenge has diminished

8. What are the implications of the Goffman-Sarason framework for real and meaningful change? A stated value in Sarason's writings is the importance of persons within a setting growing and changing. Effective leaders ought to foster an environment in which they and others can change. On the other hand, the kinds of superficial, cosmetic changes in behavior which are so often promoted within settings should be guarded against. Change -- authentic and significant change -- is more often evolutionary than revolutionary, more often gradual than sudden, almost always from inside-out, almost never imposed from without. The framework implies that changes in behavior -- especially changes in the way leaders behave -- are more than shallow, modified responses to a manipulated environment. Real change is thoughtful reaction; deliberate action. It seems that if leaders are to grow and change, they must first know themselves. This is an implied challenge which the framework makes to leaders. It follows that a person must be him/herself. One must be authentic -- "for real." For, we are who and what we are. The real performer tends to shine through in the expressions one gives off. It would be difficult for a leader within a setting in which there was prolonged, frequent, or intense contact with others to successfully act contrary to his/her real feelings, beliefs, and values. Change is important, but it must be profound and genuine if the leader's performance is to be authentic. Leaders

must want to change. They must be willing to grow. They must sense within themselves the power to think and act differently.

9. What are the aesthetic implications? "Front" is an important concept in Goffman's writing. Front involves certain aesthetic elements of the performance. The setting of the stage and the provision of those visual elements that help define the dramatic situation are obviously aesthetic activities. They are expressive and creative activities to which performer and audience affectively respond. Front is a type of symbolic expression, for, it sums up the essence of the situation far more effectively than could words alone. Carefully arranged floral tributes around a sculpted bronze casket within a darkly paneled, richly carpeted family room; the dark blue, finely tailored, pin-striped suit worn by a higher education administrator to a very important meeting; fresh, seasonal fruits and vegetables neatly displayed in the produce section of a grocery store; carefully arranged desks, freshly waxed floors, and cheerfully decorated bulletin boards -- all are creative, symbolic attempts to express certain facts about and elicit certain responses to a situation.

Likewise, the presentation itself has certain aesthetic qualities. There is something creative and symbolic about how the leader interacts with others and how he/she comports him/

herself while within sight and earshot of the audience. The establishment and disengagement of eye contact; the use of the hands while speaking and listening; the positioning of the body in relation to others; the use of physical contact -- handshakes, a hand on the shoulder, a slap on the back; the modulation of vocal pitch and rhythm -- words that pour out now at a torrential rate and then with deliberate slowness -- all are within the leader's repertoire of expressive devices. The orchestration of interactions is not unlike a composer's careful use of instrumental timbres to weave a tapestry of symphonic sound. The role of the leader is not unlike that of the conductor who must balance and proportion performing forces to mold out of a multitude of musical talents an artistic consensus.

And, the pulling together of human talent in the creation of a setting is an art, as Sarason points out. Choosing performers who will complement each other -- performers who are capable of strong solo work while also contributing to the integrity of the ensemble -- and providing for them a stimulative, facilitative environment is settings leadership that is truly aesthetic.

## An Investigative Framework

These more practical questions will give structure and focus to the examination of the three chief academic officers that will receive attention in the next chapter.

1. What can be learned from the history of the setting -- the "before the beginning stage?"
  - 1.1. What forces will work for and against the creation of a new setting? Giving leadership to an existing setting?
  - 1.2. What types of problems and conflicts can be anticipated?
  
2. What can be learned from the culture of the setting?
  - 2.1. What changes in his/her own behavior might the leader make to accommodate the cultural uniqueness of the setting?
  - 2.2. Is there a point at which the leader might decide that those changes are so alien to who and what he/she is at that particular time in the leader's development that he/she cannot give an authentic performance?
  
3. What factors should the leader consider in the formation of his/her core group?
  - 3.1. Competence is obviously important. How important is compatibility? And should some degree of competence be



- sacrificed in exchange for more compatible core members?
- 3.2. What problems might the leader face if a core group is already formed when he/she joins the setting?
4. What can the leader do to facilitate growth and change of those within the setting?
    - 4.1. How can the leader effect a balance between organizational and human needs -- e.g., between the kind of task structure, division of labor, and specialization often necessary to getting the job done and the sort novelty, challenge, and sense of freedom that can prevent boredom within the setting?
    - 4.2. How can the leader separate his/her positional function as evaluator, rewarder, and punisher from the supportive, facilitative role that will make it possible for those within the setting to be truly open and honest about their growth needs?
    - 4.3. In what ways can the leader encourage deep and lasting change that will benefit the setting and the individual?
  5. How can resource attitudes and perceptions work against realizing certain goals?
    - 5.1. Can the leader use creative means of solving problems and meeting needs despite resource inadequacies?
    - 5.2. How do definitions of problems in terms of resource availability affect values

and priorities within the setting?  
Reflect values and priorities?

6. How can the leader's privacy -- the leader's reluctance to share his/her fantasy with others within the setting -- affect leader-core and inner core relations?
7. How can the leader deal with his/her own growth and change?
  - 7.1. How can the leader know when change is warranted? What motivates him/her to change?
  - 7.2. Can the leader create a blueprint or map that will guide him/her in conscious and purposeful growth and change?
  - 7.3. How does he/she react to boredom?
8. What obligations does the leader as performer have? To him/herself? To others?
9. Can the leader manage his/her impression while still being sincere?
  - 9.1. Where is the dividing line between giving off expressions that would ruin the performance and calculated deception?
  - 9.2. Can a leader always give an authentic performance?
10. How can the leader's sensitivity to regions and region behavior make his/her performance more effective?

- 10.1. How can the leader be alert for persons playing discrepant roles? How might he/she handle such persons?
11. How can a leader know when his/her core group is a team and when it is an audience?
  - 11.1. Will making such distinctions create tension and conflict within the setting?
12. Is there a point where backstage behavior -- even though it may be unseen by the audience -- is so incongruous with who and what the leader purports to be onstage that the performance becomes a farce or a confidence game?
  - 12.1. How much backstage control must the leader exercise?
  - 12.2. Can inordinate incongruity between front and back region behavior lead to cynicism?
13. What is the emotional toll on a leader who must constantly juggle so many varied roles and play to so many diverse audiences in a relatively short span of time?
  - 13.1. Is rejuvenation possible? If so, how?
  - 13.2. How might the leader deal with misperformances?
14. In what ways can the leader most effectively direct team presentations?
  - 14.1. Are there things that the leader can do to promote and encourage (or to decrease the likelihood of) team solidarity -- i.e., loyalty, discipline, and circum-spection?

- 14.2. How might the leader deal with performance risks?
15. In what ways might the leader explore and actualize the aesthetic dimension of giving leadership?
- 15.1. How might the leader show sensitivity to and accentuate the aesthetic nature of setting and personal front?
- 15.2. Is it possible for the leader to...
- a. perceive beauty in persons within his/her setting?
  - b. create such an environment that the personalities and talents of those within the setting can blend in such a way as to become a work of human art?

### Summary

In this chapter I have asked, "Do Goffman and Sarason make sense? Do their frameworks make sense in light of my autobiography, internally, vis à vis each other, and in terms of what some others have written about leadership behavior? And do their frameworks make sense to those who wish to know more about giving leadership to higher education settings?" The results of these analyses are:

1. YES. The frameworks make sense.
2. They can be usefully integrated.
3. They can be revised for use by higher education leaders.

Toward the end of the chapter, I raised several questions which will form the focal point of my application of the revised framework to the three chief academic officers mentioned in Chapter I. The application of the framework to their observed leadership performance will be made in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV:  
APPLICATION OF THE GOFFMAN-SARASON FRAMEWORK

In the last two chapters, I examined, analyzed, and revised the Goffman-Sarason framework. I also presented an investigative framework to facilitate the application of the Goffman-Sarason framework which will be made to the leadership performance of three chief academic officers whom I observed during my practicum. The application will be presented in this chapter. The questions raised in the investigative framework of Chapter III will be addressed in narrative form.

Learning From the History and Culture of the Setting

Each of the three institutions has its own unique history and culture. The oldest of the three is Salem College, a Moravian school which began its service to young women in 1772. This fact makes the school especially unique as it was commonly agreed during the eighteenth century that women belonged at home and could best learn what they "needed" to know (cooking, sewing, canning, mending, and other domestic arts) from their mothers. It is located in picturesque Old Salem, a pioneer Moravian community. Salem remains a women's school, has

high admissions standards, and is expensive -- the most costly to attend of the three. While some attention has been paid in recent years to the practical matter of preparing Salem graduates for specific vocations, the college maintains its strong, traditional commitment to liberal education.

Wake Forest University celebrates its sequicentennial in 1984. It is a school with strong Baptist ties established by the Baptist State Convention, an affiliation that has been somewhat diluted in recent years. Wake Forest Institute and College began as an institution for white male students, opening its doors to women more than a century later and, even later, to minority scholars. Most of its history was spent in the tiny town of Wake Forest, North Carolina. An opportunity to move to Winston-Salem came when the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation offered to fund the relocation (the School of Medicine had already moved to Winston-Salem). The move was completed in the 1950's and the school now sits on the scenic Reynolda campus in the northwest section of town. In addition to the College (the liberal arts, undergraduate school) and the medical school, the university also includes highly respected schools of law and management. The Bowman Gray School of Medicine -- North Carolina Baptist Hospital is one of the leading teaching/research/treatment centers in

the South.

North Carolina A. & T. State University is one of the state's two land-grant institutions. Founded in 1891 as a school for black students, the university enjoys a rich heritage. Four of its students initiated the first lunch counter sit-in, a technique which was subsequently used all over the South as blacks and sympathetic whites sought to eliminate racial segregation in public places. One of its alumni and trustees, the Reverend Jesse Jackson, is a candidate for President as of this writing. Another alumnus is one of only two black men ever to have traveled in space. The school enjoys a fine reputation as a center for agricultural and other types of research. Its research budget ranks third in the University of North Carolina system behind the Chapel Hill campus and N. C. State in Raleigh. Being a traditionally black, state-supported institution (unlike the two private schools where authority and decision-making are more centralized), A. & T. has had to adapt to outside efforts -- administrative, legislative, and judicial -- to desegregate (or give the appearance of desegregating) it. The perceptions of equality within the sixteen-institution UNC System and the realities of life in a society which still has its share of inequities to overcome are not always in consonance. The sprawling 181-acre campus of A. & T. is located on the eastern edge of downtown Greensboro.



The three academic administrators seemed to be very much aware of the history of their settings in the broadest sense (as summarized above) as well as the more specific, detailed, and intimate history of their respective institutions. Of course, it is the latter which is primarily concerned with the problems and conflicts of the "before the beginning" stage and how they affect the institution and give shape to institutional issues. For example, the academic leader in one school knows how important that school's rich heritage is and how powerful a deterrent that tradition can be to certain types of change -- imminent or imagined. Another leader understands how the very facts of history that gave rise to that setting have now become circumstances to be studiously avoided and deliberately reversed. A third officer has, for nearly three decades, witnessed his school's attempts to become more independent of, but not completely sever relations with, its denominational founders and patrons. Each leader's performance is affected by his or her awareness of the history of the setting and of the danger of becoming a hostage to the "narrow present."

Each of the three institutions is culturally unique. I observed that each of the three academic officers responds to the culture of the setting both objectively and consciously (each is aware of it) and in a subjective and subconscious way (each is a part of it). One person has held his deanship for seventeen years and has

been at the institution even longer. By contrast, another of the three is completing three years of service to the particular school. Yet, each seems to have fully absorbed and assimilated the culture of the institution -- the way things are, the way things are done, the way people there think and act, and all the tangible and intangible factors that make their respective settings unique. One leader spoke to me about the tremendous power of that institution's faculty. "They must be persuaded," this person essentially said. They cannot be pushed or pulled along. This type of culture encourages a collegial approach to decision-making. Such a participative process invites lots of thought and rhetoric, is seldom linear, frequently cumbersome, often time consuming, and can be particularly frustrating to the administrator who likes to see ideas transformed into actions. The major behavioral change that this leader had to make in response to this aspect of the culture was to become more patient. For, in this setting pushiness and excessive persistence can be counterproductive.

I am likewise certain that the other administrators have made several behavioral concessions to the cultures of their settings. Some have probably been deliberate while others have been made less consciously. Some have been major changes, like the acquisition of greater patience. Others have been of lesser moment and perhaps as

mundane as where one goes to lunch, when, and with whom. Yet, I see such changes as inevitable: "When in Rome, do as the Romans." All of us make this kind of concession in return for being a part of certain cultures. The trade-off is an accepted and acceptable part of life within a setting, unless the changes go against the grain of who we are and what we deeply believe. Then a conforming performance becomes forced; it takes on a false, hollow ring. The three leaders seemed comfortable within their respective cultures and with the performances each was being called on to give.

### The Core Group

The concept "core group" can be narrowly or more broadly construed. In its most narrow application, it can be used to include the administrator's staff. Most broadly, it encompasses staff and all academic officers -- i.e., faculty. There are obvious intermediate applications such as the academic staff and co-leaders such as school deans, division directors, and department chairpersons. Either way, each of the three academic administrators relies heavily upon a core group to help him or her provide academic leadership. The core groups -- in the narrower sense of the term -- varied in size and constituency from setting to setting. In one setting, the group consisted of three

assistants and three secretaries. Another group included one assistant and a secretary. The extent of my inclusion in the core groups varied from institution to institution. In one instance I was an intimate part of the group, although I did not participate in the making of any decisions (with the possible exception of where we were to have lunch). I was with them during meetings and was privy to their discussions and deliberations. In another case I was peripheral to the core group and did not get to see the core members and leader interact very often. Yet, in each setting, I sensed that leaders were comfortable with members of the core group. The leaders had brought some of the persons into the group, while others were "inherited." This did not seem to make a difference. (In one setting, due to the academic leader's length of tenure in the position, all of the core members had followed him into the setting. It is reasonable to assume that he either chose them personally or was influential in their selection.) I also observed that secretaries are "special" core members. They do not enjoy the status or receive the pay of other core members. Yet their contributions are invaluable. In many respects they are the "glue" that holds the setting together. (The secretary knows what is happening as she is at her desk most of the time and in a position to "see all" and "hear all.") In each setting the relationship between leader and secretary appeared to be especial-

ly good.

Must leaders choose between competent and compatible core members? All persons bring strengths and weaknesses to a given job. If successful work performance encompasses having good relationships with others as well as technical aspects of doing the job, then compatibility is as important as competence. A core member should be evaluated in terms of compatibility strengths as well as competence. The other side of the coin is that defining compatibility too narrowly can greatly decrease the diversity within the group and, possibly, the setting. It seems that within each setting (the three observed and others of which the writer has knowledge) is the potential for a clash between two opposing forces and imperatives. On the one hand, the culture often tends to define its strength and viability in terms of conserving its salient characteristics and preserving its uniqueness. It wants to remain the same. This force causes compatibility to be highly valued and sought. Compatible persons are brought into the setting: persons who think, value, believe, and act in ways that are comfortable, familiar, and consistent with the ways in which those already within the setting think, value, believe, and act. On the other hand are forces -- mostly always external to the setting -- that challenge the setting to become more diverse by admitting into its ranks those who are quite different, in some way or another,

from those presently within the setting. On one side, a basically internal need to maintain the stability of the culture through the perpetuation of homogeneity. On the other, an essentially external push to increase diversity within the setting by admitting "different" types, thus making it more heterogeneous. Neither extreme is absolutely good or bad. Each force has a tempering effect on the other when each is allowed to operate. The cultural uniqueness of a setting ought to be preserved -- somewhat. What is highly unfortunate is the fact that efforts to do so have too often resulted (and still too often result) in the exclusion of those who were racially, ethnically, religiously, and sexually different! To define compatibility so narrowly is immoral for it denies equal opportunity. Leaders should look at all of the strengths which a core member (or potential core member) brings to the job and ask, "Can this person do a good job both by virtue of his technical competence and the quality of his relationship with me and others? Will my definition of compatibility cause anyone to be unfairly excluded? Can we use a little more diversity?"

In its broadest sense, the core group can include other faculty administrators and instructional personnel. One leader spoke with special pride of his role in faculty selection. (I had an opportunity to witness one interview.) It was important to this administrator that per-

sons came into the setting not only well prepared and with appropriate experience, but also with the ability to "fit in" -- to be the kind of humanistic, empathetic, nurturant teacher that he feels the institution needs. Each faculty interview is an opportunity for the leader to participate in the creation of a setting. Another leader spoke with pride of academic core members, most of whom he had no role in appointing: "They are strong deans."

In the more restrictive sense, the core members that I observed were generally effective. They related well with each other and with the leader. They did their respective tasks well. They were fairly homogeneous. In the broader sense, there was obviously more diversity, such as I could discern. There seemed to be greater variances in both competence and compatibility.

### Growth and Change Within the Setting

Higher education settings are very much human-oriented settings. They consist of human beings providing for the needs of other human beings. Of equal importance, they consist (or ought to consist) of human beings providing for their own needs. Chief among these are development needs -- the need to grow and change. Obviously, each of the three institutions is committed to the individual development of students within acceptable limits -- certain

philosophical, moral, and curricular limits which, while varying somewhat from institution to institution, appear to be universally present at schools of higher learning. There also seems to be some commitment to the development of institutional personnel -- setting members -- again, with certain limitations. To some extent, this commitment is stated and systematic, taking the form of opportunities for in-service experiences, support for research, funding for doctoral and post-doctoral study, etc. But much of an institution's commitment to the growth and change of persons within the setting is implicit and insidious, and can be perceived in the attitudes of leaders and in a kind of intangible, yet very powerful institutional attitude.

In a sense, the institution itself is an organism with needs for growth and change as well as stability. The institution needs to fulfill its purpose and tends to justify its continued existence in terms of how well it fulfills those stated aims and objectives. The goals and purpose of the institution tend to be stated chiefly in terms of "What shall we do for others." Institutional growth tends to be aimed toward helping the institution better provide service for others. This is true of the three settings examined. Growth and change issues are addressed most often on an institutional level and least often on a level that speaks to the needs of members of the setting. Each of the chief academic officers was seen to be keenly in-



terested in helping the institution meet its particular needs. I would have been surprised to discover otherwise. But I was also interested to see how each leader -- in obvious as well as subtle ways -- facilitated the growth and change of those within the setting. Concerns for meeting institutional needs tended to take the form of "How can we do a better job?" This, of course, is always a legitimate question. Concerns for meeting individual needs tended to come across as "How can we help ourselves realize more of our human potential?"

One academic officer was very organizationally oriented. The primacy of organizational values and institutional needs was explicit. The smooth, regular, efficient, predictable, and orderly operation of the institution was of primary concern. The maintenance of a bureaucracy was seen as the means of getting the job done. This was an important part of that institution's culture. This was also a value of the administrator. Meetings had the flavor of corporate board meetings. Adherence to the chain of command was stressed. Directives, requests, and commands flowed downward. Information and compliance were directed up the chain. While individuality was inevitable, I observed that it was not expected to interfere with the performance of one's duties or the fulfillment of certain role expectations.

Another academic officer was considerably more individualistic in orientation. This orientation, too, was congruent with that institution's culture which I would describe as open, somewhat informal in some respects (although a very formal, highly organized structure existed on paper), and collegial. The institution was a place where there are rules, as there are at other colleges and universities, but also a place where exceptions are made when cases merit them. (One day I had lunch with several mid-level administrators who spoke nostalgically of how easy it had been to see the soon-to-be-retired head of the institution.) It was a place where chain-of-command did not preclude dialogue between higher-ups and subordinates. Ideas were respected and persons of differing status had an opportunity to present their ideas. It was a setting in which people could step outside the rules (when necessary) and find creative and, often, unorthodox ways of solving problems. This academic leader valued these cultural characteristics. This was obvious in meetings where student problems were discussed. Thoughtful consideration was given each case. The question always seemed to be, "What is best for the student?" This orientation was obvious when an assistant dean's mother became gravely ill, remained hospitalized for several weeks, and then died. The leader and others in the core group went out of their way to make it possible for her to spend as much time

as she needed with her mother. The leader and entire core group attended the funeral. (What is remarkable here is not that someone from the office went but that everyone did, virtually closing down shop in the process. The value attached to sharing that moment with the bereaved core member as opposed to continuing office operations is indicative of the kind of prioritizing that I found to be pervasive within the leader's core group.) On another occasion the administrator and other core members treated secretaries, who had done a very effective job, to a special lunch as a way of showing appreciation. None of this type of thing focuses attention on improving job performance or enhancing members' competence. But on the other hand, an environment that affirms human worth and seeks to meet the needs of core members has to pay rich dividends for the individual and the setting.

Evaluations can provide a basis for personnel actions -- raises, promotions, tenure decisions, reprimands, and separations. They can also present opportunities for growth and change. Leaders are challenged to provide purposeful, constructive assistance to settings members in their developmental efforts. But, since leaders have the power to reward and punish the performance of subordinates, persons within the setting are often understandably wary about being truly open and honest with leaders about their weaknesses and growth needs. So, traditional evaluations are

often ineffective in promoting growth and change because of their punitive potential. Recognizing this, an academic co-leader in one of the institutions was extremely proud of a faculty development evaluation that persons in his core group had developed. The evaluation would provide faculty members an opportunity to look at their own strengths and weaknesses and make their own decisions about how they might change and improve. Neither the leader nor any other person in the setting with the power to make personnel decisions would see the results unless the faculty member wanted to share the information.

Each leader was understandably concerned with his or her setting doing as effective a job as possible. Two addressed this concern more directly than the other, who seemed to define doing a good job largely in terms of meeting the needs of persons within the setting. One leader seemed to think and act decidedly in favor of meeting institutional needs as opposed to those of individuals within the setting.

### Resources

I perceived that each of the three academic administrators tended to look realistically at resource availability. Each seemed to realize that there would never be as many "qualified" people to do the job or as much money

to support educational programs as one might like. Persons at one institution who hoped to establish a distinguished linguistics chair fretted that, linguistics being so esoteric a field, the calibre of person sought for the position might be gainfully and very satisfactorily employed and not wish to leave his or her present position. The academic leader and co-leader at another institution sought to enhance educational opportunities for their students by establishing an alumni network which would provide internships for interested students. The same institution makes extensive use of community persons to teach certain courses. These are examples of creative approaches to solving problems that circumvent limited or inadequate institutional resources.

One especially memorable afternoon was spent talking with an academic co-leader on one of the three campuses. He ended our conference by suggesting that I visit a small museum not far from his office which housed a notable collection of rare artifacts and art works. He spoke of some badly needed improvements that he wanted to make as soon as funds became available. I visited the house-turned-museum. I was very impressed -- impressed with the exhibit itself and with the very creative way in which the curator obtained new objects and maintained the present collection in spite of resource shortages. She had obviously not defined the problem of housing and expanding

this remarkable collection in ways that depend upon the availability of adequate institutional resources.

### The Leader -- Privacy and Growth

To what extent does the leader's sense of privacy -- i.e., the reluctance to share feelings and thoughts with others -- and the discrepancy between the leader's fantasy and the realities of the setting create tension within the setting? I was unable to discern much concern within each of the three settings over the leaders' privacy or their fantasies. I suspect in one case that this kind of intimate sharing was not really expected of the leader. In another instance, the leader seemed to share a great deal of himself with core members. I, a newcomer to that setting, was quickly taken into his confidence and got to know a lot about his thoughts and feelings concerning the setting and his role as leader of that setting. In a third setting, the leader seemed a bit more private. But I do not know if this made others anxious.

I concluded that each of the leaders was very comfortable in his or her setting. I could not imagine there ever having been a time when they might have been otherwise. I do not think that any of the three had to make radical changes in their actions or values due to the demands of their particular setting. One administrator was more the

corporate executive -- decisive, firm, efficient -- chosen to manage the academic affairs of the institution. This leader's straightforward, task-oriented style of leadership was very appropriate to the situation. Before coming to the institution, the administrator had had considerable success in other bureaucratic organizations. Another had been called upon to essentially "chair" the faculty and manage other non-academic institutional functions. This person seemed well suited to the job of presiding over a collegial decision-making apparatus, a role quite different from that of the previously mentioned administrator. The third was a respected liberal arts professor who had been asked to provide leadership for faculty and students. I perceived that this person had never ceased to be that liberal arts professor at heart. Thoughtful, humane, scholarly, gentle, democratic -- are a few descriptive words that come to mind. (In fact, in a private conversation, one member of the leader's setting, who was not, interestingly enough, a teacher, questioned the leader's administrative effectiveness because of these very qualities.) Each leader seems to give the kind of leadership needed by and most congruent with his or her setting's history and culture.

If the leaders have changed during the course of their administrative leadership and will change -- and I suspect that each has grown and continues to grow in the position --

this development has been and will be gradual and evolutionary. One leader related to me how the culture of the setting has encouraged more patience. Another spoke of "coping skills" acquired over time that compensate for the gradual loss of vigor and resiliency that has occurred with time.

All three spoke of what they might do when they were no longer satisfied by their leadership role and needed a change in responsibility. Two of them anticipate an eventual return to full-time teaching and research. Another spoke of the possibility of doing a more narrowly defined, high-level administrative job at a larger institution in the future. The challenge and variety of the chief academic officers' present leadership duties appear to have eliminated possibilities of boredom for the time being, however.

#### Performance Obligations and Impression Management

Each of the three is a competent performer. Each met fully the expressive demands of the performances to which I was privy. Each leader showed responsibility and sincerity; each seemed conscious of the role he or she played and of the impression presented to the audience. I had a chance to witness many performances by the three academic administrators and each was impressive.

There are obviously secrets which a performer withholds from his or her audience. Not only does the performer



not want to make known all facts to the audience, but the audience does not really care to know everything. It wants and expects a smooth performance that reaffirms the situation being defined. On the other hand, the audience expects that performers will be sincere in who and what they purport to be. Is there a dividing line between controlling one's performance so that only relevant facts are revealed to the audience and deceiving the audience? Yes. A well-managed performance may well withhold certain irrelevant or potentially damaging information but can still be sincere in that the performer honestly believes in himself and the role being filled and cares about the audience. I found the performances of the three leaders to be consistent with this ideal balance of control and sincerity.

Of all the performances I witnessed during my practicum, the most memorable were the first ones -- the performances given for my benefit in the initial interview (although I was somewhat acquainted with one of the three from another institution at which we both worked). One performance had an air of formality about it. Another was less formal though still restrained. A third was noticeably more intimate. Yet, each leader wished to make an impression on me and mobilized all expressive resources at his or her disposal to do so. For example, none of the three offered to meet me in the campus dining room, or in a

lounge, or under a shady oak tree. Each met me in his/her office. It is obviously convenient and customary to meet one's appointments in one's office. But, the office is a stage, fully set with all the props and trappings which serve to underscore the status and authority of the occupant. It is one's turf; a base of power. It is there that the occupant is in control. Guests are invited, admitted, and, in usually subtle and tactful ways, told when it is time to leave. It is there that it is understood and accepted that the occupant will manage the interaction. True, the guest also performs (as I performed for each of the leaders), but it is the occupant of the office, the host, who sets the tone and establishes the terms of the transaction. The furnishings and the decor of the office say something about the situation, as was the case during each of my interviews. Clothing serves to further define the situation. What is said and how it is said also has dramaturgical value. For example, two of the leaders got right to the point after a customary exchange of pleasantries. One leader and I chatted about brand names which, due to their popularity, have gained generic usage (such as Kleenex, Vaseline, Xerox, Sanka, etc.) before turning attention to more ponderous matters. This bit of small talk grew out of my having been offered refreshment ("Coffee or Sanka?") upon my arrival. Each leader gave me his or her full attention. Each did most of the talking.

Each used the performance as a way of saying something to me about who each was, what each did, and what each valued. One was especially outgoing. Another seemed more guarded. One gave off expressions which said to me, "This will work out fine. I am looking forward to your being here with us." Another's expressions seemed to say, "I think this might work out, but I sure would feel better if this thing had more structure to it!"

Each of the three leaders appeared to handle region logistics and region behavior with the greatest skill. I went with one leader and core group to attend the funeral of a core member's mother. The cars in which we traveled to the church were a back region. The behavior of the leader and those in the party reflected the fact that those who were gathering for the service would not know what was being said or how persons in the group were conducting themselves. Persons conversed freely. They chatted about a wide range of topics. Occasionally, there was laughter. There was nothing unbecoming or distasteful about what took place in the back region. But, the conduct was not appropriate to the performance in which we were soon to take part. Upon arrival at the church, changes in behavior took place. There was still conversation, but it became subdued as the leader and core members came within view and earshot of those gathering at the church. By the time we entered the church, the leader and other core members' expressions

had changed to fit the occasion. Smiles were limited to slight gestures of acknowledgement for acquaintances who filed through the vestibule into the sanctuary. Verbal communication was limited to hushed whispers when such communication was needed at all. The leader and others sat quietly in their pews and looked straight ahead. Every gesture -- consciously and unconsciously -- was marshalled to express reverence for the worship place, respect for the deceased, and love and concern for the grieving core member. The whole scenario was reversed as we walked back to the cars and then, rode back to the campus.

It seems that if we are to speak of a back region or backstage, then we must ask, "Backstage to what?" If we answer, "Backstage to the performance," we must also respond to the question, "What performance?" For, it makes sense that since performances, performers, and audiences vary, what is backstage for one performance may not be backstage for another. For example, secretaries in each of the three settings participated in certain performances and shared in the attendant backstage activities but were excluded from other performances and the related back regions. Secretaries may transcribe and type confidential memos but may not sit in on or learn the details (or all the details) of certain private meetings or appointments. In one institution, certain academic matters were

decided by a committee consisting of administrators and faculty and student representatives. Backstage confidentiality is expected of each performer. Yet, some performances were for administrators alone to present and entailed the necessary concealment of certain facts from faculty and students. (For example, the sharing of certain personnel information with students or, generally, with other faculty is considered to be unethical.) Even within the core group, some performances must include some persons and exclude others. And there are times when the leader must stand on stage alone. At such times, the backstage is the leader's and his or her's alone, and secret information about the performance cannot be shared with others -- not even the closest core members. This kind of privacy can, in excess, cause tension and anxiety within the setting as persons wonder "what's up." But I did not observe such excess or the attendant strain within either of the three settings to which I gave attention.

It seems that the performance -- the momentary presentation of self -- is only the tip of a much larger iceberg -- the whole person, the bulk of it being submerged and hidden from view. It is that submersed and hidden portion, with all of its irregularities and jagged edges, that may well cause the damage that "sinks the ship." I perceive the danger posed by inordinately incongruous backstage conduct to be twofold. Like the "Wizard" in the

movie The Wizard of Oz, who is "found out" when Dorothy's dog, Toto, pulls back the curtain that has bounded the Wizard's back region and exposes him for what he really is -- a pretentious "scientist" manipulating a fabricated performance, an intruder or a quirk of circumstance may cause the leader's back region to be exposed. Or, backstage behaviors may unconsciously intrude on frontstage activity during an unguarded moment. Secrets are shared behind the stage of action; facts are concealed which cannot be revealed to the audience. But this selective presentation ought to take place within a context of sincerity and authenticity. If this is the case, then the consequence of someone violating the privacy of backstage or of a leader imprudently permitting some backstage fact to make its appearance frontstage will certainly be embarrassment, but should not be the permanent incapacitation or total discrediting of the performer. Insincerity within the back region, if exposed, can be utterly damning! (Consider the fate of the itinerant medicine man who, having just sold a town his entire stock of "Magic Elixir," is overheard by one of the townspeople telling a confederate, "They ought to rename this place 'Suckertown!'") Each of the three academic officers seemed to be sincere, and there was nothing in their backstage behavior -- to the extent that I was able to observe it -- that essentially contradicted their public images. Their authenticity, as

I observed it, was consistent in both front and back regions. Their concern for the various audiences to which each played was genuine.

The emotional toll of moving constantly from performance to performance, often with little recovery time in between and sometimes with little warning, can be considerable. One leader spoke of the terrific emotional demands placed upon higher education administrators -- demands quite different from those placed on teachers, whose jobs are much more structured and predictable. The emotional requirements are even greater when the administrator is sensitive to the human dimensions of his or her job and is aware of the human consequences of actions taken and decisions made. The same leader recalled instances in which he had to relay the news to faculty members that their tenure applications had not been approved. The leader felt it important not simply to tell persons that they would not be granted tenure but also to help them explore other alternatives. In one case, a faculty member, who had not been successful as a teacher, was assisted in "re-tooling" for another career. Another leader stressed the need to keep things in proper perspective and to be in touch with the realities of life within the setting. Looking and thinking clearly about what it is that one can do and what one must wait on others to do is very helpful to this administrator's maintaining emotional equilibrium as efforts are made to influence others

through various performances. Once I had an appointment with an academic co-leader in a third setting to ask questions about his academic unit and leadership responsibilities. The co-leader was very busy and had attempted to reschedule our appointment, but could not reach me in time. He graciously consented to meet with me and declined my offer to return at a more convenient time. Toward the end of our talk, he seemed genuinely appreciative for the opportunity that I had given him to stop and think deeply about his role and responsibilities. He said that such opportunities for reflection, while rare, are needed to counteract the often frenetic pace and emotionally enervating demands to which academic leaders are so constantly subject.

The various teams with which the leaders aligned themselves during performances seemed to be loyal, disciplined, and circumspect. It appears that this sense of team solidarity and impressive control was enhanced by the fact that most of the teams with which I observed the leaders perform were either the leaders' core groups or consisted of certain core members. I did not at any time sense disloyalty or a lack of control during any of the team performances that I witnessed. Also, each leader directed each team performance with great skill, defining the dramatic role and responsibilities of each team member with clarity. Team members were sensitive to audiences



and regions. They did not contradict -- verbally or expressively -- the situation being defined. When accreditation visitors came to the office of one chief academic administrator, team members performed in an acceptable, predictable manner. The person responsible for greeting them and showing them into the leader's office did so. Others worked on (or appeared to work), thus dramatizing for the visiting team that the situation was indeed what it was supposed to have been. This kind of performance was consistent and authentic enough that whenever the head of the institution came into the suite, as he often did, no changes in dramatic activity were usually needed. The performance continued. I did not have an opportunity to observe leader behavior toward performance risks -- team members who, on occasion are less than loyal, disciplined, and/or circumspect -- as I did not witness any risky performances.

### The Aesthetic Dimension

The aesthetic character of each setting was powerful. One office is located in a new administrative building. It is actually a suite of offices. The area is spacious and well lighted, the decor is modern and functional, and the furnishings are of simple, unadorned line. There are no immediate clues to the uninformed visitor that this of-

office is really the academic nerve-center of an institution of higher education. It could well be a corporate executive suite. An ambience of efficient formality prevails. The behavior of the leader seems to confirm the aesthetic impressions fostered by the physical setting. Upon my first visit to the office, the leader offered me a seat in one of a couple of chairs located in front of the desk and resumed his seat behind the desk after the initial greeting. The expressive and symbolic use of certain elements of setting and personal front was actuated: the spatial separation between host and visitor reinforced a sense of formality and discouraged too much intimacy. The expression given off was: "Let's be pleasant and courteous, but let's not misunderstand this performance, our roles, or our relationship. This is business." The desk and large swivel chairs were symbols of power and position, not unlike the throne and scepter which represent regal authority and station. To sit behind the desk says: "I am in control here. This is my turf. Do not forget that you are here on terms that I have (or will) set." I should emphasize that the use of such expressive devices (setting and front) to help define the situation are not to be summarily disparaged. All performers -- successful performers, at least -- set stages and use expressive equipment to their advantage. Nor should one assume that such an aesthetic realization as I have just described is necessarily bad. It simply represents one

leader's attempt to affirm and buttress certain facts about the performance using the elements of setting and front in certain ways.

Another office is located in a massive, old building which stands with imposing dignity on one of the most beautiful campuses I have ever seen. It is a beauty mellowed and deepened by age much as a fine wine gets smoother with passing years, or an old oak tree becomes more magnificent with time, or the tone of a priceless Stradivarius sings with a sweetness of tone not possible in an instrument two centuries its junior. The office is small and darkly attractive. It is cozy, but does not seem crowded. At the time of my initial visit, the academic leader invited me into the office and we sat in two handsome chairs close to a window facing a courtyard. She offered me a cup of coffee. She listened attentively and spoke precisely. There was a quiet dignity in her demeanor that was not unlike the quiet dignity of the office in which we sat or of the solid, old building in which it was located.

A third office is situated in a large office building which sits at one end of an ellipse at the center of campus. This campus is also beautiful and has a timeless quality about it. (On another occasion I was to almost ask someone how old the building was, forgetting that the whole campus is no more than about thirty years old.) The archi-

ecture is traditional and does not at all betray the fact that it was erected in the 1950's. The leader and I sat in two upholstered armchairs around a small table and talked as we sipped coffee. The office was bright and cheerful. I could not help but contrast this setting (which seemed to invite a certain intimacy) with the first one described. The leader's behavior and conversation reinforced these facts about the use of aesthetic elements. The expressions given off seemed to say, "Let's visit!"

There is an aesthetic quality to the human presence within a setting. There is beauty in each person -- beauty in the uniqueness of each personality; beauty in what each person brings to the setting. In this essential quality exists the potential for a blending and meshing of individuals into a setting that is, in every way, a work of art. The leader of a setting must be able to perceive the beauty of this human potential if he or she would creatively and expressively proportion and pull into harmony and consonance the diverse and unique personalities, skills, and talents which make up the setting. It seemed that each leader did this at least satisfactorily -- although I am not sure how conscious each was of the aesthetic impact of creating and giving leadership to a setting.

### Summary and Guidelines

In this chapter I have applied the Goffman-Sarason framework to the performance of three chief academic officers based on my observations of that performance during my practicum. I perceived these three leaders to be effective in their efforts to provide academic leadership to their settings, even though each approached his or her job somewhat differently. Each differed in varying degrees in values, experiences, training, temperament, strengths, and personal styles. Also, each setting differed in many respects. Yet, I adjudged each to be successful within his or her setting based on my perception of their performance and what I perceived to be significant others' objective and subjective perceptions of each officer's leadership performance. I attribute that success, in large measure, to the congruence of each leader's performance with the tenets of the Goffman-Sarason framework. Each leader gave leadership to gatherings within the setting and to the setting's efforts to realize its goals in a manner consistent with the framework.

My own subjective evaluation of the performance of each varies. There were some persons with whom I felt more comfortable, in large measure because their performance was more in line with my own values and beliefs. Their per-

formance was more as mine would have been (or as I would like for mine to have been) given an opportunity to give leadership to similar settings. There were likewise some settings in which I felt more comfortable. This was certainly due mainly to my own personal and professional orientation and the congruence of my essential self with the culture of the settings. Yet, the very fact that, in a more objective perspective, each leader was effective and successful provides considerable support for the claims I make for the usefulness and applicability of the framework. For, despite many variables in the efforts of persons to give leadership to higher education settings, the basic tenets of the Goffman-Sarason framework present constant and universal challenges to all who would be effective higher education leaders. Such persons must provide appropriate leadership to encounters which occur within the setting between him/herself and others and must provide appropriate leadership in creating the setting and helping the setting realize its goals and objectives. I am convinced that failure to meet these two challenges -- however differently one may set about to do so -- will result in ineffective leadership.

The opportunity to be a participant and observer within each setting and, then, to evaluate what I saw, heard, and experienced was an important growth experience which significantly enhanced my own autobiography. I am the

richer for having been able to study higher education leadership from so close and intimate a vantage point and for having been able to make sense of and organize those observations and experiences in terms of the Goffman-Sarason framework. The entire process has been an important self-actualizing experience for me.

Based on my understandings of the Goffman-Sarason framework, my observations of the three leaders, and my application of the framework to their performance, I now offer the following conclusions which shall also serve as guidelines for the higher education leadership scholar.

1. It behooves a leader to know the history and culture of his or her setting. Virtually every institution has a "stormy past." The length, nature, and intensity of the storm will vary from setting to setting. Some institutions will have experienced more frequent such episodes than others. Yet, somewhere in the "before the beginning" stage of the institution's history -- or at least before the arrival of the leader -- there has been a period or periods of stress and conflict which left a profound mark on the setting and, in all likelihood, continues to influence life within the setting. The leader must consider the historic relationship of his or her setting to other settings and to the larger society as well. And tradition often plays a strong role in institutions of higher learning and dictates

how a college or university perceives itself and seeks to carry out its mission. Leaders must know that tradition and what it implies for how they will act as leaders. That tradition will profoundly affect and shape the setting's culture -- how people live and think and act within the setting. Leaders must be aware of this culture and aware of how comfortable they will be within it. Can one adapt to it or is it so alien to who and what the leader essentially is as to make such efforts to conform forced and false performances?

2. The leader's vision must be prospective as well as retrospective. From the history of the setting, he or she must be able to anticipate problems, or at least the fact that problems and conflicts will occur, and must provide ways in which these might be resolved. This does not suggest that leadership must become a highly structured chess game in which every move is strategically planned in advance. This does not mean that there must be definite answers for any and all possible problems. But it does mean that effective leadership cannot be treated like a dice game in which all is left to chance and wishful thinking. Nor can the most commendable of motives or the most noble of intentions be counted on to see the setting through rough times. Love is great, but love is not enough!
3. Forming the core group is one of the leader's most important responsibilities. It is important



that those persons chosen to work most closely with the leader and help him or her lead be competent and compatible. The leader must weigh the desire for compatible core members against the need to inject diversity into the setting. The leader must also be morally responsible for not unfairly excluding persons from the setting for race, religious, sex, age differences, and the like. The leader who inherits a core group faces a special challenge which he or she must meet creatively. Even greater sensitivity is required of such a leader.

4. The leader has an obligation to facilitate the growth of those within the setting. As important as the services the setting performs for others -- the students, the community, etc. -- is what it does for its own members; how important it is for persons within the setting to grow and change in meaningful and lasting ways. This strongly suggests that the leader will not only look at meeting institutional needs (what the setting can do to meet its service obligations) but will also give attention to the needs of individuals within the setting and what can be done to help each one grow -- not only in direct relation to what he or she does within the setting -- but as a whole person.
5. When the leader looks realistically at the job to be done and the resources -- human and material -- available to help him or her and others meet the goals of the setting, he or she will

probably realize the inadequacy of those resources. The leader has a choice of getting the job done in such a way that the setting is utterly dependent on sufficient resources and is impaired in its efforts to meet goals without them, or more effectively defining the problem so that ways can be devised for working around shortages and using in more imaginative ways the resources that are available. For example, available resources can be reallocated, efficiency can be sought, and networks can be utilized.

6. The leader, like others, must also grow and change. Much of this growth entails effecting a balance between the leader's needs and the needs of those within the setting. But real growth and change cannot be superficial. Its matrix is internal. So, leaders must look within themselves. "Know yourself." The advice of the philosopher applies very much to those who would lead. "Be yourself." An authentic performance is possible only when the performer truly believes that he or she is who and what that person purports to be. "Consider what is worth changing and what is worth keeping." Some things should be conserved; change for its own sake is usually unwise. Change should be purposeful. It is also important for the leader to be aware of the inevitable changes which take place within each of us over time and to know what those changes imply for the leadership role. Have the leader and the setting grown apart? Does the leader now have needs that the setting cannot satisfy? Does the setting have needs that the leader can no longer meet?

7. The leader must be an expressively responsible performer if he or she wishes to give leadership to others during the numerous interactions that occur during life within the setting. Self-control is absolutely necessary. But self-control must be balanced by sincerity. It is essential that the leader believes in his or her role and projects that sincerity to the audience. The performance must be authentic!
  
8. The leader must be aware of where he/she is and for whom he/she is performing at all times. He/she must also know who is on the performing team at any given moment. Ignorance of any one or any combination of these can spell doom.
  
9. The leader must be aware of the emotional costs of having to present so many varied performances with so little time between shows to recover from one or prepare for the next and so little opportunity to retreat to the back region. The leader must find ways of coping with these demands and finding renewal. The job that he/she is called upon to do requires much action and presents little time for reflection.
  
10. The leader is called upon to affirm certain moral facts. He/she is expected to be who and what he/she claims to be. The leader is also called upon to underscore and give support to, by virtue of his/her performance, certain commonly held values — certain facts about the institutional culture and the larger society. This will often entail "over-

acting" or the giving off of somewhat exaggerated and "super-real" expressions at a given performance as a way of making certain that these moral facts are communicated to the audience. This is similar to the theatrical "broad gesture," and is especially necessary in that each performance usually presents an opportunity for no more than a brief moment in which the leader can give his or her audience a chance to "sample" the very complex person that they will never fully know. The leader must be able to call attention to that which he or she wants to make sure the audience does not miss.

11. Authenticity is important even in the private back region. While the leader may, and ought, reasonably expect that persons who have no place there will not intrude, and that, if such an intrusion does take place, he or she will be able to detect it in time to perform responsibly for the intruder, there is the danger of someone coming unwarned -- innocently or surreptitiously -- into the leader's backstage and discovering about the performance some fact or facts which the leader would rather have remain undiscovered. There is also the danger of persons who once had access to the back region and who were at one time trusted members of the performance "going public." Additionally, there is the ever-present danger of backstage behaviors accidentally seeping into the leader's performance. For the leader who really is who he or she presents him/herself to be, this can be embarrassing. For the insincere leader, this can be destructive.

12. The leader must also be concerned with the performance of team members. In addition to the self-control which the leader must possess as a responsible performer, it is to his/her advantage to encourage the same type of self-control among members of his/her team. Co-performers should be loyal -- if not to the leader as a person, certainly to the performance and the situation being defined. They should show discipline or a willingness to remain within the boundaries of the scenario. Team members must also be circumspect. They must exercise a certain prudence in their performance. The leader must deal with persons whose conduct endangers the performance -- performance risks.
13. The leader must be sensitive to the aesthetic dimension of giving leadership. The performance provides many opportunities for symbolic expression. The institutional setting -- campus layout, architectural design, landscape, building materials, etc. -- has a certain aesthetic quality. On a more intimate level, the leader can set the stage. Office decor and furnishings, the presence or absence of pictures, plaques, and other memorabilia; the cleanliness or clutter of the desk, the arrangement of furniture -- all say something about the situation and the leader. This is equally true of "personal front" items such as clothing and voice inflection (which can be altered) and sex and age (which are fixed characteristics). The leader can and should use all expressive resources at his/her disposal to bring out certain facts about the per-

formance. Even when the leader is not on home base, "front" can be used effectively to enhance his or her performance. There are also aesthetic implications for helping the setting reach its goals. Each person comes to the setting as a work of art -- a unique expression of individual talents, experiences, interests, aspirations, needs, and personal style. If the leader is sensitive to the beauty in each member of his or her setting, then the chances of providing an atmosphere in which each person can give creatively to the setting (and take from it, as well) and in which what each person has to offer can be blended into a harmonious whole are all the greater. The leader can preside over the creation of a work of art.

CHAPTER V:  
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
FOR FURTHER STUDY

Much importance has been attached to the study of leadership in higher education. Much research has been done, and continues to be done in the field. Much has been written and published on the subject. And unlike former years when few opportunities existed for higher education leaders to study educational administration (nor was there widely perceived to be a need for such study) , there now exist many such programs in universities all across the country. One focus of this emphasis upon higher education leadership study has been to seek a better understanding of how leaders perform and how they might more effectively give leadership to college and university settings. The dissertation has provided a framework that will be helpful in viewing and understanding the performance of higher education leaders and useful in assisting them to enhance their performance based on frameworks of Erving Goffman and Seymour B. Sarason integrated with the writer's autobiographical understandings.

First, the frameworks of Goffman and Sarason were reviewed in detail. Special attention was given Goffman's book, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (1959) and

a book by Sarason, The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies (1972). In addition, other books by Goffman were reviewed. The review presented the essence of the two frameworks. The Goffman framework dealt with how persons behave as they seek to influence others while interacting. Goffman used the metaphor of theatrical performance as a way of looking at and understanding these activities. One of the salient themes of his framework was the need of the performer to control his or her performance and manage the impression he or she wishes to make upon those being performed to. This control entails making obvious some facts while deemphasizing or concealing others. The framework also stressed the dramaturgical and moral importance of sincerity -- the belief of the performer in his or her performance. The Sarason framework focused on giving leadership to new settings -- fresh efforts by two or more persons, who join together in sustained relationships, to reach certain common goals. Sarason emphasized the need to look realistically -- rather than idealistically -- at efforts to create and lead a setting. He held that it is necessary for the leader to look beyond the "narrow present." The past is important, for the forces that will work against the setting and may very well destroy or incapacitate it can be found in the history and the "before the beginning" stage of the setting. The future is also important. The leader must anticipate problems and conflicts as he or she seeks to



move beyond benefic and euphoric emotions in facing the realities of life within the setting. The Sarason framework also stressed the importance of carefully forming the core group, the need for members of the setting to get from the setting as well as give to it and others, the effect of what the leader thinks and feels upon the setting, the effect of resource perceptions on the values and priorities of the setting, and the aesthetic dimensions of creating a setting.

Next, the frameworks were analyzed, integrated, and revised. Several questions were posed. One was, "Do the Goffman and Sarason frameworks make sense in light of my autobiographical understandings?" (Given the research goals and orientation stated in the first chapter, this was an especially appropriate and significant question.) The answer was YES! Other questions grew out of my attempts to inspect more closely and understand more clearly the frameworks from an internal perspective, vis à vis each other, in relation to some of the ideas of other leadership writers, and in terms of the utility and applicability of the frameworks to leadership in higher education settings. It was found that the frameworks stood up well under this kind of analytical scrutiny and that the ideas could be successfully integrated and revised for use by higher education leaders. An investigative framework was fashioned to facilitate the application of the Goffman-Sarason framework to the leadership perfor-

mance of three academic administrators.

The revised framework was then applied to the performance of three academic officers based on my observations of them during a higher education administrative practicum which took place in the fall of 1983. It was determined that each of the three leaders, while different in many ways, was an effective academic leader and each was successful based on my perceptions of their performance. It was further determined that much of this success was due to the congruence of each leader's performance with the framework. Each leader was effective in giving leadership to presentations within the settings and to the settings as that effectiveness is defined by the framework. Thirteen guidelines for effective higher education leader performance were presented based on the Goffman-Sarason framework, my life's experiences, and my observations of the three leaders.

### Conclusions

The result of this investigation has been the development of a framework for higher education leadership performance. The salient elements of the framework can be found in the thirteen guidelines presented at the end of the previous chapter. These guidelines, which represent the major conclusions of the study, are summarized below:

1. Leaders must know the history and culture of the setting. They cannot afford to be captives of the "narrow present." Leaders must be sensitive to the culture of the setting and must ask themselves what might that culture imply for the leadership that they might give to the setting. "Will I be comfortable and able to give an authentic performance? How much will I be expected to conform to this culture? Will I be willing to make adjustments?"
  
2. The leader must look to the past and future if he or she would be aware of the forces that work against the setting. Awareness of the conflicts of the past and what they portend for the future is essential. Leaders must anticipate the consequences of the past and present. The sense of uniqueness, enthusiasm, missionary zeal, and hope will sooner or later give way to the realities of life within the setting. The leader must be prepared.
  
3. Leaders must form the core group with care. They must be aware of the potential for conflict within the core group. Leaders must also find the appropriate balance (appropriate to their setting, that is) between competence -- where narrowly defined as having the necessary technical skills to do the job -- and compatibility -- the congruence of core members with the values of the setting and the ability to relate to the leader and others in the setting, also important to getting the job done -- when choosing persons for the core group. Compatibility is important. However, the leader should ask what will be the price of failing to

seek some degree of diversity within the setting. And he or she should also ask whether the desire to seek compatible core members unfairly excludes persons from the core group. Giving leadership to an inherited core group is a special challenge that requires even greater sensitivity.

4. The setting should be a place where persons can grow and change -- where persons can get as well as give. The leader is responsible for maintaining an environment which encourages positive, meaningful, and lasting change among the members of the setting.
5. There will never be enough institutional resources to do the job adequately if the leader defines meeting the goals of the setting in such a way as to be contingent on the adequacy of those resources. The leader must find creative ways of doing the job, ways of working around the inevitable scarcity of resources.
6. The leader must also grow and change. But the root of the leader's growth, of his or her process of becoming must be internal. The leader must look within and be in touch with his or her inner self. Change must be real and meaningful. And it must be balanced by appropriate conservation. The leader must constantly balance his/her needs and the needs of those within the setting and must be very sensitive to the implications of the growth and change of each for each.

7. The leader must be in control of the expressions he or she gives off but must, at the same time, be sincere.
8. Leaders must be sensitive to performance regions and audiences. They must also know who is on the performing team and who is a part of the audience at any given moment.
9. The leader must be cognizant of and prepared to deal with the tremendous emotional demands of so many varied, back-to-back performances.
10. Leaders must be attuned to the moral expectations of the setting and the society. They will be expected to reaffirm certain values and moral facts by their performance.
11. Leaders must be careful that their front and back region behaviors are not so incongruous that backstage facts inadvertently discovered about the performance will completely discredit the leader.
12. The leader must encourage team solidarity and direct team performances so as to preserve dramaturgical discipline, loyalty, and circumspection among team members. He or she must also be prepared to deal with those who would imperil the performance.
13. The leader must be aware of the aesthetic implications of giving leadership. Performances and the creation and leading of settings present opportunities for artistic expression.

### Recommendations for Further Study

This study has been largely heuristic in nature. It represented the researcher's efforts to explore new ways of looking at and understanding higher education leadership. A new framework for conceptualizing higher education leadership performance was developed out of an analysis of frameworks of Goffman and Sarason and the synthesis of those frameworks with each other and with my own experiential understandings. Descriptive use of the resulting framework was made by applying it to the performance of three academic administrators. Programmatic use of the framework was made by presenting guidelines for higher education leader performance, guidelines which grew out of the framework. As a result of the study, new learnings have been added to what is known about giving leadership to higher education settings. Answers to the question, "How might one better understand higher education leadership and go about providing it in a more effective manner?" have been presented. However, such research answers customarily generate more questions. This instance is no exception. Additional questions are suggested by the findings of this investigation. It is hoped that this dissertation will encourage others to seek answers to these questions and to formulate other questions regarding the ideas explored herein and their implications. Some matters deserving

further inquiry and investigative attention include the following:

1. The Philosophical Implications of the Framework  
How does the framework stand up in relation to some of the major philosophical systems? Some examination of the framework vis à vis the tenets of Humanism and Existentialism, for example, would be appropriate.
2. The Psychological Implications of the Framework  
How does the framework square with what is known about human psychology? Does it tend to fit within the teachings of a certain "school?" Is it behavioristic? Is it atomistic or wholistic? Does it conform more to an externalistic, environmentally controlled concept of what influences behavior or to a more internalistic, human-centered view of how and why people act as they do?
3. The Analytic/Descriptive Value of the Framework  
Can the framework be used to study, analyze, and describe the performance of persons who give leadership to higher education settings? For example, can it be used as an investigative tool in conducting case studies of college and university administrators?
4. The Conceptual Value of the Framework Can the framework help others to understand higher education leadership behavior? Can it form a foundation for other conceptual explorations of higher education leadership (or public education leadership or any form of institutional leadership)? Does the framework have the potential for generat-

ing new ideas? Can any facet of the framework be usefully expanded and developed?

5. The Curricular Value of the Framework Can the framework be incorporated into higher education leadership teachings (courses, seminars, workshops, etc.)? How receptive might teachers and instructional leaders who have relied on other frameworks be to such an incorporation? How effective might students perceive it to be? While studying the framework? After having had an opportunity to use it as settings leaders?
  
6. The Practical/Applicative Value of the Framework Can the framework be used to actually enhance leader performance in a measurable or discernable way? For example, can a research problem be formulated such that relationships can be shown to exist (positively or negatively) or not to exist between leader behavior which conforms to the framework and other appropriate variables (job satisfaction, longevity in the position, perceptions of others, some measure of job effectiveness, etc.)? Can a causal relationship be established? Can an experimental study be structured to test the effectiveness of the framework (as a whole or any part of it)?



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Benezet, Louis T., Joseph Katz and Frances W. Magnusson.  
Style and Substance Leadership and the College Presidency. Washington: American Council on Education, 1981.
- Brown, J. Douglas. The Nature of Organization. New York: AMACOM, 1973.
- Brubaker, Dale L. Curriculum Planning: The Dynamics of Theory and Practice. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1982.
- Fiedler, Fred E. and Martin M. Chemers with Linda Mahar.  
Improving Leadership Effectiveness: The Leader Match Concept. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1976.
- Gay, L. R. Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis & Application. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1981.
- Goffman, Erving. Behavior in Public Places. New York: The Free Press, 1963.
- Goffman, Erving. Encounters. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1961.
- Goffman, Erving. Forms of Talk. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.

- Goffman, Erving. Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Goffman, Erving. Interaction Ritual Essays in Face-to-Face Behavior. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1967.
- Goffman, Erving. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1959.
- Gorman, Alfred H., The Leader in the Group: A Conceptual Framework. New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.
- Graduate Programs and Admission Manual 1981 - 1983 Volume D Social Sciences and Education. Princeton, New Jersey: GRE Board, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, The Educational Testing Service, 1981.
- Greene, Maxine. "Curriculum and Consciousness." In Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists, William Pinar, ed. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1975.
- Hersey, Paul and Kenneth H. Blanchard. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.
- Johnson, Juanita J. The Evaluation of the Reading Program of the Guilford County School System. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1983.

- Knowles, Henry P. Personality and Leadership Behavior.  
Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing  
Company, Inc., 1970.
- Mooney, Ross L. "The Researcher Himself." In Curriculum  
Theorizing: The Reconceptualists, William Pinar, ed.  
Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Company,  
1975.
- Sarason, Seymour B. The Creation of Settings and the  
Future Societies. Washington: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1972.
- Scriven, Michael. Evaluation Thesaurus. Inverness,  
California: Edgepress, 1980.