

Interim Leadership: The Professional Life History of Dr. Delbert M. Shankel

By

Sheahon J. Zenger
B.S., Kansas State University, 1988
M.S., Kansas State University, 1992

Submitted to the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership and the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dissertation Committee:

Redacted Signature

Redacted Signature

Redacted Signature

Redacted Signature

Redacted Signature

Dissertation defended: 4-18-96

Disc
1996
1996
1996

Abstract

The study of leadership in higher education has emerged as a field of research that is attracting a great deal of attention. However, very little if any research has been conducted on interim leaders in institutions of higher education. In an effort to fill this gap within the knowledge base, this study of the professional life history of Dr. Delbert M. Shankel was conducted. During Dr. Shankel's thirty-seven year career as a Professor of Microbiology at the University of Kansas, he served in thirteen administrative positions. Seven of these positions were on an interim basis and two others began as interim appointments. It was believed that this study was at the forefront of studying interim leadership and studying the professional life history of an individual who served in interim positions of leadership on a repeated basis provided an information-rich case and an opportunity to gather in-depth data.

In an effort to describe interim leadership from Del Shankel's perspective, it was necessary to investigate why and how he became an interim leader, his experiences as an interim leader, his definition of interim leadership, and his style of interim leadership. As the data were analyzed from this vantage point, five themes emerged: career path, institutional fit, professional influences, definition of interim leadership, and style of interim leadership. From these five themes three major implications for the literature were discovered. It was found that Del Shankel was a symbolic leader who represented the institutional culture during times of uncertainty such as periods of interim leadership. It was also found that while his definition of interim leadership was transactional, his practice could be viewed as trans-

vigorational. Finally, it was discovered that Shankel evolved into a consensus builder over the course of his thirty-seven year career.

Acknowledgements

Without Del Shankel, this dissertation would not have been written. I thank him for his willingness to participate. Few people are courageous enough to open their lives to another individual's interpretation.

My advisor, Marilyn Amey, has been a friend and a mentor throughout my time at the University of Kansas. Her guidance, support, and encouragement throughout this process will never be forgotten.

My dissertation committee, Jerry Bailey, Mary Lynn Hamilton, Ray Hiner, Suzanne Rice, and Ted Wilson all influenced my educational experience during the past four years. I thank them for this influence as well as the effort that they put forth in seeing this dissertation through to completion.

Ed Meyen and the staff in the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor have provided endless support and provided me with the flexibility in my work schedule to complete a project such as this.

Countless friends have encouraged me throughout this process and I am grateful to them all. Cheryl Harrod, Kevin Lennon, Lori Reesor, and Wes Williams became my confidants throughout the time that I spent at KU and deserve special recognition for their never ending ability to listen.

My parents, Weldon and Sharon Zenger, have always encouraged me in all worthwhile endeavors. I cannot begin to count the number of ways that they have supported me in life. Educationally, they provided me with two of the finest role models that a son could ask for.

Finally, my wife Pam sacrificed greatly in order that I might pursue this dream. I will forever be indebted to her and can only hope that one day she

will be rewarded for those sacrifices.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	x
Chapter I. Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	2
Research Questions	3
Methodology	4
Outline of the Chapters	4
Chapter II. Review of Literature	7
A Crisis in Leadership	7
The History of Leadership Theory	11
The Impact of the Great Man Theory on Current Leadership Theory	14
Business Principles in Educational Leadership	15
Current Definitions of Leadership	19
Leadership as Contingency Theory	20
Leadership as Persuasion	21
Leadership as Traits	23
Leadership as Process	25
Leadership as Relationships	26
Types of Leadership	30
Transactional and Transformational Leadership	30
Charismatic Leadership	32
Consensus Leadership	32
Symbolic, Political, Managerial, Academic Leadership	33
Magic Leadership	34
Post-Managerial Leadership	35
Summary of Definitions and Types	36

From Theory to Reality	37
Frames of Organization - Application to Higher Education	39
Structural Frame	41
Political Frame	43
Organized Anarchy	43
Symbolic Frame	45
Culture	45
Summary	48
Chapter III. Method	49
General Approach	49
Qualitative Design	50
Life History	53
Role of the Researcher	55
Data Collection Procedures	57
Interviewing Techniques	59
Data Analysis	60
Limitations of the Study	64
Ethical Concerns and Legal Issues	65
Chapter IV. Biographical Sketch	67
The Early Years	67
The College Years	72
University of Kansas: Teaching and Research	78
University of Kansas: Administration	82
Acting Chair: Department of Microbiology	85
Assistant Dean/Associate Dean: College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	87
Acting Dean: College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	89
Executive Vice Chancellor: Lawrence Campus	91
Acting Chancellor: University of Kansas	95
Special Counselor to the Chancellor: University of Kansas	99
Acting Director of Athletics: University of Kansas	101
Acting Vice Chancellor: Academic Affairs	104

Acting Executive Vice Chancellor: Lawrence Campus	106
Executive Vice Chancellor: Lawrence Campus	108
Chancellor: University of Kansas	109
Summary	113
Chapter V. Career Path	117
A Review of the Positions	117
Turning Points	119
Attributes	126
Faculty Credibility	127
Role within KU Culture	130
Work Ethic	133
Personal Characteristics	134
General Descriptors	134
Leadership Traits	135
Personable	137
Interests	137
Influences	139
Role Models	139
Background	143
Chapter VI. Interim Leadership	147
Definition of Interim Leadership	147
Change	149
Morale	154
Associates	157
Evolution of Leadership Style	159
Consensus Building	161
Chapter VII. Discussion	169
Career Path	169
Institutional Fit	173
Influences	176

Definition of Interim Leadership	179
Style of Interim Leadership	182
Research Questions	185
Question One	185
Question Two	186
Question Three	186
Question Four	186
Question Five	187
Question Six	187
Question Seven	188
Implications for the Literature	189
The Role of Institutional Culture and the Symbolic Leader	189
Transactional and Trans-vigorative Leadership	194
Consensus Building	198
Suggestions for Further Research	199
References	202
Appendix A - Interview Protocol	208

List of Tables

Table of Positions

84

Chapter I

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

The field of higher education is comprised of multiple facets of research. The study of leadership has emerged as one facet that attracts a great deal of attention. Originally, much of what was considered to be leadership theory was assimilated from the field of business, or borrowed from history, political science, or other social sciences. Elementary and secondary educational administration also contributed to early constructs of leadership theory and continues to share in the development of this field. The study of leadership is both strengthened and limited by this broad base of disciplines. It draws the attention and interest of a variety of scholars throughout the university community and may lay claim to being a true interdisciplinary study. This interest at times makes it difficult to narrow the scope of a specific research project and may necessitate incorporating a variety of perspectives. At other times, the researcher may have to limit the perspectives in an effort to focus the project. Finally, leadership itself is a term that is broadly used in society and loosely interpreted by the media. This has created a situation wherein the general public often misinterprets what scholars in the various disciplines and in higher education define as leadership theory.

The research on leadership in higher education originally focused primarily on the power wielders within the university structure such as presidents or provosts. This tendency changed in recent years as more studies seek to describe leadership in the middle management ranks of the

institution and others turned to studying the role of the follower within the leadership equation. Regardless of the focus of the research, each study adds to the collective knowledge base of leadership theory. For example, research conducted on university presidents and research conducted on academic deans may indicate that individuals in both positions utilize the same components of contingency leadership theory within their own professional practice. However, very little if any research has been conducted on interim leaders in institutions of higher education. This means that no information exists within the knowledge base as to whether interim leaders lead in similar or dissimilar ways than leaders who serve on a permanent basis. There is also a lack of information pertaining to how interim leaders are selected, what tasks and responsibilities are assigned to them, and what personal and professional qualities lend themselves to being selected and/or successful performance of those tasks. In an effort to fill these gaps within the knowledge base research should be conducted on interim leaders and questions should be asked that address these issues.

Purpose of the Study

What is interim leadership or an interim leader? The term “acting” is often used in the world of higher education, yet do we know what it really means? The term itself and the use thereof, may take on new meaning across institutional types and differing organizational structures. This dissertation began the process of discovery by recording the professional life experiences of Dr. Delbert M. Shankel. Dr. Shankel’s career is unique in that he maintained a thirty-seven year career as a productive faculty member and also moved freely through the administrative structure of one institution.

As a professor of microbiology he has a long list of publications, has spoken at seven international conferences, has been involved with postdoctoral research training programs, and was a research investigator and visiting professor at the National Institute of Genetics in Mishima, Japan. As an administrator, he served as chancellor twice and as the executive vice chancellor on three other occasions as well. In addition to these roles, he served in many other administrative capacities at the university, including acting director of athletics. What is of special significance to the professional experience of Dr. Shankel is that he rarely pursued these positions and always returned to faculty life upon the fulfillment of his interim administrative duties. The study described these experiences as an “interim” leader at the University of Kansas and adds to the knowledge base in leadership theory by studying a previously unresearched topic.

Research Questions

Seven research questions were constructed in an effort to describe Del Shankel’s experiences as an interim leader:

1. What is interim leadership as he experienced it at the University of Kansas?
2. Was interim leadership defined or experienced differently according to position?
3. Did the definition or experience change over the course of time?
4. Was he called upon to create change or maintain the status quo?
5. How did these experiences differ in his various interim

positions?

6. Why was he selected to serve in multiple interim capacities on multiple occasions?

7. How did he experience the shift back and forth between the role of faculty member and interim leader?

Methodology

In-depth interviews were utilized in collecting the data for this dissertation. Ten face-to-face interviews lasting from sixty minutes to ninety minutes were conducted with Del Shankel. Interviews of the same length were conducted with seven of Shankel's former and current associates. Chronological facts that were in question were checked with University archives, multiple short meetings were held with Shankel and phone calls were made to the associates in an effort to clarify facts as well. Data were sorted, coded, and analyzed according to research questions and themes. This analysis was presented in the context of a life history as defined by Yow (1994) and more specifically as a professional life history, as it focuses on the part of Shankel's life which may then help to define problems, or study aspects of a profession or culture (Denzin, 1989).

Outline of the Chapters

Chapter 2 is a review of the literature as it pertains to leadership in higher education. This section provides a history of leadership theory, current definitions of leadership, and a discussion of types of leadership. The chapter concludes with a presentation of organizational frames as they apply to universities and a discussion of culture within the higher education

arena.

Chapter 3 presents the methodological design of the study. It begins with an explanation of the general approach to the research and includes a description of qualitative design and an in-depth definition of life history. The role of the researcher, data collection procedures, and interviewing techniques in the research process are described and followed by a discussion of the data analysis procedures. The limitations of the study, ethical concerns, and legal issues are also included in this section.

Chapter 4 is a biographical sketch of Del Shankel's life which provides an overview of his early years, his teaching and research at the University of Kansas, and proceeds through each of his administrative appointments at the institution. A table detailing these appointments is provided to give context to his thirty-seven year career.

Chapter 5 is a discussion of Shankel's career path. It specifically highlights significant turning points in that career and discusses the leadership attributes that assisted Shankel in his interim leadership. This chapter also discusses Shankel's faculty credibility, his role within the KU culture, his work ethic, personal characteristics, and life influences that contributed to his unique career path.

Chapter 6 provides Shankel's definition of interim leadership and focuses on three themes that are central to that definition. Change, morale, and the contribution of associates are discussed at length as they apply to Shankel's definition. This chapter concludes with a discussion of the process by which Shankel's leadership style evolved into that of consensus building.

Chapter 7 is a final discussion of the study. Shankel's career path is

reviewed and findings of the research are presented. Findings pertinent to Shankel's fit with the institution, his life and professional influences, his definition of interim leadership, and his style of interim leadership are discussed and are followed by answers to the seven research questions. Implications for the literature are presented in three sections: the role of institutional culture and the symbolic leader, transactional and trans-vigoration leadership, and consensus building. The manuscript is concluded with suggestions for further research.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

A Crisis in Leadership

In seeking to define interim leadership, an exhaustive review of the literature was conducted. Three references were identified that dealt with the topic of interim leadership from an organizational perspective in higher education. Koenig and Langevin (1992) discussed the institutional advantages of appointing an interim president. Neff (1989) recommended issues to be considered when appointing an interim president and Barringer (1982) discussed interim presidencies as an item of concern for community colleges, but no literature was identified that attempted to define interim leadership. Therefore, a review of the literature defining leadership itself was conducted both to provide background information on the topic of leadership and with the hope that somewhere within those definitions, one might find concepts that would be applicable to the phenomenon of interim leadership.

Defining leadership itself can be overwhelming and it is subject to as many interpretations as there are individuals. A review of the literature pertaining to leadership not only bears this out, but seemingly carries with it an undertone of crisis and confusion.

Leadership is often identified as a concept that lacks adequate definition...Whatever leadership is, it is presumed to emerge within groups, organizations, and societies in times of crisis. As an emergent event, leadership is thus seen as unpredictable but somewhat inevitable. An organizational or national crisis evidently produces just exactly the kind of leadership needed to cope successfully with uncertain and hostile events or forces. (Fincher, 1987, p. 156)

Burns (1978) reiterates the notion that leadership carries with it a great deal of misunderstanding, but Foster (1989) contends “that leadership *is* a real phenomenon, one that does make a difference” (p. 39). However, he adds that “before the term can be utilized meaningfully, it is necessary to try to tease out the various ways in which it has been used and to try to come to an agreement on its essential aspects.” It is from this vantage point that this literature review begins.

When the concept of leadership is narrowed to the field of higher education, the definition appears to be subject to just as much misinterpretation as it does within a broader context. Cohen and March (1991) suggest that presidents of colleges and universities are especially susceptible to uncertainty and identify four areas of particular ambiguity: purpose, power, experience, and success. They suggest that college presidents are particularly prone to confusion in these areas “because they strike at the heart of the usual interpretations of leadership” (p. 399).

When purpose is ambiguous, ordinary theories of decision making and intelligence become problematic. When power is ambiguous, ordinary theories of social order and control become problematic. When experience is ambiguous, ordinary theories of learning and adaptation become problematic. When success is ambiguous, ordinary theories of motivation and personal pleasure become problematic. (Cohen and March, 1991, p. 399)

While the general concept of leadership and the more narrow concept of leadership in education, or higher education more specifically, continues to be subject to interpretation, the meanings are also subject to the variable of time. Maxcy (1991) suggests that while “there is still an enormous conceptual confusion regarding the meanings and bearings of the term” (p. 7), an “enormous leap” has been made in recent years. This “leap” refers to

a perceptual change in some of the literature in educational leadership, a change which now acknowledges a need for democratic and participatory direction as opposed to bureaucratic school management and administration. Not all scholars in the field buy into this notion, but a movement in this direction is a recent trend. Green (1988) suggests that this shift in perspective is not unusual and that in trying to define leadership, one must acknowledge and be aware of the changing definitions over time, "for effective leadership in one era may be entirely inappropriate or ineffective in another" (p. 30).

The need to define leadership, or the call for leadership, within the past decade appears to be one of urgency. Bennis (1989) clearly and emphatically makes this point as he asks the question, "where have all the leaders gone?" (p. 5). In answer to his own question he provides the reader with a walk through modern history and a laundry list of past leaders on a grand scale: F.D.R., Churchill, Eisenhower, Schweitzer, Einstein, Gandhi, the Kennedys, and Martin Luther King. He then proceeds to move forward in history with a recapitulation of the corruption of government in the United States and the fragile condition of many nations throughout the world. He brings his picture to a close by once again addressing the question of leadership.

The leaders who remain, the successors and the survivors--the struggling corporate chieftains, the university presidents, the city managers and mayors, the state governors--all are now seen as an 'endangered species' because of the whirl of events and circumstances beyond rational control. (p. 5)

Giroux (1991) sees this problem as a "crisis of authority" and narrows the perspective to that of public education. He believes one of the foremost

problems in American society is the “refusal of the American government over the last thirteen years to address the most basic issues of meaning and purpose which link public education to the development of critical citizens capable of exercising the capacities, knowledge, and skills necessary to become human agents in a democratic society” (p. ix).

Maxcy (1991) extends Giroux’s argument and calls it a “crisis facing American public education” (p. 1). He contends that there is “a lack of effective leaders who will redirect teachers and children back toward the basics, the essentials and foundations of American life” (p. 5). Maxcy lists current social conditions which have led to this crisis. Among them he includes splintering of interests with no consensus. “This modern collapse in leadership, coupled with a fracturing pluralism of followers, has parents, teachers, and administrators in a quandary” (p. 1). Gardner (1990) addresses Maxcy’s question from a broader perspective and one that brings this search for the need of a definition of leadership full circle. Gardner suggests that this urgent cry for leadership may simply be the way in which a culture or society expresses its anxiety, an anxiety derived from the conditions explained by Bennis, Giroux, and Maxcy.

It would strike most of our contemporaries as old-fashioned to cry out, ‘What shall we do to be saved?’ And it would be time-consuming to express fully our concerns about the social disintegration, the moral disorientation, and the spinning compass needle of our time. So we cry out for leadership. (p. xi)

It is this perceived crisis in leadership that underlies and seemingly drives the current study of leadership theory. It is a tone that permeates the literature and must be understood by the reader as various definitions of leadership are explored and presented.

The History of Leadership Theory

In keeping with Green's notion of changing definitions of leadership throughout different eras, it is helpful to glance at the past and observe what ideas about leadership preceded this time of so called crisis or urgency. When reflecting on leadership in the past, current authors refer to a time of romanticism (Cooper, Kempner, & Amey, 1993; Tierney, 1993). Simply put, romanticism in leadership theory refers to the time prior to World War II (with some carry over to the recent past) when the leader of an educational institution was regarded as an idealistic role model or hero. This was a very individualistic notion and one in which the ultimate authority and responsibility (power) were given to one person. College presidents were seen as visionaries and gatekeepers of social responsibility. This concept has been termed the "great man" theory.

We once held a heroic ideal that assumed certain individuals were capable of single-handedly creating change. Such an idea was born of romanticism in which leadership was defined in terms of 'great men' who had divine capabilities, and life was ruled by mysterious or naturalistic forces. We conceived of power in individualistic terms and believed that the human will was free-floating and capable of producing changes it desired. Individual identity was also fixed, coherent, and determined. Institutions such as church and state established categories within which individuals fit. (Tierney, 1993, p. 11)

During this period in time, leaders in the United States tended to be of the same gender and race and as the above quote would indicate, they were expected to have "powers" nothing short of divine inspiration. In the history of higher education, institutions were often mirror images of the moral philosophy and intellectual priorities of the college president. Within this context, particular situations or circumstances were not particularly relevant

to a discussion or notion of leadership. The individual brought a particular set of characteristics to the environment and the environment was expected to adapt to the needs, philosophy, and direction of the leader.

Some believe that the romantic notion of a heroic leader was supplanted by the modern era and the modern obsession with empirical research. This shift is most apparent in the pursuit of the scientific. Within that pursuit lies the rejection of the religious or the naturalistic, which was so closely associated with the romantic movement. "Instead, the scientific study of human progress sought to understand by rational analysis 'man's' motivations and inner drives" (Tierney, 1993, p. 12). This can most easily be seen in the history of leadership theory in the development of books which contained lists of traits associated with effective leaders and educational administrators. The application of scientific inquiry and theory led the research down a path of categorization and quantification in an effort to analyze what worked and what did not work. The result was the production of "how to" books on leadership and administration. Tierney suggests that the fields of psychiatry and scientific measurement are indicative of the rejection of belief in favor of measurement, and it may also be suggested that the emergence of quantification of leadership traits and behaviors was a rejection of the "great man" theory. It may also have been a step toward the belief that a greater number of individuals were capable of leading if they possessed the appropriate traits and skills naturally, or acquired them through practice.

Much of this change toward measurement, categorization, and quantification was also reflected in the actual practice of educational leaders, in particular, university presidents. This was evidenced in the

changing roles of the presidents following World War II as a result of the differing societal demands placed on the individuals in the positions at that time. These leaders were forced to deal with issues of policy and procedure. They became fundraisers and spokespersons for their institutions and their administrative abilities were focused on managing and administrative team building (Kelly, 1991, pp. 30-32). These roles were a reflection of the modernistic quest for scientific truth and rational analysis (Cooper et al., 1993, p. 1).

Giroux (1992) suggested in the past that this process was only natural, as modernism “becomes synonymous with civilization itself” (p. 44) and it stands to reason that as we progressed through the past century that we would inherently be affected as well. Aronowitz (1988) extends this to the notion of control and power which may be seen within an organization operating from the vantage point of modernistic leadership. “From its very inception, science is thus an enterprise with an interest, and that interest is the prediction and control of what is considered to be ‘external’ nature” (p. 527). Embedded within this theoretical framework was the organizational perspective of “us versus them,” lines being drawn in the sand, specific attention to differences rather than acceptance of the “other,” limitation of voice as opposed to multivocality, and the emergence of the bureaucracy.

These are the foundations upon which leadership theory was built. One may believe that theory is never static and that the field may have progressed beyond the modern era. However, then one must answer the question: to what have we progressed? Which is a subject for another debate. What is important to note is that leadership theory has a history and that some scholars now divide it into the romantic and modern periods of

theory development. In order to understand the phenomenon of interim leadership, it is first necessary to realize that divergence of opinion exists with respect to the concept of leadership itself and the history behind the evolution of that debate is critical to understanding the current definitions.

The Impact of the Great Man Theory on Current Leadership Theory

The romantic period and the modern era have both contributed in their own way to the evolution of leadership theory. Specifically, the great man theory of the romantic period, while now commonly rejected as an adequate explanation of leadership, continues to linger in the language of the leadership debate. Cross and Ravekes (1990) assert that this “hero” mentality has specifically carried over into the literature and debate surrounding community college leadership. They suggest that the literature is generally written by males and that the oral discussions,

are replete with the kind of terminology and examples that speak more to the male perspective than the female--that is sports analogies (how much have we heard about team building?), comparisons to war or other competitions, and similar authoritarian and directive metaphors. (p. 7)

Cross and Ravekes continue the argument by adding that this type of dialogue eliminates the female voice from the leadership discussion. This language and these arguments “presuppose the equation of leadership with positions of power, authority, or hierarchy” (p. 7). The authors assert that women may be more prone to a ‘connected leadership’ style and this traditional leadership language eliminates their voice from the scholarship.

Amey and Twombly (1992) conducted further research into this matter through the use of critical theory and discourse analysis as they reviewed

the use of language in the literature on community colleges. Their review discovered that there were definitely “vivid descriptors and images that have been used over time” (p. 127) and that “although critical, conceptual, or theoretical discussions of institutional leadership may be rare, the scholarship is so replete with heroic images of leaders, triumphantly constructing this unique sector of higher education, that the literature on four year college leaders seems pale by comparison” (p. 127). Amey and Twombly assert that this scenario is not only “a reflection of inequality” (p. 129), but leads to the construction of social reality by the dominant class. Therefore, white, middle, or upper-class men are able to censor, exclude, block, or repress more diverse populations from engaging in the leadership discussion and ascending to leadership positions at the community college level. This notion of heroic images, hierarchy, and the “great man” theory is repeated throughout the literature (Bavelas, 1984; Blackmore, 1989; Maxcy, 1991; Smyth, 1989; Tierney, 1993; Watkins, 1989) and provides the reader with a historical context by which to evaluate current discourse on the topic of leadership. More importantly, one must note that the field is no longer closed to more diverse populations and that if other voices are to be heard, then the language that is utilized in the literature will have to change.

Business Principles in Educational Leadership

In searching for a current definition of leadership, one realizes that the heroic tradition continues to influence some of the language utilized by today's scholars, including leadership definitions. The greatest example of this may be the many references in the leadership literature to the world of business. The literature is replete with terminology and examples from the

corporate structure. One asks, is leadership synonymous with management? Phrased another way, is a leader the same thing as a manager? Rost (1991) argues that the perspective of leader equals manager is the result of the infusion of values from the industrial paradigm, dating back to the 1930's. He contends that,

...confusing leadership and management and treating the words as if they were synonymous have a long and illustrious history in leadership studies. The practice is pervasive in the mainstream literature of leadership. It is pervasive in all academic disciplines where one can find the literature on leadership...Many scholars and practitioners went even further and equated leadership with management. (p. 129)

However, Rost and other scholars in organizational theory do not agree with the assumption that leadership and management are one and the same. Zaleznik and Burns were two of the first scholars to challenge the manager as leader philosophy (Burke, 1988, p. 44). Kouzes and Posner challenge this line of thinking in their text entitled, The Leadership Challenge. While they write for an audience primarily in the world of business, they make a clear distinction between leaders and managers, leadership and management. Kouzes and Posner (1987) assert that both managers and non-managers can lead and that both have potential to "lead others to get extraordinary things done" (p. xviii). Not only do they believe that managers are not leaders by definition, but that "leadership begins where management ends, where the systems of rewards and punishments, control and scrutiny, give way to innovation, individual character, and the courage of convictions" (p. xvii).

When attempting to apply leadership theory to educational institutions this paradox between divergent theories in the literature can become even

more confusing. Codd (1989) asserts that the “pervasiveness of the ideological forces involved” has led educational administration away from recognizing and promoting “the distinctly educational features” of their organizations and administrative theory has “become separated from educational theory with the effect of distorting and narrowing the way educational administrators interpret their roles” (p. 158). He further contends that the industrial management model views teachers as “workers rather than professionals” and fails to recognize their “commitment to the values and principles which define the field of educational practice” (p. 159). As one looks at an educational institution and the role of the teachers/faculty, one must deal with the issue of professionalism. If the faculty are viewed as professionals, then much of the decision-making would come from within their own ranks. Conversely, if stripped of that professionalism, then administrators might easily assume the role of autocratic decision-makers. This paradox complicates the application of business principles to educational settings. Burke (1988) purports that the true leader in any organization has the ability to “empower” others. He believes that this is the true distinction between managers/administrators and leaders, “my central thesis is that one’s effectiveness in empowering others depends on whether one is a manager or a leader. The two processes differ significantly” (p. 44). He then points to work done by Wortman (1982) that suggests leaders should “think and act strategically (that is, long range), whereas managers must be more concerned with daily operations” (p. 44).

While there are scholars who disagree that management is by definition synonymous with leadership, there are others who see the

application of management theory to educational institutions as one of the reasons for crisis in education. Bogue (1985) suggests that “among education administrators today there are too few philosophers and too many managerial mechanics - enamored of technique, hurried and harried, seldom asking questions of purpose and meaning” (p. 2). He adds that faculty should be concerned with the “transfer of management concepts from private-sector settings to education institutions” and with those in powerful positions that use only “common sense” as a guide (p. 2). Giroux (1991) speaks about the same issues, only with a slightly stronger tone when he addresses the trend to transfer leadership from corporate America to America’s educational institutions.

This view of educational leadership is quite paradoxical. Not only does this approach to educational reform ignore the discourses of community, solidarity and the public good, it also draws upon a sector of society that has given the American public the savings and loan scandals, the age of corporate buyouts, and the proliferation of “junk” bonds, and has made leadership synonymous with greed and avarice. To be sure, it is precisely the business community that prides itself on abstracting leadership from ethical responsibility, subordinating basic human needs to the rules of the marketplace, and legitimizing commodification as the highest virtue of American society. (p. xi)

Smyth’s (1989) view is similar to Giroux’s, saying that to transfer meaning from the management sciences into the schools is essentially anti-educational, because one group of individuals wielding “hegemony and domination” over another group runs perpendicular to the basic definitions of education (p. 170). Maxcy (1991) may add the most clarity to this argument against “management” in education. He discusses leadership within the context of individualism, community, authority, power and control,

all issues that need to be addressed in any study of leadership. He contends that educational institutions have so much bought into management theory that “gone is the interest in improving the quality of educational life for its citizens-to-be, and in its place we find management” (p. 2). He further concludes that even though multiple studies have now been conducted on leadership “there is still an enormous conceptual confusion regarding the meanings and bearings of the term” (p. 7). He sees this confusion primarily centered around the debate between leadership as bureaucratic management and leadership as democratic and participatory direction, or stated another way, issues of authority. It is precisely these issues of authority, community, power, and control that need to be investigated as this review pursues a definition of leadership.

Current Definitions of Leadership

As one reads across the literature on leadership, there appear to be as many definitions as there are authors. In this section, some of the more popular themes that recur throughout the literature will be presented. For example, some scholars in the field would define leadership as the power to persuade (Bensimon et al., 1991; Gardner, 1990; Holloman, 1984), while others may see it as more of an ongoing process without any real intent to persuade anyone to a specific end (Bavelas, 1984; Smyth, 1989; Trow, 1991). Some might proclaim that styles of leadership depend upon the circumstances of a given situation (Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum, 1991; Bolman and Deal, 1991) and those who adhere to this belief might, at times, run counter to those who believe that there are some definite traits and tasks (Bennis, 1986; Cronin, 1989; Gardner, 1989) that can be attributed

to successful leaders.

Leadership as Contingency Theory

Some scholars advocate the use of contingency theory when studying leaders. This may also be referred to as situational leadership. These individuals believe that one cannot establish lists of tasks or traits that fit all leaders in all situations. Instead, they believe that each situation demands a certain kind of leadership. Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1991) maintain that, "from this perspective, effective leadership requires adapting one's style of leadership to situational factors" (p. 395). While Bensimon et al., present contingency theory in their writing, they also contend that "little systematic application of contingency theory has occurred to determine under what conditions alternative forms of leadership should be displayed" (p. 395). Bolman and Deal (1991) support the view that "almost everyone believes that widely varying circumstances require different forms of leadership" (p. 413), but also support the suggestion of Bensimon et al., that not enough research has been done in this area to support any major assertions. Zaleznik (1989) contends that the amount of research is not so much the issue as is the fact that contingency theory or situational leadership "ignores the significance of personality characteristics which determine how an individual will respond" (p. 108). Zaleznik believes that individual leaders naturally "resort" to "habitual modes" of dealing with conflict consistent with their individual personalities and that this is contradictory to any type of theory that tries to establish particular behaviors that would be applicable to all individuals based upon given situations.

In response to Zaleznik (1989), this researcher would suggest that

resorting to habitual modes is simply another form of situational adaptation. Those individuals who are more prone to utilize a certain form of leadership will do so naturally in specific situations, unless they make a cogent effort to adhere to another form of leadership that does not come naturally, but one that they believe is best suited to the situation. Admittedly, if a leader is not familiar with various leadership theories, he or she will adapt to the situation based upon natural affinity for one form or another. This researcher purports that leaders themselves emerge situationally and agrees with Holloman (1984) who said that title and position alone do not make one a leader (p. 109). The author also contends that leaders emerge based upon the following variables: personal characteristics, possible situations, and timing. In other words, if all forces align themselves correctly so that a particular individual with just the right combination of needed characteristics, is present in just the right situation that begs for his or her abilities, at just the right moment in time, then a leader emerges. This researcher maintains that situational leadership is not only the process of leadership, but contingency variables determine when leadership emerges as well. Finally, in studying leadership of any kind this researcher not only believes that contingency theory best defines leadership, but that its value lies in the practicality of acknowledging the potential worth of other existing theories. With this premise in mind, this paper will now review other existing theories, all of which contain some element of truth and may be relevant to some degree within the context of specific leadership situations, namely interim leadership.

Leadership as Persuasion

Gardner is one who believes that leadership is essentially the power to persuade others to one's own line of thinking or toward a specific goal. In his book entitled, On Leadership (1990), he asserts that "leadership is the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers" (p. 1). Holloman (1984) concurs to some degree with this definition, but substitutes the word influence for the word persuasion and suggests that the true leader only emerges when the leader is "voluntarily accepted by members of the group" (p. 111). Once accepted, Holloman then sees the "leader as the group member who is able to influence his followers to willingly cooperate in certain ways in working toward group goals" (p. 111). By defining leadership in this way, Holloman is careful to point out that there is a distinct difference between what he calls "headship" and leadership. The distinction is reminiscent of the earlier debate about management and leadership, in that Holloman purports "mere occupancy of an office or position from which leadership behavior is expected does not automatically make the occupant a true leader" (p. 109). Kouzes and Posner (1987) choose the word "inspire" instead of persuade or influence and align themselves with Holloman by speaking of this inspiration leading toward a "shared vision" (p. 9). However, Bensimon et al., (1991), speak of influence as if it were a specific leadership category, thereby suggesting that influencing others is only part of the overall definition. They separate what they call power and influence theories such as social power, transformational leadership, social exchange and transactional leadership theories from trait theory, behavioral theory, contingency theory, cultural,

symbolic and cognitive theories (p. 389-397). Badaracco and Ellsworth (1989) suggested that it is not quite so important what “style” a leader selects or employs as it is that the leader remain consistent in the manner in which he or she leads. They speak of leadership integrity and contend that a leader’s values must be imparted to the group so as to allow the group to develop a firm understanding of what is expected of them (p. 199-209).

Leadership as Traits

Other researchers reinforce the idea of an individual possessing certain qualities or traits that allow them to attract followers and/or persuade them to pursue a common goal. For example, Cronin (1989) provides the reader with a list of fourteen qualities that he believes are “central to leadership,” beginning with self-knowledge/self-confidence, moving through other such qualities as worldmindedness and stamina, and finishing with a sense of humor (pp. 54-55). This type of laundry list is not unusual in the leadership literature. Bennis (1986) conducted a study of what he believed to be 90 successful leaders, many of which were corporate leaders involved with Fortune 500 companies. His observation of these leaders eventually led him to conclude that there were four traits common to each of his “leaders”: the management of attention, the management of meaning, the management of trust, and the management of self. By these terms he meant that first, people were drawn to these individuals and their ideas. Second, they communicated their visions to others. Third, they were able to develop trust among their followers which Bennis further defined as reliability and constancy. Fourth, they knew their own abilities and used them in an effective manner (pp. 79-89).

Not all leadership scholars recognize these qualities as traits, but rather as tasks that are performed, or should be performed, if one is to be an effective leader. Gardner (1989) puts a slightly different spin on the concept of leadership traits by suggesting that there are seven tasks, rather than traits, that an effective leader should perform. He lists those tasks as “envisioning goals, affirming values, motivating, managing, achieving a workable level of unity, explaining, serving as a symbol, representing the group externally, and renewing” (p. 24). Gardner does not suggest that this list is an end unto itself. He invites others to add to this list as they see fit, but he personally sees these as the “most significant functions of leadership” (p. 24).

It should be noted that some feminist scholars object to trait theory because it has primarily been built upon the experiences of male leaders (Schein, 1989, p. 154-155). They see these “traits” as an extension of the great man theory and the heroic ideal. These theories also imply that if a particular individual will clone the traits of a specific successful leader in the past (usually male), then that individual leader will in all likelihood become a successful leader as well. This, by definition, eliminates the female voice and/or voice of other minorities from the leadership equation. Schein suggests that it may be more appropriate, fair and effective to consider traits that represent the reality of both men and women in the form of an “androgynous” leader. Such a leader would blend the “characteristics of dominance, assertiveness, and competitiveness with those of concern, relationships, cooperativeness, and humanitarian values,” but she cautions that this is still a “narrow and simplistic approach to what is a broad and complex set of issues and activities” (p. 154-155).

Leadership as Process

Rather than just focusing on the traits of an individual leader, or even the situation within which a leader exists, Smyth (1989) makes an argument for viewing leadership as a process. In his edited text, Critical Perspectives on Educational Leadership, Smyth makes a call for writers who will shift their focus “from sterile discussions about traits, personalities and styles of educational leadership” (p. 5) toward the structures and processes within the organizations. Smyth contends that if the focus will shift to unmasking the structures and processes that ultimately “stifle” educational relationships, then leadership research may serve to empower the organizational participants (p. 5). Bavelas (1984) made a call for broadening the perspective of the research many years ago, but argued that there was room for viewing leadership from the organizational as well as the personal perspective. He believed that there was “a useful distinction to be made between the idea of ‘leadership as a personal quality’ and the idea of ‘leadership as an organizational function’” (p. 117). He also suggested that the important variable in discussing leadership was to be aware of the perspective from which one was addressing an organizational issue and under which conditions one should consider both perspectives. He purported that knowledge of these variables would allow one to understand any given leadership situation. As leadership applies to higher education, Trow (1991) extends the concept of blending personal qualities and organizational functioning by defining leadership in higher education as “the taking of effective action to shape the character and direction of a college or university, presumably for the better” (p. 355). Not only does Trow define leadership as a process, but he sees it as an active process, or in other

words, as action.

Leadership as Relationships

In thinking of the ways in which organizations work and the processes that could be defined as leadership, one readily recognizes the importance of human interaction, or in Kouzes and Posner's (1987) words: "leadership is a relationship between leader and followers" (p. 1). While multiple definitions of leadership exist, many of them refer to the existence of relationships and specify the role of followers as an important variable in the leadership equation. Bolman and Deal (1991) concur with this line of thinking as they discuss leadership. They emphatically state that leadership is not "a thing," but rather, "exists only in relationships and only in the imagination and perception of the parties to a relationship" (p. 404). Bolman and Deal continue that within these relationships there exist "three or four" basic answers to the question of "what is leadership?" (pp. 404-405). They submit that most managers, when asked this question, will respond with "it is the ability to get others to do what you want....leaders motivate people to get things done....leaders provide a vision....leadership is *really* facilitation" (p. 405).

Cronin (1987) suggests that there is a great irony in the fascination that Americans have with the issue of leadership. He contends that "we have an almost love-hate ambivalence about power wielders" (p. 45). Americans "yearn" for leaders and leadership while at the same time detest anyone who "tries to boss us around." If one agrees with Cronin, it would be easy to see just how complicated this concept of the leader-follower relationship could become. Gardner (1990) and Kelley (1989) both raise the

point that most leaders, at one time or another, have also been followers, and at times, may very well play both roles at once. In other words, an individual may be a leader in one group or setting while, at the same time, be a follower in another group or setting. Gardner suggests that this relationship between leader and follower may vary from one culture to another, and may depend upon whether “an organization or group is in a time of quiescence or crisis, in prosperity or recession, on a steep growth curve or stagnating” (p. 23). He further suggests that “leaders are almost never as much in charge as they are pictured to be, followers almost never as submissive as one might imagine” (p. 23).

Kelley (1989) asserts that a leader does not exist without actual followers. Holloman (1984) and Gardner (1990) show support for this assertion as they both speak of followers conferring power upon the leader. Gardner specifically uses the term “confer” and says that he believes “good constituents tend to produce good leaders” and that “executives are given subordinates; they have to earn followers” (p. 24). As Holloman stated earlier, “mere occupancy of an office or position from which leadership behavior is expected does not automatically make the occupant a true leader. Such appointments can result in headship but not necessarily in leadership” (p. 109). Gardner spoke of earning leadership, Holloman states that “without followship, there can be no true leadership” (p. 112). So, he argues, that followers are “in a sense...also leaders - they lead their leaders, select their leaders, and sometimes reject their leaders because they do not meet expectations” (p. 112). In keeping with this pattern of thinking, Burke (1988) submits that “leadership, after all, is a reciprocal process. By definition, no followers, no leader. The followers’ power is manifested when

the leader does not respond to their desires" (p. 21). In his article on leadership and empowerment Burke discusses, at length, this relationship between leader and follower. He also addresses differences between leaders and managers and, more specifically, the differences between followers and subordinates. In one paragraph, Burke seems to capture the essence of this concept best.

Perhaps the greatest difference between leaders and managers regarding empowerment is the type of follower and subordinate need to which each appeals. Leaders appeal to a dependency need. Managers appeal to an independency need. Followers need to have direction. Subordinates need *not* be cast in the role of subordinate for every aspect of their work. Yet followers and subordinates are usually the same individuals. The point is that successful leaders appeal to one need that most people have, and successful managers appeal to quite another need that these same people have. (p. 21)

Of significance is the fact that Burke, while noting a difference between followers and subordinates, suggests that they usually are the same people. The key to understanding this concept is to acknowledge that subordinates do not have to be subordinates in every setting and in every task that they perform.

Kelley (1989) argues that organizations and organizational theorists place too much emphasis on leaders and don't focus enough on "trying to cultivate leadership in the employees we already have" (p. 124). He has no argument with the enthusiasm that people and organizations show for leadership and for seeking out leaders, "but in searching so zealously for better leaders we tend to lose sight of the people these leaders will lead" (p. 124). Burke (1988) applies this analogy back to organizations and concludes that organizations do succeed, in part, because of effective

leadership, but effective followership is just as important. In keeping with leadership theory tradition and the urge that leadership theorists seem to have for making lists of leadership traits, Burke sets forth a short list of qualities of followers. In that list, Burke suggests that effective followers “manage themselves well...are committed to the organization and to a purpose, principle, or person outside themselves...build their competence and focus their efforts for maximum impact...are courageous, honest, and credible” (p. 127). Phillips and Kennedy (1986) approach this issue from the perspective of the leader and purport that leaders should place great emphasis on establishing shared values among themselves and their followers.

In the organizations that Phillips and Kennedy (1986) studied, “shared values” defined “the fundamental character of their organization” (p. 199). These same shared values also gave the organizations the “attitude” that made them distinguishable from all other organizations. This attitude which originated from the shared values provided meaning for employees that allowed them to see their work as something apart from just “earning a living.” Even more importantly, Phillips and Kennedy assert that “the values really guide behavior” (p. 199). They see this being enacted in several ways. For example, managers may refer to the values when trying to provide guidance for subordinates; through company folklore, new employees may be told stories “that underline the importance of these values to the company” (p. 199). In each of these methods, Phillips and Kennedy believe that followers and leaders can come together as well as provide meaning to their work. Shared values may inherently lead to shared work and common goals as individuals “interpret these values in the context

of their own jobs” (p. 199).

Types of Leadership

In both scholarly and popular literature, it has been common practice to discuss leadership in terms of generalities, or what may be referred to as the “big L” of leadership. This is often done by studying or referring to political or military leaders of the past in an effort to make a point about leadership and what defines it. One looks for examples of exemplary leadership, and also attempts to categorize such exemplary behavior. This approach may be useful when studying religious or social movements, but is less meaningful when studying leadership in formal organizations, including institutions of higher education. The research in this paper is informed by larger, societal leadership studies. However, it is not a study of generalities, or the “Big L” of leadership. In an attempt to elude speaking in generalities, some theorists who study leadership in institutions of higher education have found it helpful to define leadership within organizations according to types of behavior or action.

Transactional and Transformational Leadership

Burns (1978) may have been one of the first to identify types of leadership that exist within organizations such as universities in a way that could then be coherently discussed and debated within the field of higher education. He developed the concept of transactional and transformational leadership which Cronin (1988) refers to as “two overriding kinds of social and political leadership” (p. 53). Cronin defines transactional leadership as “an exchange, usually for self-interest and with short-term interests in mind.

It is, in essence, a bargain situation" (p. 53). This type of leader is what Cronin calls a pragmatic officeholder and is reminiscent of the managerial types that Rost (1991) discusses earlier in this paper. The transformational leader, on the other hand, "so engages with followers as to bring them to a heightened political and social consciousness and activity, and in the process converts many of those followers into leaders in their own right" (Cronin, 1988, p. 53). Cronin adds that this type of leader often serves as a teacher, mentor, or educator for his or her followers who helps to identify dreams and possibilities within each individual and brings them to the surface in an effort to invigorate or transform the workplace or organization.

Bensimon (1989) contends that transactional leadership is a two-way relationship with give and take from both sides, while transformational leadership is more of a one-way process in which "leaders initiate relationships which raise followers to new levels of morality and motivation." She further suggests that recent research calls for a reconceptualization of transformational leadership. In the past it was believed that this type of leadership would replace goals and values with new ones that would drastically change the organization. Bensimon argues that research now shows that this type of leadership "reconfigures rather than replaces existing goals and values, and thus shifts in direction are more moderate." Based upon this evidence, she suggests that a more appropriate name may be "trans-vigorative" leadership as "it is primarily focused on invigorating, rather than transforming, organizations." However, she still maintains that "leaders can generally be characterized as being either transactional or transformational," but adds "trans-vigorative leaders combine characteristics of both types."

Charismatic Leadership

A discussion of transformational leadership leads to a discussion of individual and collective dreams, values and hopes. These qualities are all very personal in nature, something Bogue (1985) refers to as the “spiritual character of leadership” (p. 3), and easily connect with the notion of charismatic leadership. In general, this may be the type of leader that comes to mind when introduced to the topic of leadership. Most great leaders who have transcended the pages of history have done so with a certain degree of charisma, but once again that is leadership with a “big L.” Zaleznik (1989) contrasts the charismatic leader with one who leads through consensus, thereby presenting the reader with two additional types of leadership. He presents the charismatic leader as one who attracts others through a combination of unusual qualities that may result in special attachments. Zaleznik suggests that when Max Weber first applied the concept of charisma to leadership he did so by presenting “charisma in the religious sense as a spiritual quality” (p. 96), or an inner light which might cause something like a conversion experience in followers. Rosenbach and Hayman (1989) extend this concept further by suggesting that some leaders have such an attraction that they can lead without actually being present. This absentee leadership is represented by individuals such as Mahatma Gandhi and Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini (pp. 210-211).

Consensus Leadership

Zaleznik (1989) presents a picture of the consensus leader as an “antihero” or the “common man” who “does have the distinction of being able to survive the rigors of institutional politics” (p. 95). Zaleznik sees the

consensus leader as a part of “industrialization and the development of bureaucracy” (p. 95) and “rejects the paternal image and charisma” (p. 101). He further suggests that this type of leadership is particularly close to the American personality as Americans “seem to have a basic distrust of charismatic leaders” (p. 101). Within this American personality Zaleznik sees a legacy of questioning authority, a situation wherein an individual must earn rank, and status is gained by “achievement rather than ascription” which is based on “a peer group culture built on the dual images of pragmatism and egalitarianism” (p. 101). The consensus leader represents the amalgamation of all these tendencies as one who can bring together the issues and gain support through a majority opinion.

Symbolic, Political, Managerial, Academic Leadership

Trow (1991) and Badaracco and Ellsworth (1989) use the organizational frame in categorizing types of leadership. Trow distinguishes between four types of leadership and is explicit about their differences. He sees symbolic leadership as “the ability to express, to project, indeed to seem to embody, the character of the institution, its central goals and values, in a powerful way” (Trow, 1991, p. 355). He defines political leadership as “an ability to resolve the conflicting demands and pressures of many constituencies, internal and external, and in gaining their support for the institution’s goals and purposes, as they are defined” (p. 355). Managerial leadership “is the familiar capacity to direct and coordinate the various support activities of the institution” (p. 355) and one part of academic leadership is “the ability to recognize excellence in teaching, learning, and research” (p. 355).

Badarraco and Ellsworth support Trow's notion of political leadership and suggest that one who practices this form of leadership believes that "man is motivated by self-interest and by a search for power, wealth, and coherence in the face of self-interested behavior by others" (Badaracco and Ellsworth, 1989, p. 95). However, they deviate from Trow's descriptors at this point and submit that two other forms of leadership exist in addition to political. They contend that "directive leadership" is closely aligned with political leadership, as, it does not reject the notion of self-interest, but "directive leadership believes that man is also a competitive creature driven to achieve. People want the satisfaction of knowing they have won through their own efforts" (p. 95). Finally, Badarraco and Ellsworth assert that a higher level of leadership exists than the political and directive forms. They maintain that "the values-driven leader takes the directive leader's view one step further and believes that people need to find meaning in life through their work" (p. 95).

Magic Leadership

While some theorists continue to search for new forms or types of leadership, others hold the line and insist on revisiting familiar concepts of organizational culture. Nadler and Tushman (1989) speak of something that they call "magic leadership" (p. 135). In actuality, they are speaking of heroes, a familiar theme in leadership literature of the past. They see these individuals as those who are capable of "revitalizing organizations," yet add a new twist by suggesting that "unless the magic leader has developed complementary leadership in the ranks below, his efforts to create change may badly disrupt the organization - or even wreck it" (p. 135). This concept

of revitalization through “magic leadership” closely aligns itself with what Bolman and Deal (1991) call change agents (p. 370), or individuals who assume leadership roles within organizations for the sole purpose of creating change and not necessarily with any respect for long-range outcomes. Nadler and Tushman (1989) provide additional insight suggesting that the successful “magic leader” usually “bends” the frames of the organization as opposed to “breaking” them, hence the title “framebender” (p. 136).

Post-Managerial Leadership

Green (1988) submits that leadership of the future should be referred to as “post-managerial” leadership. She agrees with Bolman and Deal (1991), and Trow (1991), that “symbolism is without a doubt an eternal aspect of leadership” (p. 38) and therefore sees the symbolic leader as a type that will obviously continue into the future. She also recognizes that the coalition builder, or political leader, is a form that will not soon go away. However, she then adds the concepts of a team builder, knowledge executive, and future agent to her list of types of leadership that will be needed as time continues. She sees the team leader as someone who is able to “minimize the separate agendas of the various parts of the institution and create a common one” (p. 42). The knowledge executives would be “generalists, characterized by their breadth, by their ability to see connections, and by their ability to extract and integrate relevant bits of information” (p. 43). According to Green, the future agent would bring it all together. He or she would be a knowledge executive as well as a coalition builder who “looks outward, foresees trends, anticipates issues, and when

possible acts rather than reacts” (pp. 46-47). Essentially, Green proposes several new concepts, but in her argument that some circumstances warrant traditional types of leadership while others beg for newer forms, she makes a case for allowing all forms to exist together. It may also be that no one leader adheres to any one type of leadership at all times. It stands to reason that complex organizations such as institutions of higher education would demand various types of leadership out of many different leaders simultaneously as well as at different points in time.

Summary of Definitions and Types

It was stated in the opening paragraph to this document that very little research has been conducted on the topic of interim leadership. The goal of the first section of this chapter was to review the literature of leadership theory. This was done in an effort to define leadership with the hope of uncovering and presenting variables in the leadership equation that would then be recognizable within the phenomenon of interim leadership as it is studied in the professional life of Del Shankel. The approach taken was to present a brief history of leadership theory itself and in so doing introduce the reader to the origins of the debate surrounding the topic of leadership. The review of literature then progressed through actual definitions of leadership based upon the premise that each has some value and might be applicable in varying circumstances. This, in essence, is contingency theory or situational leadership and it is the belief of this researcher that this approach best defines and delimits leadership.

From Theory to Reality

Can the theory presented to this point be practically applied to higher education? Green (1992) raised this very question as she wrote a short article about her experiences as the interim president at Mount Vernon College during the 1990-1991 school year. Going into the position, Green had been a leadership theorist with the American Council on Education (ACE) and saw this as an opportunity to test theory. In her article she presented three significant findings. First, she challenged the theory that "management and leadership are quite different" and concluded that "more often than not, leadership was demonstrated through an accumulation of small acts, many of them management decisions" (p. A18). Second, she questioned the idea that "leadership is largely symbolic, and a president is the living symbol of an institution" (p. A18). She found that as much as she tried to separate herself as a human being from the position, "no one else saw that important difference. To everyone else, I was a living, breathing symbol; the recipient of everyone's projected hopes and frustrations" (p. A18). Third, she tested the theory that "institutional change requires vigorous leadership from the top" and determined "that leaders *do* make a difference, although probably less of one than some scholars might think" (p. A18). While these observations may be interesting, the important factor to remember is that there very well can be differences between leadership theory and reality. In another article, Green (1988) takes the position that time may enter this equation as a variable, "for effective leadership in one era may be entirely inappropriate or ineffective in another" (p. 30) and in reflecting on the relevance of leadership theory, offers her own definition. "Leadership is a combination of individual traits, learned behaviors and

skills, and historical circumstances, which coexist and change in highly complex and still dimly understood ways” (p. 47).

Richard Bates would agree with Green’s use of the modifier “dimly” when describing what theorists actually know about leadership and asserts that “the first error is to believe that the processes of abstraction and reification constitute an appropriate path toward powerful theory” (p. 131). As reification is part of the process employed by positivistic science, Bates uses boiling water as an example to compare with leadership. He argues that “all other things being equal, water will always boil at the same temperature....Treating leadership as if it were a notion similar in kind to that of temperature has some rather bizarre consequences” (p. 132). Bates then furthers this analogy by suggesting that if this comparison were to be extended and one selected “key variables” to leadership and measured them out accordingly, that one could “reproduce particular conditions at will, transforming incompetent into competent leadership wherever and whenever we so desired” (p. 133).

While this may appear to be a rather injurious criticism of leadership theory, Bates (1989) continues with what he sees to be the most significant mistake made in leadership theory as it is studied in the “science of administration.” He contends that administrative science has ignored the issue of power and its role in relationships within educational institutions (p. 135). Because of this, Bates argues that the old notions of leadership in administrative science need to be revised. He sees these old notions as being represented by the leader “who discovers and applies the laws of organizational control” and the “great man of iron will who imposes his moral vision upon his followers by force of presence” (p. 154) as being an

outdated concept. What Bates recommends, is that theorists begin to think of leaders differently,

...as located in space and time within particular discourses of power and knowledge, within particular definitions of agency and structure, and within particular discourses which address issues involved in the rationalization of culture and ethics on the one hand and power and organization on the other, a[s] well as within the dialectic between them. (p. 154)

He suggests that once theorists begin to frame their view of leadership from this perspective, they will begin to see that power does not reside in people, or in positions, but rather in relationships. Looking at leadership and power from this vantage point would then allow theorists to “study the constitution and reconstitution of ‘networks’ of leadership, and to produce a ‘geopolitics’ of leadership which took into account the specific nature of the spatial and temporal location of leadership as well as the nature of the discourse by which leadership was defined” (pp. 154-155). Both Green and Bates are asking for leadership scholars to take that next step beyond modernistic positivism and to think in new ways about leadership and organizations. In studying the professional life history of an individual who has actually experienced the role of being an interim leader on multiple occasions, this study is attempting to take a step in this direction.

Frames of Organization - Application to Higher Education

Definitions of leadership have been presented in an effort to search for elements in existing theory that might provide some understanding of interim leadership as well as to establish that a gap exists in the literature with respect to this phenomenon. As is often the case with theories, debate exists as to whether they are truly applicable to real world settings. Green

(1992) suggests that these definitions or theories take on a slightly different meaning when tested in the real world, while Bates (1989) contends that the process of leadership is not quite as scientific as many theorists believe it to be. Meanwhile, Trow (1991) and Bensimon et al., (1991) maintain that leadership in higher education can be studied in such a way that theoretical categorization is possible and Birnbaum (1988) asserts that this attempt to conceptualize and categorize leadership in organizations can be reduced to five basic approaches: trait theories, power and influence theories, behavioral theories, contingency theories, and symbolic and cultural theories (p. 23).

While scholars may argue the validity and wholesale applicability of various leadership theories, it is important to recognize each theory likely has some value and utility in practice. We also know that interim leaders have and do exist, and that very little has been written about their experiences in these roles. In order to study interim leadership, one needs to also understand the original context in which the leadership exists.

Organizationally the university is, in fact, one of the most complex structures in modern society; it is also increasingly archaic. It is complex because its formal structure does not describe either actual power or responsibilities; it is archaic because the functions it must perform are not and cannot be discharged through the formal structure provided in its charter. (Perkins, 1973, p. 3)

Organizational frames are presented below as a context by which one may view an interim leader's experiences at a research university. A review of the literature reveals that there are four organizational frames that can be applied to universities: structural/rational (bureaucratic), political, anarchy, and symbolic. It is essential that any student of institutional governance

realize that each university is unique unto itself and may, or may not, house parts of each frame in any combination, or singularity, thereof. Institutional character and individuality depends upon the frames that are represented at the institution in question and the level of emphasis that is placed on each frame within that particular university.

Structural Frame

The structural frame is based upon the work of industrial psychologists such as Frederick W. Taylor and the German sociologist Max Weber of the early twentieth century when patrimony was the primary means by which any organization operated. Their goal was to construct organizations for maximum efficiency and Weber established six major components of the structural frame, or what he called the bureaucracy. These components included fixed division of labor, hierarchy of offices, rules governing performance, separation of personal from official property and rights, technical qualifications for selecting personnel, and employment as a long-term career (in Bolman and Deal, 1991, p. 47). Commenting on how the structural frame operates in the latter part of the twentieth century, Bolman and Deal add that the structural frame is based upon the premise that organizations exist in order to accomplish goals and do so through a set core of assumptions. Specialization of tasks leads to efficiency and the structure can be adapted to new situations, or in an effort to fix a problem (p. 48). With respect to decision-making processes, Chaffee (1983) maintains that the structural frame, or rational model of decision-making within the structural frame, places value on order and logic as opposed to chaos and intuition (p. 11). She suggests that this is most apparent in the “economic

theory of the firm, in the scientific method, and in such prepackaged management tools as Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems and Management by Objectives” (p. 48). The role of the leader in such a frame would be autocratic in nature delivering mandates in a top-down fashion. According to Bolman and Deal, an effective leader within the structural frame would lead by analysis and design and thereby serve as a social architect. An ineffective leader would manage by detail and fiat and become a “petty tyrant” (p. 423).

Theorists such as Baldrige et al., (1991), and Mintzberg (1991) take the concept of the bureaucracy a step further and differentiate between types of bureaucracies. Baldrige et al., refers to an academic bureaucracy and Mintzberg to a professional bureaucracy. Essentially, both are saying that certain components of the bureaucratic model apply to organizations, but in slightly different ways, or with slightly different emphasis. For instance, Baldrige et al., (1991) contend that goals in traditional bureaucracies are more clear than one would find in an academic bureaucracy. They also connect bureaucracy and the academy by suggesting that,

the hierarchical structure is held together by formal chains of command and systems of communication. The bureaucracy as Weber described it includes such elements as tenure, appointment to office, salaries as a rational form of payment, and competency as the basis of promotion. (p. 35)

Mintzberg (1991) refers to this as a professional bureaucracy as opposed to academic because professionals, or the “operating core,” have a great deal of control and power in the system (p. 58). Leaders in such a system lack power in comparison with the leaders in the more traditional bureaucracy or structural model. Even so, they still maintain indirect power by serving “at

the boundary of the organization, between the professionals inside and interested parties--governments, client associations, and so on--on the outside" (p. 63).

Political Frame

Bensimon (1991) submits that conflict is the essential ingredient in the political frame. This conflict results from different entities with differing values and interests. Leaders of these political institutions often pay particular attention to external groups who, in turn, may have strong influence over policy-making. "This frame sees organizations as formal and informal groups vying for power to control institutional processes and outcomes. Decisions result from bargaining, influencing and coalition building" (p. 422). Chaffee (1983) alleges that some theorists believe that the university "is not like a corporation (the rational model) but is much more like a political entity in its pluralism and in its recognition of the legitimacy of internal conflict" (p. 18). Birnbaum (1988) clarifies the issue of conflict, to some degree, by suggesting that subgroups exert power or influence primarily for allocation of institutional resources such as money, prestige, or influence (p. 134). Bolman and Deal (1991) suggest that a politically effective leader would be an advocate and succeed through coalition building, but would fail if he or she attempted to lead by fraud or manipulation, in which case they would be seen as a con artist or hustler (p. 423).

Organized Anarchy

Due to the complexity and diversity of research universities, some

theorists account for the variance in institutional behavior and activity through the conceptualization of an organized anarchy. These theorists maintain that what truly exists on university campuses is some sort of anarchy that still allows for the decision-making process to be enacted. Chaffee (1983) describes the logic behind this sort of decision-making as a “traffic collision” (p. 25) and that it “takes place through accidents of timing and interest” (p. 24). Cohen and March (1991) assert that the greatest determinant in the university decision-making process is ambiguity (p. 399). They contend that there are four fundamental ambiguities that come into play in any organized anarchy. Leaders within this type of institution must deal with ambiguity of purpose, ambiguity of power, ambiguity of experience, and ambiguity of success (pp. 399-420). Bennis’ (1989) reference to leaders as custodians may be applicable within an organized anarchy (p. 10). By this Bennis implies that with so many external forces bearing down on institutional leaders, at times, the best they can do is simply care for the institution and hope to maintain some semblance of its former self. Bennis’ notion of cameo leadership, “which aspires to carve things well, but smaller” (p. 18) may also describe the role of the leader in this type of organization. He suggests that this type of leadership is “growing in popularity” and that it advocates a “radical decentralization of organizational life” (p. 18).

In trying to make sense of this frame, Cohen and March (1991) have developed the notion of the garbage can decision-making process to explain the complexities of the decision-making process in universities. “In a garbage can situation, a decision is an outcome (or interpretation) of several relatively independent ‘streams’ within an organization” (p. 175). In this theory, the garbage can represents “a choice opportunity” and the streams

are “various problems and solutions: which are then “dumped by participants” (p. 175).

Symbolic Frame

Bensimon (1991) maintains that “organizations are cultural systems of shared meanings and beliefs in which organizational structures and processes are invented” (p. 422). Much of what occurs in the symbolic frame is unconventional in nature and when an event occurs, it is not the event that is important, but rather what it means. A single event can also have multiple meanings for various individuals within the organization and “most significant events and processes in organizations are *ambiguous or uncertain*” (Bolman and Deal, 1991, p. 244). These factors make it difficult for leaders of an organization to apply rational analysis to a problem in an effort to solve it. Under these circumstances, people tend to “create symbols to resolve confusion, increase predictability, and provide direction” (p. 244). Tierney (1991) suggests that symbols exist in organizations even if members are unaware of their existence and that they require an act of interpretation on behalf of the members. This interpretation is key to the success, or failure, of the leader of that organization (pp. 432-433). Bolman and Deal (1991) suggest that an effective leader within the symbolic frame would be a prophet who inspired and framed experiences. His or her antithesis would be a “fanatic” who managed through the use of smoke and mirrors (p. 423).

Culture

The culture of an organization is of utmost importance to leaders of institutions of higher education and may be far more encompassing than any

of the previously mentioned organizational frames. When thinking in terms of interim leaders, one should pay particular attention to organizational culture, for it is the culture of the institution that may have great bearing on the selection of such individuals. Kuh and Whitt (1988) contend that "the core or culture is comprised of assumptions and beliefs shared - to some degree - by members of the institution that guide decision making and shape major events and activities" (p. 26). Artifacts of the culture may be "rituals, stories, language, and other artifacts...that reflect deeper values and help faculty, student, staff, alumni, and others understand what is appropriate and important under certain situations" (p. 26). Bolman and Deal (1991) suggest that culture as process "is continually renewed and re-created as new members are taught the old ways and eventually become teachers themselves" (p. 250). The importance of culture to a leader of an institution cannot be overstated, for it may not only affect the members of a university, but Tierney (1991) contends that going against the culture of an institution may lead to conflict (p. 127). Should this conflict occur during a period of declining resources, faculty and staff may become alienated and develop low morale (Dill, 1991, p. 182).

An element within university culture of particular concern to institutional leaders is the relationship between faculty and administration. This factor is critical for two reasons. First, it is difficult to please both sectors of the organization on most occasions and second, it is even more difficult to serve as an institutional leader without alienating the faculty and becoming labeled an administrator. Clark (1991) submits that while the structure of a university may lead most to believe that some sort of bureaucracy is operating, a closer look will reveal that it is not a true bureaucracy just as it

no longer is a collegium. By comparing academic work with other types of professional work, one must look at how individuals within the academy attain authority. Those with titles almost always have some authority, but Clark contends that "status is also derived in academia from one's standing in a discipline, and this source of status is independent of the official scheme" (p. 449). Clark also asserts that the individuality that results from disciplinary specialization opens the door for more bureaucracy and administration, and that this has led to growing faculty disenchantment with the system and university structure (p. 457).

Etzioni (1991) believes that this disenchantment is due to a conflict between professional and administrative authority. If professionals (faculty) are placed in positions of leadership, professional (faculty) needs should be satisfied. Whereas, if a "lay administrator" (non-faculty) is in a position of leadership, Etzioni contends that practical requirements would be fulfilled, but professional needs would suffer (p. 446). Etzioni further contends that most successful professionals do not want to become administrators and those who do, often don't want to take mid-level management positions. He maintains that those who take such positions often sacrifice their publication record to do so (p. 447). This dilemma highlights the complexities and role conflicts with which university leaders are forced to deal on a daily basis as well as the ironic twist in the paths to leadership. Of particular interest to this review is not only how leaders emerge within such a system, but how do interim leaders emerge and are their experiences different than the individuals who serve in full-time capacities?

Summary

The lack of research pertaining to interim leaders has driven this review of the literature. In beginning the process of discovery with respect to this phenomenon, the history of leadership theory was explored so as to provide a foundation for the presentation of current leadership definitions. The lack of a definition pertaining to interim leadership was especially significant and traditional definitions of leadership were presented in its absence. This was done with the hope that as this study was conducted, connections would be made between the experience of one particular interim leader and elements within the current definitions of leadership.

This review also discussed the transfer of leadership theory to actual practice acknowledging that theory is not always the same as reality. Yet, it is important to construct and evaluate practice through theory as it allows us to conceptualize what it is that actually transpires in the lives of organizations and individuals. The construction of a professional life history may be even more pertinent today as it allows the research to take a step away from positivism and toward filling in the gaps of actual lived experience.

Finally, recognizing that leaders, and interim leaders more specifically, operate within the constraints of organizational entities; the review presented organizational frames that apply to the major research university. In documenting the professional life history of Del Shankel within such a setting, it is necessary to have a common understanding of the environment and culture within which he has emerged as an interim leader on multiple occasions.

Chapter III

Method

General Approach

The purpose of this study was to pursue a better understanding of interim leadership. A review of the literature revealed that while a great deal of information and theory exists with respect to the concept of leadership itself, little to nothing has been written with respect to interim leadership. Veritably every college or university, at one time or another, has found it necessary to employ or appoint individuals into temporary leadership roles. These individuals are usually given a title with the term "acting" preceding it. It was the purpose of this study to begin the process of discovery by recording the experiences of one interim leader at the University of Kansas.

In an effort to study the phenomenon of interim leadership, this researcher chose to conduct a study of the professional life history of Dr. Del Shankel. This was done for several reasons. First, it had been suggested that leadership theory has grown considerably with little or no attention being paid to the phenomenon of leadership in interim capacities. It was therefore believed that this study would be the beginning of such research and that in "examining a specific setting" or individual the research would focus on "a case of a larger phenomenon" (Marshall and Rossman, 1995, p. 7). This was especially significant in this research project because Del Shankel had served in as many as seven interim capacities at the same institution. This high frequency of interim appointments made him a rich resource for beginning this study of an existing, but unexplored phenomenon. Second, the project was doable. Access to Dr. Shankel was

possible and he was willing to participate. The researcher also had access to the University archives as well as current and former colleagues and associates of the collaborator. An internship in the office of the Executive Vice Chancellor allowed this researcher to become acquainted and build relationships with many of these individuals. Additionally, the researcher was able to observe the collaborator for several months in his own work environment.

Constructing a professional life history entailed the gathering of data from several sources. First, the subject of the study was interviewed in what was in essence, an oral history. Second, other individuals associated with the subject in his work over the years were interviewed. This was done in an effort to gain insight from other perspectives and add to the “consistency in testimony (reliability) and accuracy (or validity) in relating factual information” (Yow, 1994, p. 21). Third, archival evidence was reviewed in an effort to once again enhance the reliability and validity of the historical account. Marshall and Rossman (1995) refer to this as triangulation of data and suggest that it can “enhance a study’s generalizability” (p. 144).

Qualitative Design

The research strategy for this study was qualitative in nature and therefore the researcher served as the research instrument (Marshall and Rossman, 1995, p. 59). In qualitative research, the researcher seeks to explain and describe certain phenomena in such a way that they can “identify important variables for subsequent explanatory or predictive research” (p. 10). The selection of qualitative inquiry in the pursuit of interim leadership for this study was one of necessity rather than one of theoretical

preference. Patton (1990) refers to this choice as methodological appropriateness (p. 39). In this particular situation, the appropriateness of the method was due to two significant factors. First, the lack of existing research or theory pertaining to the topic suggests that one should look toward individuals, or situations, wherein the phenomenon of interim leadership exists for further study. Second, the existence of an information-rich case (p. 141) which could provide an opportunity to gather data in-depth and detail (p. 53) warranted consideration of the qualitative approach.

Patton (1990) suggests that a pure qualitative study integrates multiple themes, or dimensions (p. 59), but the level to which these are implemented varies with the nature and the subject of each individual project. There are ten themes within qualitative research to which he refers, the first of which is naturalistic inquiry. Second, he asserts that inductive analysis within a holistic perspective is an integral part of this process as well. Data derived from the qualitative process is usually thick and descriptive utilizing the direct quotes of individuals. The researcher engages in personal contact with the phenomenon as well as individuals within that context. The process is viewed as a dynamic system that can and may change with time and each case is viewed as unique and special in its own right. The researcher must also be aware of the context within which the case or phenomenon exists across space and time. This is best achieved through "empathic neutrality," which advocates understanding and acknowledges emotions while refraining from advancing personal agendas. Finally, Patton maintains that all qualitative studies must to some degree remain flexible, in that, as "understanding deepens" paths of inquiry may shift (pp. 40-41). Because of the potential for design fluctuations,

"qualitative inquiry designs cannot be completely specified in advance of fieldwork" (p. 61). This is not an excuse for poor planning and improper preparation for fieldwork, but rather an acknowledgement of, and openness to, change within the process of gathering data.

While design flexibility may be uncomfortable to some, it is part of the qualitative approach that allows for the evaluator to search for "totality," or the "unifying nature" of the setting (Patton, 1990, p. 49). As opposed to quantitative measurement where a setting or phenomenon may be broken apart into individual variables, the qualitative study attempts to holistically "gather data on multiple aspects of the setting under study in order to assemble a comprehensive and complete picture of the social dynamic of the particular situation or program" (p. 50). Patton suggests that this leads to the "parsimony, precision, and ease of analysis" (p. 50) which, in turn, means that "greater attention can be given to nuance, setting, interdependencies, complexities, idiosyncrasies, and context" (p. 51). Marshall and Rossman (1995) list several practical advantages of the qualitative approach, in that, "it is a useful way to get large amounts of data quickly...Immediate follow-up and clarification are possible...Combined with observation, interviews allow the researcher to understand the meanings people hold for their everyday activities" (p. 80-81). It is through this process that qualitative research attempts to understand more about "the structure and essence of experience" (Patton, 1990, p. 69) of a particular phenomenon. The key to this approach is an underlying belief that it is important to understand "what people experience and how they interpret the world" (p. 69-70). Marshall and Rossman suggest that the true value in this approach to research is that it "searches for a deeper understanding of the

participants' lived experiences of the phenomenon" (p. 39).

Life History

One way in which researchers are able to achieve this greater understanding of lived experiences is through the construction of a life history. Denzin (1989) asserts that this method is based upon the assumption that a life has been lived and that it can be "studied, constructed, reconstructed, and written about" (p. 28). He also contends that in studying life, life itself becomes the interaction and culmination of an inner and outer self. The inner self refers to the world of thoughts and the outer self refers to the world of events and experiences. Furthermore, Denzin labels the inner world a phenomenological stream of consciousness and the outer world an interactional stream of experience. It is the job of the researcher to bring the two together in such a way that the life can be studied and understood by others.

Marshall and Rossman (1995) view the life history approach as being "particularly useful for giving the reader an insider's view of a culture" (p. 87). This may then help to define problems, or study aspects of certain professions, through "studying cultural changes that have occurred over time, in learning about cultural deviance" (p. 88). The primary method by which this is achieved is through the use of in-depth interviews in which the narrator is able to tell his or her story. Denzin (1989) submits that the story may cover an entire life, or part of a life, and that "part" may be "topical, or edited, focusing only on a particular set of experiences deemed to be of importance" (p. 29). The collection of these stories is often referred to as oral history and forms the basis for ethnographies, biographies, and

autobiographies (p. 41).

Yow (1994) defines life history as “the account by an individual of his or her life that is recorded in some way, by taping or writing, for another person who edits and presents the account” (p. 168). This definition coincides with Tilton’s previously cited definition. Yow differentiates between life history and biography according to the way in which the data is utilized.

It is clear, then, that no matter how long the direct quotation from the narrator, the interviewer-editor manipulates the written text, just as he or she has already to some extent guided the oral account. Thus the final product of a life history is the result of a collaboration.

I distinguish this literary form from biography in which the subject is quoted, but which seldom presents long blocks of testimony from his or her life account. The main part of the text is the author’s words. Although the author has been helped by various narrators, this is not a collaboration. (p. 169)

While Yow does distinguish between the two methods in this way, she continues to acknowledge that “oral history research will go on in much the same way for life histories as for biographies” whether this is with the individual narrator, or with close associates (p. 169).

At this point, it becomes clear that depending upon who is being read or cited, definitions of terms may vary. At times, oral history may be used to refer to any number of the various methodologies that exist for an individual to record his or her story. “Although theorists have proposed a set of more technically specific meanings for each term, these meanings seem not to have caught on, and the terms remain interchangeable” (Yow, 1994, p. 4). For the purpose of this study, it appeared that some agreement existed about the use of “oral history” as the method for collecting data for both “life histories” and “biographies.” This led this particular study to become a “life

history,” as Yow defines it, with “oral history” being the primary method of data collection. More specifically, this study became a professional life history. Its goal was not to present all aspects of the narrator’s life, but rather to study what Denzin refers to as a “part” of that life which may then help to define problems or study aspects of a profession or culture. It was found that a description of Del Shankel’s early life experiences enhanced the discussion of his professional life, but a description of Shankel’s personal adult life was not the focus of this study and was not discussed at length during the interviews. The professional life history of Del Shankel was utilized in an effort to better understand the lived experiences of an individual who served as an interim leader at the University of Kansas on multiple occasions. In recording this life history, the study asked: what is interim leadership as he experienced it at the University of Kansas? Was interim leadership defined or experienced differently according to position? Did the definition or experience change over the course of time? Was he called upon to create change or maintain the status quo? How did these experiences differ in his various interim positions? Why was he selected to serve in multiple interim capacities on multiple occasions? How did he experience the shift back and forth between the role of faculty member and interim leader?

Role of the Researcher

In preparation for this study, several measures were undertaken. First, the researcher completed the coursework and comprehensive examinations toward a degree in Educational Policy and Leadership with an emphasis in higher education. Second, in partial fulfillment toward that

degree, the researcher completed a minor emphasis in U.S. history. Through coursework, the researcher became familiar with the issues indigenous to higher education and the historical context that frames those issues in the United States. The researcher completed a seminar in leadership issues and pursued an independent study in the field, both of which provided the underpinnings for the review of literature in this study. The researcher also took four research courses, two which were quantitative in nature and two which were based upon qualitative design.

As part of this coursework and as a research assistant working on an institutional grant with two principal investigators, the researcher contributed to two significant research projects and completed two others on his own. Each of these projects in some way contributed to the preparation of this final project as a doctoral candidate. As a research assistant, the researcher assisted in the collection and analysis of data in a study of a School of Education's advising program. He also collaborated with a principal investigator on a project investigating six leaders across one state through the lens of postmodern leadership theory. This study was presented at both the American Education Research Association and the Association for the Study of Higher Education conferences in 1994. Two other research projects were conducted by the researcher himself during that time frame. The first was an oral history pertaining to the Kent State tragedy of 1970. The second was a life history of an African American pioneer in both athletics and education. All four projects allowed the researcher to refine his interviewing skills as well as his ability to collect and analyze data. Additionally, the researcher's past experience as a higher education professional and a master's degree in journalism and mass communications

prepared him to conduct oral interviews in the setting of higher education.

Data Collection Procedures

As stated, in qualitative research the researcher is the instrument. Marshall and Rossman (1995) maintain that in the case of in-depth interviewing this is achieved by entering into the lives of the actual participants in a brief, but personal manner (p. 59). In this study, and in any life history, the subject by the very definition of a life history, represents a purposive sample of N=1. This study represents what Patton (1990) refers to as "extreme case sampling" in which the focus is "on cases that are rich in information because they are unusual or special in some way" (p. 169). Del Shankel, who served in an interim capacity on seven different occasions, would certainly fulfill this definition. While Patton speaks of extreme cases with respect to programs and suggests that "lessons may be learned about unusual conditions," it was believed that the same rationale applied to studying the professional life of Del Shankel. Because of the uniqueness of Dr. Shankel's career, it was possible to gain important and valuable insight into the phenomenon of interim leadership.

Questions were not limited to Del Shankel's professional life only, as knowledge of an individual's complete life often provides critical insight and perspective (Yow, 1994, p. 37). The questions pertaining to Shankel's early life were especially useful in providing a context of a human life as well as aiding in the development of a relationship between collaborators. Yow suggests that in selecting a research project, one should "choose a subject for research that engages both your mind and your heart" (p. 52) and this subject did so. The professional life of Dr. Del Shankel was an information

rich case that provided the field with hypotheses that may then be tested by quantitative research or comparative qualitative research.

The data for this study were gathered in three ways. First, the primary source of data collection was through the use of in-depth interviews with Del Shankel himself. Second, former and current associates were interviewed to gain insight into Dr. Shankel's professional life from various perspectives. Third, University archives were reviewed in an effort to maintain chronological facts that may otherwise have been distorted by human memory. Marshall and Rossman (1995) maintain that this is an unobtrusive way to supplement interviews and to gain additional insight into values and beliefs of participants in a setting. This approach of utilizing several sources in constructing a life history is referred to as triangulation of data which greatly strengthens the design of the study (Marshall and Rossman, 1995, p. 144; Patton, 1990, p. 187). Dr. Shankel was also provided with a draft of the biographical sketch for his review in order to ensure correct spelling of names and reliability of content. The selection of additional narrators resulted from an initial suggestion by Dr. Shankel as to whom the individuals with the most insight might be. Some of those interviewees then recommended other individuals who were knowledgeable as well. This method of narrator selection is referred to as snowball sampling (Yow, 1994, p. 45). In the case of this study, there were seven narrators who provided additional insight and served as a reliability check. Yow suggests that at some point interviews may reach a point of saturation in which narrators are often repeating stories or perspectives (p. 46). That point was reached following interviews with five narrators, but two additional interviews were conducted to further ensure reliability.

Interviewing Techniques

While conducting the interviews with Dr. Shankel and other narrators, it was important to show empathy to the narrator's point of view while still remaining impartial. Patton (1990) maintains that this is what allows the qualitative researcher to gain understanding into another individual's life experiences. This role of the researcher is referred to as empathic neutrality and gives "the researcher an empirical basis for describing the perspectives of others while also legitimately reporting his or her own feelings, perceptions, experiences, and insights *as part of the data*" (p. 58). Yow (1994) maintains that this is all part of building a rapport between the researcher and the narrator (p. 60) and that it can best be achieved by utilizing skill in questioning. In the course of in-depth interviews, narrators often reveal inner perspectives that otherwise would not be revealed through observation (Patton, 1990, p. 278) and at times may reveal information that they never intended to reveal (p. 355). One had to be sensitive to the needs of the narrator about what he or she may not want published. One also needs to maintain control of the interview, remaining focused, asking pertinent questions, and giving appropriate feedback to the narrator (p. 330).

Ten interview sessions, approximately 60 to 90 minutes in length, were conducted with Dr. Shankel and seven interviews were conducted with associates in an effort to gather sufficient data and to reach a saturation point. Data were recorded through the use of a tape recorder and fieldnotes. Fieldnotes were taken both as a back up to poor or faulty sound recording and as a means of recording non-verbal behaviors and settings. The fieldnotes were also useful in maintaining control of the flow of conversation

as notes often prompted other appropriate questions. Notes also provided documentation of what had already been covered in previous interviews.

The questions themselves followed the general interview guide approach (Patton, 1990, p. 280) which outlined the general areas to be covered in an interview along with several specific questions addressing each area (see Appendix A). At the same time, the interview guide remained flexible so as to allow for probes and new avenues of conversation that were advantageous to the research. This form of questioning differed from the informal conversational interview, which is completely spontaneous, and from the standardized open-ended interview, which strictly adheres to set of prearranged questions. As the interviews began, the questions followed a chronological pattern with respect to Dr. Shankel's life and career with particular attention being paid to his various interim positions. As time progressed and various themes and issues began to emerge, questioning followed these avenues of inquiry. Specific attention was paid to lead-in questions at the beginning of the interviews as well as the end of interviews when informal conversation often revealed pertinent information. Each interview was then transcribed as questions were developed for the next interview session from the accumulated fieldnotes of previous interviews.

Data Analysis

Any discussion of data analysis procedures should be prefaced with a quote from Patton's philosophical character, Halcolm, who warns that once a study is completed it will become obvious to the researcher what questions should have been asked had they had perfect foresight. With this perspective he then states that, "the complete analysis isn't" (Patton, 1990, p.

371). Marshall and Rossman and Patton refer to the analysis process in qualitative research as an attempt to reduce or bring order to “massive” (Patton, 1990, p. 371) or the “mass” (Marshall and Rossman, 1995, p. 111) of collected data.

The first step in the analysis actually began in the data collection stage of the research. Complete and detailed organization of tapes, fieldnotes, and archival documents allowed analysis to begin with the appropriate degree of efficiency. This required labels pertaining to times and dates of interviews, location of documents, names, titles, and chronologies. Notes were also color coded when necessary as themes began to emerge within the data. This process was then carried over into the actual analysis of the data and a continued search for themes. “Qualitative data analysis is a search for general statements about relationships among categories of data; it builds grounded theory” (Marshall and Rossman, 1995, p. 111). This applied directly back to the purpose of this study. It is new basic research on interim leadership that contributes to fundamental knowledge and theory in both higher education and leadership.

Marshall and Rossman (1995) contend that in the process of building this grounded theory, analysis of qualitative research can be messy, ambiguous, time consuming, creative and it does not proceed in a linear fashion (p. 111). Patton (1990) reiterates this notion by suggesting that “there are no absolute rules except to do the very best with your full intellect to fairly represent the data and communicate what the data reveal [sic] given the purpose of the study” (p. 372). This is not to suggest that strategies for analyzing qualitative data do not exist. Both Marshall and Rossman and

Patton recommend several strategies and it was these strategies coupled with the researcher's own patterns developed on past projects that were implemented in this analysis and presented in this paper.

Marshall and Rossman (1995) maintain that "analytic procedures fall into five modes: organizing the data; generating categories, themes, and patterns; testing the emergent hypotheses against the data; searching for alternative explanations of the data; and writing the report" (p. 113). This by and large was the process that was followed in analyzing the data in this study. However, in the case of a life history, chronology and important events also came into play as the data were organized and presented. Each interview was labeled with a letter of the alphabet. The first five interviews conducted with colleagues were labeled A, B, C, D, and E. The ten interviews with Shankel were given the letters F - O. The final two colleague interviews were labeled P and Q. Beginning with interview A, each page was then numbered in sequence through interview Q. This process allowed for identification of exact quotes from colleagues in the manuscript and for referencing Shankel's quotes in future publications.

The first step in the data analysis was to organize the data with respect to particular interviews and documents. This organization centered on chronology, key events, various settings, people, processes, and issues (Patton, 1990, p. 377). The second step in the process of analysis was to generate categories, themes, and patterns. This was accomplished through constant movement back and forth through the data (p. 423). Converging ideas and concepts into groups was critical to analyzing the qualitative data and eventually led to a classification system of the data (p. 402). The themes within this system were then coded onto the actual copies of the data

while a separate record of the categories was kept as well. Patton contends that just as there are no “right” strategies to analysis, there is no “right” language or terminology to be utilized for themes and categories (p. 419). It was at this point that general themes in Del Shankel’s life or career began to diverge from themes that were pertinent to interim leadership. Patton refers to this process as inductive analysis, in that, “the patterns, themes, and categories of analysis come from the data; they emerge out of the data rather than being imposed on them prior to data collection and analysis” (p. 390). He further breaks this concept into two smaller categories. Key terms and phrases that are gathered within the data from quotes are called indigenous concepts while concepts that are eventually labeled by terms that the researcher brings to the document are referred to as sensitizing concepts (p. 390-391).

The third and fourth step of the process were closely linked. The researcher tested emergent hypotheses by searching through the data and challenging them. Patterns which did not fit the hypotheses were then added to the constructs to determine whether the hypotheses stood or fell. This process of evaluation then culminated in the fourth stage in which the researcher searched for alternative explanations. Prior to writing any conclusions to the study, the researcher was sure that no alternative explanations for the phenomenon of interim leadership existed within the data that were not mentioned. Finally, the researcher wrote a draft report of what was found, both with respect to the professional life history of Dr. Del Shankel and the phenomenon of interim leadership, in which case it was deemed necessary that the report be both descriptive and interpretive in nature. Patton (1990) notes that the final report should be well balanced

between descriptiveness and interpretation (p. 429-430). In this case, descriptiveness generally applied to the professional life of Dr. Shankel and interpretation to the phenomenon of interim leadership.

Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations to which life histories and the oral history method are most vulnerable. Yow (1994) indicates that "life reviews may result in a picture that is narrow, idiosyncratic, or ethnocentric" (p. 16). Yet, a strength of the life history is the thick description that one is able to gain by focusing on an individual life. The selectivity of narrators may also be considered a limitation of the life history. Yow submits that in most research projects, the shy, or inarticulate, or private individuals probably do not come forward to contribute to the collection of data. This would also affected the ability of the researcher to generalize about the experience of all individuals. In this particular study, it limited comments that could be made about the ways in which associates viewed the interim leadership of Del Shankel. Conclusions had to be restricted to views held by the interviewed associates and not generalized to a larger population of associates that were not interviewed.

A third limitation of the life history is that it leans heavily on retrospective evidence (Yow, 1994, p. 18). Questions of memory and selective memory necessarily arise at this point, but one must recognize that written documents such as diaries also contain some sort of slanted perspective, as the writer usually tries to protect the ego (p. 18). Yow also contends that many respondents become more candid as time passes. Subjectivity is often referred to as the major limitation of oral history of any

kind, but it is usually considered a strength as well.

We are likely to be more spontaneous in talking about our feelings than in writing about them, and many people speak to the oral historian with great candor and courage. These spoken memories and ruminations are the essential human stuff of our time, for they reveal inner sources and motives. (Hoopes, 1979, p. 17)

Finally, the personal biases of the author should also be taken into account as one reads this study. The author had an interest in studying the professional life of Del Shankel which by definition would indicate that a bias existed to some degree toward valuing his work and/or career. The author also acknowledges that Del Shankel is an extremely likable person and that the author values Dr. Shankel as an individual. Again, this could also be interpreted as a strength for it suggests that the researcher's interest level and passion for the project were maintained throughout the study.

Ethical Concerns and Legal Issues

Denzin (1989) asserts that a biographer, or in this case a life historian, "is a historian of selves and lives" (p. 34) and that the "story that is told is never the same story that is heard" (p. 72). This paradox necessarily raises ethical questions for both the researcher and the narrator, some of which have legal ramifications.

Dr. Shankel and other narrators were informed of their rights prior to interviews and the goals of the project were honestly portrayed. Narrators were given release forms prior to an interview in accordance with institutional research procedures. Narrators reserved the right to comment off the record with the tape recorder shut off and request transcripts for their perusal and changes. All of these measures were taken in an effort to

protect the narrator, as Patton (1990) indicates, "people in interviews will tell you things they never intended to tell" (p. 355).

Chapter IV

Biographical Sketch

In studying the professional life of any individual, questions pertaining to influences in that individual's life immediately come to the forefront. The professional life of Dr. Del Shankel is no different. This study did not overlook the years prior to the beginning of Shankel's professional career. Much of what happens to an individual prior to his or her professional life actually has great bearing on the behavior of that individual during his or her professional career. While Del Shankel's early years were not the focus of this study, significant time was spent with Dr. Shankel reliving those early years prior to his arrival at the University of Kansas, as this material is necessary in developing a complete picture of the man. When one reads the story of those years, with particular attention being paid to his educational experiences and youthful leadership experiences, one begins to see the future emerge. This process allows the reader to then gain some understanding as to what, or who, the influences might have been that directed Del Shankel down the path of educational leadership and more specifically toward positions of interim leadership.

The Early Years

Del Shankel was born August 4, 1927 in Plainview, Nebraska because in his words, "that was the nearest town that had a hospital to where we lived." His father was principal of the high school in nearby Foster, Nebraska which was not large enough to warrant a hospital of its

own. Shankel's father, Cecil, had migrated to Nebraska from Canada upon completion of his Bachelor of Arts degree at Walla Walla College in College Place, Washington. Cecil Shankel was born in Nova Scotia, but migrated with his parents to Alberta and fulfilled the necessary requirements at Canadian Junior College in Alberta prior to completing his education at Walla Walla. With an undergraduate degree in chemistry and science, the elder Shankel then traveled to Lincoln, Nebraska where he completed a master's degree in education. "His first job out of school was being a principal of this little high school. My mother came down from Canada, they got married, and a year later I was born."

A master's degree in 1927 might be considered a rare occurrence in either Canada or the United States, but Shankel's grandfather placed a high priority on education for his children. His grandparents moved from Nova Scotia, Canada in 1908 to Alberta, Canada as homesteaders. Shankel recalls that his grandfather had a third grade education, but maintained an extensive library and encouraged his children and grandchildren to read. His four sons and two daughters all attended college. Both daughters received undergraduate degrees. The oldest son completed a doctorate and Shankel's father received a master's degree.

The other side of Del's family valued education as well. His mother did not complete a degree before marrying his father, but did "go to college for a year or two." Her parents migrated from the Dakotas to Saskatchewan, Canada as homesteaders and of the six children, Shankel says that "most of them" had at least some college experience. The emphasis placed on education in both families carried forward to Shankel and his siblings. The oldest of four children, Shankel has one brother who is a physician, another

who is the head of the Eastern division of his church in Singapore, and a sister who is a nurse.

When Del was a year old, his parents moved back to Canada where his father accepted a position similar to that of Registrar and Head of the Science Department at Canadian Junior College, a church affiliated school in Alberta. The Shankels lived in Alberta for eleven years allowing Del to spend most of his summers on his grandparents' farm at Leduc where he developed an interest in the outdoors. It is a time period that he fondly recalls.

Those were great experiences on my grandfather's farm. I got to drive the horses, and ride the grain wagons, and help the field hands in the harvest, and carry water, and play in the creek and the pasture, and chase cabbage butterflies out of the garden, and eat my aunt's chocolate cake.

He describes his father as a "strong disciplinarian" and his mother as a "homemaker in every sense of the word. She took care of the kids and patched our pants, did sewing, the cooking, and the taking care of us." Shankel remembers Alberta as a "great place to grow up. Winters were very cold and summers quite pleasant." He learned to ice skate and play ice hockey as well as completing the first six grades while his father was at Canadian Junior College. His father did not believe in sending children to school until they were eight years old, which resulted in "a lot of outdoor time, and fun time, and play time. We all started school when we were about eight years old and then very rapidly caught up with our age group." Another factor affecting the early educational experiences of Del Shankel was the fact that he contracted undulant fever when he was halfway through grade three, causing him to stay bedridden from December through May of

that year. While in bed, he entertained himself by reading extensively and became enamored with “a very dedicated family physician who took care of me during that time...He was a marvelous grandfatherly type of family physician and had a big impact, probably, on me at that time.” It was during this period that Shankel developed the desire to go to medical school.

Under what is referred to as the Canadian Collegiate System, Shankel attended elementary school, high school, and the first year of college where his father taught and served as the “Principal in charge.” Shankel explained that, having his father as Principal had some disciplinary drawbacks in some ways, but also indicated that his father served as an important role model and reinforcer of the value of education. The elementary school Del attended was operated by Canadian Junior College, while his advanced education took place at a school run by Oshawa Missionary College in Ontario, Canada where his father assumed the Presidency when Del was twelve. Under the Canadian system, high school and the first year of undergraduate study were combined. Although this system may seem foreign to Americans, Shankel credits it with providing him with a strong educational foundation.

I think that through high school and the first year of college I got an exceptionally good education in Canada. In high school, for example, we took English every day and every year. In fact, we had two English classes - one literature and one composition every year. We were required to take math every year in high school. We took a foreign language every year in high school. We were required to take chemistry, and physics, and biology in high school. We took about seven or eight subjects each year in high school. I thought, and still think, that I got an exceptionally good high school education under the Canadian system.

As a youngster, Shankel’s interests varied and he participated in a

wide range of activities. Reading, soccer, and ice hockey were some of his favorite pastimes and many of them provided leadership roles. Soccer and ice hockey were two of the more popular sports where he lived and Shankel served as captain of the soccer team for “three or four years” and as captain of the hockey team for “a couple of years.” He also served as President of his junior class, Secretary-Treasurer his senior year, and as an officer on the high school yearbook staff. Shankel remembers that one of his early lessons in leadership was learning how to control a childhood temper that was displayed primarily during tense moments in athletic events where he continually got into fights until he learned the art of negotiation.

Reflecting upon his youth, Shankel cites making straight A's through his sophomore year in high school, being elected captain of the hockey and soccer teams, and becoming sophomore class president, as major achievements. He also laughingly attributes the end of getting straight A's to his increased social development in the latter years of high school. Soccer, hockey, and other extracurricular activities were more inviting than being studious all of the time. However, Shankel credits his early success in school to the influence of teachers, particularly his two main elementary teachers and one specific high school teacher who had a tremendous influence on him during his adolescent years. He maintains that he “had a lot of good teachers,” but Harry Taylor “was very enthusiastic and demonstrative.” As an English teacher, Taylor was able to encourage Shankel in his love of reading and open new doors to the world beyond Ontario. Shankel suggests that Taylor was, “probably why I decided to major in English as an undergraduate in college.”

There were other influences in his life that served to inspire Shankel's

view of the world as well. He had two uncles and aunts who were missionaries in Africa.

One of them was actually president of a church related college in South Africa. In looking back I'm not sure how much missionary work was involved there, because it was a college that I now understand was attended mostly by white students. I'm not sure how much "missionary" they really were. My other uncle and aunt were real missionaries in Africa working out in bush country and working with the natives and trying to bring better lives to them and so on.

A combination of the experience with his physician while Shankel was bedridden with undulant fever, the influence of the missionary relatives, the impetus placed on service within the church, and success in school all reinforced Shankel's desire to pursue a medical degree in hopes of becoming a missionary doctor in Africa. The relatives also fostered Shankel's continued interest in, and appreciation for, music. The aunt and uncle who served at the South African college had a daughter who proved to be a "superb violinist and had a great career as a musician." Shankel remembers that his parents,

at one time hoped that maybe that gene ran in my family. So I took violin lessons for about six years and piano lessons for awhile, but clearly it was not a family trait. It didn't carry over. I had some fun. I played in the high school and college orchestra, and enjoyed it, but I never had either the diligence to practice, or the skill to become a great musician like my cousin was.

The College Years

His parents' educational philosophy and religious beliefs, the influence of the missionary aunts and uncles, the connection to the church affiliated school system, and a friend named Don Shepard played significant roles in the college selection process for Shankel. Shankel recalls that he

and his friend looked at “various colleges that we thought our parents would let us go to” and selected Walla Walla College “partly because it was a long way from home.” However, this attraction was short lived as soon thereafter his father returned from a business trip and announced that he had taken a position as a Professor of Chemistry at Walla Walla College. Shankel contends that his father may have accepted the position in an effort to defray the costs of providing a college education for four children as “the kids could live at home and work to earn their tuition, and that way he could get us all through college.”

When Shankel entered Walla Walla, he did so with the intention of becoming a doctor. At that time, medical school required three years of undergraduate work in pre-medicine and students then received an undergraduate degree upon completion of two years of medical school. However, the end of WWII and the influx of a large number of veterans into higher education changed that process. Shankel remembers that when he entered Walla Walla in 1947, “there were huge numbers of ex-GI’s back from the war in college and a lot of them had been medics in the army and wanted to go to medical school.” This change in student population was the same throughout the United States and medical schools started to require the completion of an undergraduate degree, “partly to slow down this huge onslaught of people who wanted to go to medical school.” This policy change meant that Shankel had to select an undergraduate major besides pre-med and since he “enjoyed English so much” and had taken a number of electives in the area, he chose English as his major. “So I ended up with a BA degree in English and minors in chemistry and zoology, which were courses that I had to have for medical school.”

Shankel continued to be as involved in extracurricular activities in college as he had been in high school. At the time Shankel graduated from Walla Walla, the enrollment had reached an all time high of 1100 students and extracurricular activities allowed Shankel to get “to know almost all the students.” He served as summer editor of the college paper one year and as circulations manager the year before. He played on the ice hockey team when it traveled to an arena in Spokane “to play a few games a year” and also played “a lot of softball and some soccer.” Aside from the school paper and athletics, he continued to serve in student government in college and was a class officer during his junior year. Teachers continued to play an important role during Shankel’s undergraduate years, just as they had done throughout elementary school and high school. He names several teachers who had a significant impact on his intellectual development while at Walla Walla. Kenneth Aplington, or “Dad” as the students called him, was particularly close to students and often had them over to his house for social gatherings. Thomas Little, “a very rigorous English teacher” and Marie Hanson, “a great English teacher” significantly affected Shankel as he took multiple classes from each in the pursuit of an undergraduate English degree. Shankel also took a freshman college chemistry course from his father who continued to impact Shankel’s educational life. Shankel remembers his father as a “very fit teacher, but a very rigorous teacher.”

Upon graduation from college Shankel faced a series of decisions that had great impact on the evolution of his professional life. In 1950, the medical schools were full of veterans making use of the GI bill and most institutions were asking younger, traditional students to wait one year after college before entering. Del Shankel fell into this category and in an effort to

make money during the waiting period, he took a job working in a saw mill near Pendleton, Oregon. Summer heat resulted in dry timber and the mill shut down, leading Shankel and a few friends to travel the coast of Oregon eventually finding work in a government construction project near Pepoe Bay, Oregon. The group of friends also found a night job in a saw mill that was rotated amongst the four of them. As the work plan became routine, Shankel received a phone call from the principal of the high school in Walla Walla who was in need of an individual that could teach chemistry, physics, biology, algebra, and geometry. Shankel agreed to teach all but the physics course and spent the next year preparing for and teaching the four other subjects saying, "it turned out that I really enjoyed that year of teaching and working with the kids."

Following the year of teaching, Shankel entered medical school at Loma Linda University, in Loma Linda, California. He found that medical school was not what he hoped it would be. He "really didn't enjoy the first semester at all," but decided to try one more semester, during which he found that he truly disliked anatomy classes and physiology classes, and had an aversion to practicing on animals. More importantly,

I kind of subtly found myself losing some of the idealism that I had started medical school with, that I had developed as a small child about medical practice, as I saw the attitudes that were developing among my fellow medical students. I probably felt, at the end, some loss of idealism about the profession.

Shankel saw that many of his fellow students were motivated more by the prospect of material gain than by the need to help others. The decision to leave medical school resulted in a few more months of working construction and a season of semi-professional hockey with the San Bernardino

Shamrocks. Shankel went to a hockey game one evening and thought that he had the ability to compete at the semi-professional level. He approached the Shamrocks' coach following the match and was invited to try out at practice. "So I went down to the practice with them the next night and played the rest of the season for them."

The season with the Shamrocks was followed by a draft notice from the U.S. Army. Shankel's medical background qualified him to become a medic while in the service. He spent one week "peeling potatoes every night" in his home state of Washington at Fort Lewis before going to basic training and eight more weeks of medical training at Camp Pickett, Virginia. Shankel then selected to go into the Medical Service Corps where he was assigned to medical technology and shipped to Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio, Texas for another four months of training. The 16 week course was comprised of all day intensive study and included sessions in chemistry, parasitology, hematology, and basic laboratory bacteriology. Shankel says that he "really enjoyed the bacteriology courses" and when those classes ended, the Colonel in charge of the Medical Field Service School asked him to remain as an instructor. Shankel was "expecting to go to Korea" and an opportunity to stay and teach was appealing. "I said 'I really enjoyed the bacteriology. I'd like to teach that, if I could.' So I was assigned to teaching bacteriology labs for the last 15 months or so of my army career."

The main bacteriology course in the program was taught by "a civilian with a master's degree in bacteriology," while the labs were run by "five or six of us PFC's and corporals who prepared the lab materials and taught the labs and taught the students the laboratory techniques for working with bacteria." The interest in bacteriology coupled with his former and current

teaching experience opened new doors for the evolution of Shankel's professional life. "Several of us who were working in the lab got interested in graduate school and our civilian chief, who was a graduate of the University of Texas at Austin in Bacteriology said, 'Well, if you guys are interested in graduate school I'd consider the University of Texas.'" From this recommendation Shankel started the process of attaining admission into the graduate program in bacteriology at the University of Texas. However, he was unaware that graduate assistantships existed so he applied for Texas residency and found a job for one year teaching chemistry at San Antonio Junior College. "In the spring, I applied for graduate school at the University of Texas in Austin and was accepted."

While in graduate school, teachers once again influenced Shankel. Just as elementary and high school teachers developed Shankel's academic character and interests, and as college professors continued this process, graduate professors influenced the initial stages of Shankel's professional growth in academia. In graduate school he witnessed pedagogical practices that he later wanted to emulate or discard in his own professional life. Shankel specifically recalls one professor whose "grading was very subjective" and based upon whether "he liked you, or if you were a grad student in his lab." From this professor, Shankel learned what he did not want to be like as a professional. He was also "influenced" by Orville Wyss, Shankel's advisor, in many ways. Wyss was "always scrupulously fair" and "was not an easy teacher by any means." Shankel maintains that Wyss "influenced my teachings a whole lot" in that "he was fairly demanding, but he always made sure his questions were clear and that there were definitive answers to them."

University of Kansas: Teaching and Research

One could say that the decision to enter academia was foreshadowed by circumstances and influences throughout Del Shankel's life. As the child of an educator and parents who both valued education, he spent his life surrounded by learning and teaching. The impact of teachers throughout his life and the positive teaching experiences that were seemingly natural to him provided a smooth transition into academia. As he neared completion of his program at Texas, Shankel was influenced by two perspectives that were held by the faculty at UT. One group believed that a career in industry was valuable and would supplement his teaching. Another group of advisors, led by Orville Wyss, warned that salaries in private industry often become so large that one might never return to the academy. Shankel looked at several positions following graduation and had interviews scheduled with several private sector industries and two universities, including KU. After interviewing within the corporate sector, Shankel traveled to Lawrence, Kansas. He met the Department Chair of Microbiology, Dave Paretsky, at the American Society for Microbiology meeting in St. Louis in the spring and Paretsky offered him an interview. As Shankel traveled to Kansas he carried with him expectations of buildings in the middle of "some wheat fields," but found the campus "beautiful" and the people likable.

I really enjoyed that group of people. My seminar went well...and I had a very nice visit with George Waggoner also in the College office about what I was doing in graduate school, and what I might do here; and when I was getting ready to leave, Dave Paretsky told me they were going to offer me the position here.

As Shankel left Lawrence, he decided that he had made a decision. He telephoned the other university, canceled his interview, returned to Austin,

and worked toward finishing his research and completing his dissertation. By August of 1959, Shankel finished his research, completed his dissertation which he defended over Thanksgiving break, handed it to his advisor, and started as an Assistant Professor of Bacteriology (now Microbiology) on September 1, 1959.

Shankel describes the early years as an Assistant Professor as "somewhat stressful and very hard working." Four to five evenings a week were spent in his lab until 10:00 or 11:00 at night "either working on course preparation materials, or working on research, or writing grant proposals." The primary focus of this time period was to acquire tenure and Shankel sacrificed many social activities in pursuit of that goal. He started to attend "some of the athletic events and some of the cultural events" by the third year of his Assistant Professorship, "but it was a period of very hard work most of the time."

During this period of time, Shankel also started to develop what he calls "a tremendous amount of loyalty to the University of Kansas." During the summer of 1960, the University paid for him to attend a three-week course on microbial genetics in Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island. This was important to Shankel as an aspiring Assistant Professor because "microbial genetics was just becoming a field" and this course "was offered by the three most outstanding people in the country." The following summer Shankel was awarded a faculty fellowship which allowed him to spend six weeks at Cal Tech, "learning some more things about particular bacterial viruses and their genetics and how to grow and use them in the lab."

Shankel's major assignment as an Assistant Professor was to "develop a research program and a teaching program in this relatively new

area called microbial genetics.” To accomplish this task he was given “a little laboratory in Snow Hall with some old used equipment.” Much of the research that was originally conducted was an outgrowth of Shankel’s dissertation research on genetic effects of low doses of ultraviolet radiation and was conducted by Shankel and two or three graduate students. In addition to the research he also taught classes in microbial genetics, microbial physiology, food and water microbiology, industrial microbiology, and various other courses related to microbial physiology or genetics.

One major finding emerged from this early research. Shankel and his graduate students were interested in reducing frequency of mutations as opposed to what was causing the mutations. “We were working with ultraviolet radiation which is a mutagenetic agent and that’s why a lot of people who get too much exposure to sunlight develop skin cancers.” Shankel explains that the cells mutate, eventually surpassing normal controls, and develop cancers. So Shankel and his associates decided to “look at a number of chemical compounds to see if they would reduce the frequency of ultraviolet induced mutation in the cells.” One compound that was of significant interest to the researchers was caffeine because it was “similar in structure to many of the chemicals that make up the DNA of our cells.” The researchers expected the caffeine to decrease the frequency of the mutations when the cells were exposed to ultraviolet light. In fact, the opposite occurred. “Instead of the caffeine reducing the number of mutations, after we fed the cells caffeine after the ultraviolet radiations, the number of mutations went up about ten times.” Shankel explains that he and his associates became so interested in the phenomenon that they continued to pursue the “research trail” and were able to publish findings

from 1964 to 1973. Shankel notes that this “illustrates something about research. You don’t always get the results you are expecting. Sometimes the unexpected results are more interesting. You can go a whole different direction.”

In conjunction with the research program, the teaching aspect of Shankel's Assistant Professorship provided him with a great deal of satisfaction. “I think a career in teaching and doing research at a university, especially at a university like this, is just tremendously rewarding and satisfying.” He adds that he received the most satisfaction from interaction with students in his classes and that while academic life was not always monetarily rewarding, it was and continues to be “psychically” rewarding.

Money has never been a large driving force one way or the other for me either...I can't ever remember, in all the years I have been here, I can't ever remember going into my Department Chair or my Dean negotiating saying, “I need a higher salary than what you're offering for the next year”... It just hasn't been one of those driving motivating factors for me.

Shankel contends that an interest in students and an enthusiasm for the subject are necessary qualities in a good teacher.

You have to have a sense of what is important in the discipline, and what is important for students to know at particular stages in their lives that they are at, and then have the communication skills to be able to communicate that in an understandable manner.

He further explains that any teacher has the ability to flunk students, but the power to give grades is not what is important in good pedagogy. In Shankel's way of thinking, good pedagogy is the ability to identify pertinent material for the students to learn and then to be able to communicate that information so that students understand the material.

Much of this teaching philosophy was modeled for Shankel by his father “whom I admired a lot for what he was able to do” and he also credits “the influence of some very good teachers that I had in elementary and high school.” Finally, he summarizes by saying that his graduate school professors were “some very good examples” who confirmed that the academic life was “worth doing and something that I would enjoy.” Even during times of heavy administrative responsibility, Shankel continued to teach and conduct research. He states that he made “a very conscious effort” to continue teaching undergraduates and maintain a research laboratory for graduate students. However, he told the students in his lab that he had an administrative appointment and that they would have to be able to work independently. He also “tried to spend at least a few hours a week down in the lab at a regular weekly meeting with my grad students from time to time just to see how things were going and so on.” In order to maintain his teaching responsibility, Shankel simply “blocked out the class times” on his schedule before the semester started. His secretary or administrative assistant would then protect his schedule from meetings one-half hour prior to class time so that he could gather his notes and prepare for class.

University of Kansas: Administration

Following the acquisition of tenure, and in and amongst his continued teaching and research programs, Dr. Shankel served the University of Kansas in six permanent administrative capacities as well as seven interim administrative appointments. For the purposes of this paper, a traditional permanent administrative position is viewed as a position to which an

individual is appointed with full title, responsibilities, authority, and accountability to be carried out until the individual resigns or is removed from the position. His six permanent appointments were Assistant Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences from 1966 through 1969, Associate Dean from 1969 to 1973, as Executive Vice Chancellor of the Lawrence Campus from 1974 to 1980, Special Counselor to the Chancellor from 1981 to the present, Executive Vice Chancellor from 1990 to 1992, and Chancellor for the year ending June 1, 1995. His interim appointments were Acting Chairman of the Department of Microbiology during the 1964-1965 academic year, Acting Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences during the academic year of 1973-1974, Acting Chancellor of the University of Kansas during the academic year of 1980-1981, Acting Director of Athletics from January to April 1982, Acting Director of Athletics from November to December, 1982, Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs from January 1, 1986 to June 30, 1986, and Acting Executive Vice Chancellor from January 1, 1987 to August 1, 1987.

Table of Positions

Position	Date
Acting Chair of Microbiology	1964-1965
Assistant Dean of the College	1966-1969
Associate Dean of the College	1969-1973
Acting Dean of the College	1973-1974
Executive Vice Chancellor	1974-1980
Acting Chancellor	1980-1981
Special Counselor to the Chancellor	1981-present
Acting Director of Athletics	1982 (January to April)
Acting Director of Athletics	1982 (Nov to Dec)
Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	1986-1/1 - 6/30
Acting Executive Vice Chancellor	1987-1/1 - 8/1
Executive Vice Chancellor	1990-1992
Chancellor	1994-1995

The biographical sketch will be continued by discussing each of the positions listed above, beginning with the Acting Chairmanship of the Microbiology Department.

Acting Chair: Department of Microbiology

During the five years that Shankel spent acquiring tenure, Dave Paretsky, Chair of the Microbiology Department, often asked him to assist with “a number of the administrative chores in the Department.” Shankel maintains that he was willing to assist Paretsky with the administrative tasks because “it was something that was useful to do and the Department Chairman asked me to do it.” This mentality was part of what Shankel saw as being “a good citizen of the Department” and explains that he always enjoyed “being involved.” Shankel says that participation and “being involved” were always “important to my psychic needs.” Assisting with these chores provided Shankel with the necessary background that allowed Paretsky to feel comfortable in asking him to serve as Acting Department Chair when Paretsky was awarded a sabbatical for the 1964-1965 academic year.

Shankel does not remember his exact emotions when asked to take the acting position, but says that he probably had “some trepidations,” as he tends to “agonize” over decisions such as this. Paretsky helped to alleviate some of those concerns by providing useful advice.

Dave had given me lots of advice before he left including advice like: “Don’t hesitate to go see George Waggoner in the College if you need some help and if you are in a tight financial position and need a few dollars for something important, go see Ray Nichols. Ray has all the money in the University and if you have a real need, and you justify it well, Ray will help you if you need help.”

The Department itself was “viewed as a fairly traditionally strong department among microbiology departments at that time.” Shankel remembers that it competed well for training grants at the national level and at the National

Institutes of Health. The faculty were supported in attending the regional meetings of the American Society for Microbiology and the Department's graduate students were "winning most of the awards for graduate students at those meetings." In Shankel's opinion, the Department was "strong" and therefore his main goal was "to maintain the strength and momentum of the Department." He adds that he tried to do this by making sure "that the morale of the Department was maintained for the year" and that he did not want to do "anything that would cause David Paretsky to be upset or unhappy when he returned as Chair."

One specific challenge presented itself during the time that Shankel served as Acting Chair. He remembers that a graduate student who was "a good solid guy, but not a great intellectual student" was ready to take his oral exams and "one or two faculty members in the Department were determined to flunk him. Cora Downs, who was a senior colleague and Distinguished Professor at the University was determined that her student shouldn't flunk." Shankel says that he had "several long conversations with Dave Paretsky in Madison, Wisconsin about how I was going to resolve this dilemma." While not remembering all of the events that followed, Shankel said that the problem was resolved, and the student passed and eventually became "a very successful head at a state health laboratory."

As a new administrator, Shankel remembers resolving the differences between his colleagues was his "biggest challenge," but that he could not recall "any specific great accomplishments. I just remember that it was a generally rewarding year...I don't think there was any loss in momentum." Organizationally speaking, Shankel also contends that he did not make "much of a contribution toward changes" because "it was a good department

when I started. I think it was a good department when Dave Paretsky returned.” He gives much of the credit to maintaining stability to having a “dedicated” group of departmental secretaries and “a group of really good colleagues in the Department who were willing to pitch in and help get things done.” Personally, the administrative tasks of the Acting Chair position required “three to four hours a day on the average” in order for Shankel to give them adequate attention and as the interim period came to a close, he felt “a little more confident” that he could spend that amount of time on administrative tasks and “maintain an active teaching and research program.”

Assistant Dean/Associate Dean: College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

When Dave Paretsky returned from sabbatical leave, Shankel returned to the faculty ranks on a full-time basis. Just a few months after Paretsky’s return, George Waggoner asked to have a meeting with both Shankel and Paretsky. The purpose of the meeting was to ask if Shankel was interested in becoming an Assistant Dean in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and if Paretsky was willing to give him leave time to be a half-time administrator. Shankel remembers that it came as a “complete surprise” and that he had to think about it and counsel with “several other scientific colleagues whose judgment I valued.” He remembers that while serving as Acting Chair, he became acquainted with the Dean, the Dean’s staff, and served on several College committees. This, coupled with the Dean’s desire to “have somebody from the sciences as the Associate Dean or Assistant Dean,” led to his appointment. His colleagues agreed that it would be advantageous to have a representative from the sciences in the

Dean's office and "after a week or two, we told George Waggoner that I would be willing to come up there and work half-time in the Arts and Sciences and continue my teaching and research."

After spending three years as an Assistant Dean, Shankel was promoted to Associate Dean and given additional administrative responsibility. Shankel was placed in charge of premedical recommendations and by the last two years of his appointment, he and fellow Associate Dean, Ron Calgaard, were responsible for much of the College budget. Shankel believes the two Associate Deans were given that responsibility in an effort to allow Dean Waggoner "to do other things and to concentrate on the larger philosophical issues."

Shankel contends that he was not responsible for instigating change during his tenure in the Dean's office; nevertheless, he found himself involved in the middle of a controversial issue. The College had developed the concept of the Colleges within the College, something that Shankel believes is still a "very viable concept" and one that "had a lot of potential," but "we were never able to carry it out in the ideal way that it had been visualized." Inside the Colleges within the College structure was the Pearson Integrated Humanities Program which became a topic of great internal disagreement and debate among the faculty of the College. This disagreement was based upon the belief of some faculty that the professors in charge of the Pearson Integrated Humanities Program were unduly influencing students with their personal religious beliefs. Shankel was involved in the debates in working "as an advisor to the Dean" and in "trying to mediate some of those discussions."

Shankel views the six and one-half years that he spent in the Dean's

office as “the most crucial time” of his administrative career and says that he “learned an immense amount from working with those people.” He points to the guidance of Dean Waggoner and Frances Heller and the camaraderie of fellow Assistant and Associate Deans as having a large influence on his administrative style. Shankel also believes that “it was probably during that six or seven year period that I developed a lot of credibility with the faculty - a large segment of the faculty - the faculty within the College.” He adds, “the faculty came to believe they could count on me to do what I said I would do and fulfill my responsibilities.” He also “learned one other very important lesson from George Waggoner and that is the importance of tying your responsibility and accountability together.” Part of that responsibility was that Shankel was “expected to maintain an active research program and to maintain an active teaching program” while upholding his administrative responsibilities. He says that this may have been easier to do while serving in the Dean’s office because it,

was clearly a half-time responsibility...I think what most people end up doing is they, end up doing that half-time job in administration and then they end up doing all the other things that they were doing besides, so your full position turns out to be a one and a half-times position.

Acting Dean: College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

While Shankel was serving as an Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, George Waggoner decided to take a one year leave of absence to pursue an interest in Latin American higher education. His leave began in January of 1973 and he needed to appoint an Acting Dean. Shankel remembers that, “he decided for whatever reasons that I was that person and asked me to be Acting Dean.” Shankel adds that he

did it “partly as a favor for George Waggoner, whom I admired greatly” and “partly because I thought it would be an interesting challenge to see if I could pull it off for a year.” Shankel believes that he was prepared for the challenge because he had “learned a lot from working with George Waggoner and Frances Heller in the College” and had also “learned some things from Dave Paretsky.” He says that these lessons from Waggoner, Heller, and Paretsky “were useful to know in terms of how you provide leadership and how you develop loyalty and how you shared decision-making in appropriate ways.”

These lessons in leadership, loyalty, and shared decision-making were especially useful as Shankel was called upon to resolve the Pearson Integrated Humanities debate that continued throughout the last several years that he served in the College office. Shankel remembers that “we had great debates in the College Assembly about the future and nonfuture” of that program. He also remembers it as “a program that in many ways [was] really a superb program for students,” that introduced them to western cultures, but was “very controversial because there were a large number of faculty who believed, whether they were correct or not, believed the three professors who were running that program were using it to indoctrinate students in their Catholic faith.” Shankel maintains that, with the help of the Assembly Parliamentarian, he was able to “generally” keep the debates on a “civilized basis...without the College Assembly erupting into violence.” The Assembly promoted some “reasonable accommodations” within the program and Shankel survived his tenure as Acting Dean. Along with the Assembly Parliamentarian, Shankel also credits his survival to “the people in the office.” This included the secretarial staff and the Associate Deans. “We

formed a good working team. We had regular staff meetings with all the Associate Deans and divided up the workload and kept things going. We had a pretty decent year, I think.”

During that year as Acting Dean, Shankel continued to teach one class a semester and kept his research lab open to graduate students, but his administrative responsibilities took more time than they had in previous positions. Personally, Shankel says that he “learned to evaluate colleagues to determine which kinds of responsibilities could be assumed by which colleagues” and “to divide the workload in proportion to responsibilities according to abilities and interests.” The time spent as Acting Dean also led Shankel to think that he “really could be successful in administration at that kind of level in the University.” So when he was “offered the opportunity to become the Executive Vice Chancellor,” he says, “I was willing to take a shot at it.”

Executive Vice Chancellor: Lawrence Campus

In January of 1974, George Waggoner returned from his year of leave in Latin America and Shankel returned to his role as Associate Dean in the College. While he was serving as the Acting Dean of the College, Archie Dykes was hired as Chancellor of the University in the summer of 1973. After spending six months at the institution, the new Chancellor decided that some structural changes needed to be made to allow him to spend more time with outside constituencies, the legislature, and “do more with public refurbishing of the image of the University which was somewhat depressed at that time.” Dykes decided to create two Executive Vice Chancellor positions, one at the Medical Center and one on the Lawrence campus. The

Chancellor believed that this change would allow him to spend more time focusing on external relations and legislative issues as well as provide more structure for the Medical Center. Having worked with the new Chancellor during his first six months at the institution and having gained experience in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Shankel became a candidate for the EVC position on the Lawrence campus. Shankel says that, at that time, he had “enjoyed the leadership role” that he had as Acting Dean and felt like he “was ready to take on some additional administrative challenges.” He also “expected that George Waggoner would be the Dean of the College for the next five to ten years,” so there would be no opportunity to meet those challenges in the College office in the near future, so he “agreed to be a candidate.”

Shankel remembers that when he first met with Dykes as Acting Dean of the College, he was impressed with the goals that the new Chancellor was setting for the institution. Based upon this and subsequent meetings, he thought that the new position would be “an interesting challenge.” He adds that he took the position based upon Dykes description of his expectations for the job. “The way the position was originally designed and described to me, and the basis on which I took it, was that basically he wanted somebody to be responsible for all of the operations on the Lawrence campus.” Through his previous experiences, Shankel says that “I felt like I knew the campus reasonably well at that time.” He had worked with all of the Deans at the University as a member of the Council of Deans and had also worked with each of the Vice Chancellors. “I thought it would be a fascinating challenge to try to manage this whole enterprise. I went into it with a fair amount of excitement in taking that challenge.”

Shankel maintained the enthusiasm for the new position for the first three years that he served as Executive Vice Chancellor. "It was tremendously challenging and fascinating because the position, I think, for the first few years, really was the way I had assumed it was really going to be." During this time period, he was responsible for the "total operation on the Lawrence campus" and also "worked closely with the Chancellor." It was during this time that Shankel became familiar with areas of the University with which he previously had not had an opportunity to work. Besides learning the integral workings of Facilities Operations, the Police Department, and Student Affairs, Shankel also started to attend Board of Regents meetings and served as a "spokesman for the Lawrence campus on different issues."

One of the more significant challenges that arose during this time was the decision to create the Regents Center in Kansas City. Shankel believes that it was needed in an effort to "become more responsive to the greater Kansas City area." He remembers that many people on campus were opposed to it because it was seen as drawing resources away from the Lawrence campus. He credits Dykes with making a controversial decision, but having foresight in planning for the future as Johnson County Community College may have addressed the Kansas City need by becoming a four-year institution. Shankel notes that such a move "would have major implications for the University of Kansas." The University initially purchased "an old elementary school at 99th and Mission Road" to serve as the first Regents Center. Because neighbors were disgruntled with the prospect of having a university building in their area, Shankel and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs had to meet with neighborhood

associations, even “testified in a court case at one point,” eventually resolving the conflict. Shankel also remembers “one or two budget crises during that time period,” adding that “it seems there has been one or two in every five year period that I can remember.” This time, the crises were enhanced by increased student enrollment with which campus resources could not keep pace. Chancellor Dykes “always wanted to see more students here every year,” but more students sometimes meant reduced resources across campus.

Finally, as Executive Vice Chancellor, Shankel was responsible for organizing and supervising the beginning of women’s athletics at the University. He explains that, at the time, the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) was the parent organization to which KU Women’s Athletics belonged and which provided the University with advice concerning how other institutions were structuring women’s’ athletic departments.

For several years, at that time, we persuaded the state legislature to appropriate some special funding to help start women’s athletics. We persuaded the Student Senate to develop a special student fee for the support of women’s athletics, and we put together a budget and launched the program.

As was the case in his previous administrative positions, Shankel continued to teach and conduct research while serving as EVC. He “usually taught either a microbiology course or a biology 104 course,” but also team taught an honors section of Western Civilization. He also maintained his research lab for graduate students who, in Shankel’s words, “didn’t get quite the supervision they deserved,” but “survived.”

Midway through Shankel’s six year term as EVC, Dykes again

restructured the administration. Shankel believes that the Chancellor “began to feel that he had things going reasonably well at the Medical Center and he decided that he wanted to have more influence on some areas on the [Lawrence] campus.” A major administrative meeting was called and Dykes revealed a reorganization scheme that created several University Director positions. The University Director of Business and Finance, the University Director of Facilities Operations, and the University Director of Facilities Planning were created with responsibilities on both the Lawrence and Medical Center campuses. Shankel was told that this was done in an effort to give the Chancellor more control over the Medical Center. It was also announced that University Relations would report to the Chancellor instead of the EVC. Shankel says that this situation was a “major issue for me personally” and remembers that he sat down that night and drafted a ten page letter to the Chancellor, “telling him all the reasons why I thought the reorganization plan was a bad idea and why it did not work well for the Executive Vice Chancellor on the Lawrence campus to lose these areas of responsibility.” He received a note in response to his letter thanking him for his input, but indicating that the changes were to be implemented as planned. Shankel says, “Chancellors can do what they want to do. We went on from there. At that point I wasn’t quite as happy in my job as I had been for the first few years.”

Acting Chancellor: University of Kansas

After spending three more years as Executive Vice Chancellor, Shankel submitted his resignation in the spring of 1979. However, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs accepted the presidency of another

institution that same spring and Shankel decided that it would be in the best interest of the institution to withdraw his resignation and remain as the EVC for one more year. He then resubmitted his resignation in the fall of 1979, and was awarded a sabbatical for the following academic year to pursue research interests, but Chancellor Dykes resigned during the summer of 1980 and Shankel was eventually asked to delay taking the sabbatical. Shankel says that he was aware “that there were a number of people urging the Board of Regents to ask me to become Acting Chancellor.” Approximately one week after Dykes’ resignation, Shankel received a phone call from the Executive Officer of the Board of Regents wanting to meet with him to sign the initial agreement naming Shankel as the Acting Chancellor.

Shankel entered the position of Acting Chancellor thinking “that there were some particular areas in the University that needed attention at that time.” He believed that the faculty in general and particularly faculty in the fine arts, women, and minority faculty needed some encouragement. He also thought that the University was feeling some internal pressure because “we had put a lot of emphasis on building enrollment and increasing numbers of students” which caused some to feel “that maybe our resources were stretched a bit” and questions of state support for higher education were surfacing. Finally, with the creation of the Regents Center in Kansas City, there was now added pressure to “continue to grow that enterprise.”

Personally, Shankel says that the biggest concern he had going into the Acting Chancellorship involved the management of the Medical Center. He remembers “that while I knew a few people there, I really didn’t have much of an understanding of the big conflicts.” He adds that such a concern

was “probably well founded” as “I probably didn’t know as much as I probably should have about its operations and big complex management,” but did his best “to make sure that I had staff to keep me informed.” Shankel also lists developing relationships with key legislators and learning how to work with the Board of Regents as other major challenges during his term as Acting Chancellor.

Overseeing the Medical Center became even more cumbersome when several members of the administration in Kansas City tried “to get the Medical Center separated from the University.” Shankel remembers having to “convince” several “key legislators” that this was “a really bad idea and solutions to the Medical Center’s problems didn’t involve setting it up as a separate campus with it’s own Chancellor and President separate from the University of Kansas.” During that same year, a mentally disturbed man opened fire with a gun in the Medical Center emergency room one night and killed two people, creating a tragedy that required considerable administrative attention as well.

Shankel credits many people within his support staff with assisting him as these challenges arose. Keith Nitcher, “who worked many years as the Chancellor’s right-hand man on all sorts of financial issues and knew the University budget well and knew the State well” was “certainly a key asset” as was Shankel’s replacement as Executive Vice Chancellor, Bob Cobb, whose “knowledge and understanding of the Lawrence campus” allowed Shankel to “devote more of my psychic energy to the Medical Center.” In addition to directing energy toward solving problems at the Medical Center, Shankel was “amazed at the number and volume of social commitments that are expected from somebody who sits in the Chancellor’s position.” He

remembers that he and his wife had “social commitments on the average of four or five evenings a week,” but submits that, “adrenalin flows at a little higher level...adrenalin flows and you respond to the challenge of the position.”

Shankel dealt with the demands of the Acting Chancellorship for one year before Gene Budig was hired as the next Chancellor of the University of Kansas. Shankel says that he thought the “faculty morale was certainly better when I left the position than when I started.” He adds, “I think people generally felt that it had been a pretty good year and morale was good when I left the position. I think the University was in pretty good shape for Gene Budig to arrive and begin his term as Chancellor.” Shankel mentions that the Medical Center “weathered a couple storms,” but “was still going to require lots of attention from the new Chancellor.”

Personally, Shankel says that the experience gained as Acting Chancellor had an effect on him. “I think it changed me,” Shankel says. He missed the excitement of being involved and pursued several other presidencies. The first position of interest to Shankel was the Presidency of the University of Arizona. While Shankel was on sabbatical in Japan for four months, he was nominated for the position. The letter indicating that he was nominated was not forwarded to Japan; when he finally received it, the deadline for applications had passed by two days. He inquired to see if he could still submit his credentials, but regulations prohibited it.

Shankel was also nominated for the Presidency of the University of Colorado and was selected to interview for the position, but after doing so had some concerns about “some of the things I saw there” and withdrew his name from the pool of applicants. Finally, in the Spring of 1982 Shankel

was nominated for the Chancellorship of the University of Maryland at College Park. He was selected for an interview and was eventually offered the position. Shankel remembers that he and his wife “stayed up until about 3:00 o’clock in the morning talking about that.” They discussed “switching our kids from the Lawrence school to the College Park school where they may not be happy” and other “complications.” The next morning Shankel turned down the offer. The Board asked to visit with him one more time in an effort to convince him to take the position and the Shankels who were in College Park, traveled to Baltimore and met with the Board. When they returned, the decision was confirmed. “We came home and that was the point where we decided I would complete my career in Lawrence.”

Special Counselor to the Chancellor: University of Kansas

In the fall of 1981, Gene Budig became the fourteenth Chancellor of the University of Kansas. One of his first decisions as Chancellor was to name Shankel as Special Counselor to the Chancellor, a position that previously did not exist. Shankel explains, “It was something that Gene Budig asked me to do when he arrived, and it is something that I enjoy doing very much, and it kept me a little bit involved in what was going on in the institution.” As Shankel implies in this statement, he was able to teach and conduct research as a full-time faculty member and still retain a degree of involvement in the administration of the University. He maintained an office space in the Chancellor’s suite, attended various administrative meetings, and met once a week with the Chancellor to discuss issues of relative importance.

Early in Budig’s tenure, Shankel’s role as Special Counselor was

significant because he was able to “provide some valuable insights...about the history and traditions of the University and about how the University was operating.” By attending the various administrative meetings and maintaining contact with the other administrators in Strong Hall, Shankel was able to keep abreast of the innerworkings of the administration and share his thoughts with the Chancellor. This eventually proved to be an asset to Budig and his organizational structure, in that he developed a pattern of asking Shankel to serve in interim capacities when high ranking positions within that structure were vacated. In Shankel's words, “It's not as if he suddenly summoned me there from the depths,” when Budig called him to his office to serve in yet another interim capacity. One colleague credits Budig with having the foresight to create such a position for Shankel and the most current Chancellor with the insight to continue the practice.

Having observed administrators over the years, not every administrator could be comfortable in doing that. Because they might feel that they would constantly be upstaged, or second guessed by a person who'd been in that role and who knew the institution so well. It was very clever of Gene and intelligent, I think, of Chancellor Hemenway to continue this practice, to keep him in a role where he could be called upon for advice or counsel where he doesn't have a specific, most of the time anyway, doesn't have a specific administrative role to play, but can do special projects and stuff....And who has that breadth of experience? (P135-136)

The same colleague adds that, “It's not a position that you would have unless you had a person who was suitable for fulfilling that. It's not a position you set up out of nowhere and say, ‘I think I will recruit for a Special Counselor to the Chancellor.’” The position was created to take advantage of Shankel's individual experience and abilities. The experience and insights served Budig first as a window to the past and then as a keyhole to

the culture of the institution. Later, Budig would benefit organizationally from having an individual as a part of his staff that could move in and out of almost any administrative position without disturbing the administrative structure of the institution, or the momentum of the unit that he was charged with overseeing.

Acting Director of Athletics: University of Kansas

In August of 1981, Shankel finished serving as Acting Chancellor and was on a four month sabbatical in Japan. While Shankel was away, the University's football team had a winning season and was invited to the Hall of Fame Bowl. When Shankel returned from Japan and Gene Budig returned from the bowl game in late December, Budig asked Shankel, who was now Special Counselor to the Chancellor, to "come in for a cup of coffee the next morning." When they met, Budig indicated that the Athletic Director had resigned to accept a position at the University of South Carolina and Budig asked Shankel to be Acting Athletic Director "for a short time while we had a search and found a new Athletic Director." Shankel says that his first reaction was one of surprise as the position "had never been anywhere near my career plans." Budig explained that he thought Shankel made a good choice because he had always been interested in athletics, had overseen the initiation and implementation of the women's athletic program, and "he felt like I knew most of the people down in the Athletic Department and said I would have some credibility there."

Shankel was concerned that he would not be able to maintain the "kind of fundraising efforts that an Athletic Director is normally responsible for" and continue to "teach my classes on a regular basis and work with my

students each day.” Chancellor Budig and Shankel eventually agreed that he would become Acting Athletic Director on a half-time basis and he,

would continue to do my teaching and research which I was very heavily involved in and committed to, but I would spend at least every afternoon over in the Athletic Department and I would have Athletic Department staff meetings and keep the Department together, until we hired a new Athletics Director.

Shankel says that one of his primary goals during this time period was “to maintain the morale of the Athletic Department at that time.” He explains, “They had just been jilted by an AD that they liked and respected...there was some feeling of loss and I felt I needed to do things that would rebuild morale and enable them to feel valued in the University community.” By community, Shankel meant that he wanted “to give coaches and the athletes and the staff a feeling that there was somebody in the University who cared about them.” In trying to create this atmosphere Shankel intended to reinforce the notion that “we were going to continue to support a strong athletics program. That we were going to try and do things ethically and honestly and still be successful, which I think, is always a major complication as an Athletic Director.”

At the end of a three and one-half month time period, the University hired an Athletic Director by the name of Jim Lessig, a person Shankel describes as “someone we thought would be an absolutely sensational Athletic Director.” Lessig had experience as a director of an alumni association, had worked for a university endowment association, and had been the Director of Athletics at Bowling Green University in addition to working as a broadcaster for professional athletics. After serving six months as the Athletic Director at Kansas, Lessig resigned to become the

Commissioner of the Mid-American Conference. Budig responded by asking Shankel to serve as Acting Athletic Director one more time with the promise that it would be a short appointment. Shankel agreed to do it and served as AD for another one and one-half months.

During both stints as Acting AD, the morale situation was of utmost importance to Shankel. He says that "the program was in reasonably good shape," but the inadequacy of facilities was an issue that created a scheduling challenge. Trying to accommodate two basketball programs and many other sports with one field house required spending "a lot of time working on and settling differences of opinion about who got what when." Shankel again credits his staff with assisting him through this period of transition, saying that knowing who could help in any given situation and being able to contact them was his biggest asset as Acting AD. Having worked with Budig "for a number of years," Shankel "had good access to him" as well as "all the key administrators" and did his best to "represent the interests of the Athletic Program" to these individuals.

In reflection, Shankel maintains that his greatest accomplishment in the Athletic Department was,

maintaining the morale of the staff and probably improving it from what it was when I came in, as they were a little bit demoralized about losing their leadership. I think they felt pretty good again when I came and when I left both times.

He also says that he did not impact the organization "in any dramatic way," but "that there may have developed a little better understanding between Athletic Department staff and faculty as a result of the time I spent in that office." While serving as Acting AD, Shankel tried to "convey to the Athletic Department staff what some of the major faculty concerns [were]." He also

tried “to reflect to faculty...some of the complexities and competing demands that impinge on coaches and athletes and athletic departments.” He not only tried to communicate these issues to others, but says that he individually gained “additional understanding of the complexities of a major intercollegiate athletic program and the kinds of pressures that the Athletic Director is subjected to from constituencies of various types.”

Acting Vice Chancellor: Academic Affairs

After serving as Acting Athletic Director on two separate occasions in one academic year, Shankel again focused his attention on teaching and research in the Department of Microbiology. He was not called upon to serve in any other official administrative capacity for approximately three and one-half years, but as Special Counselor to the Chancellor, he was able to stay in touch with the administrative pulse of the institution. In December of 1985, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs resigned her position at the University and Budig once again asked Shankel to serve in an interim capacity. Shankel says,

My initial thoughts, I suppose, were that there was a good staff in there. That there were good people who had helped keep the place going and I had developed so much respect and affection for Gene Budig at that point, that if he wanted me to do it, I was willing to do it.

Shankel's role as Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs “was very similar to the other relatively short time interim and acting positions that I had.” He felt that he had “a good group of Deans who were responsible for coordinating the academic programs in their schools” so Shankel believed his “job was to keep the office together, keep morale up as much as possible

in the interim situation, keep the momentum of the office” and “make the hard decisions that had to be made.” He qualifies this last statement by saying that, while he had to make some hard decisions, his goal was to “try not to make too many long-term commitments that would bind my successor.”

Shankel also believes that the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is in a unique and important position as it is “the position in the University that deals most directly with faculty and faculty concerns.” Promotions, sabbaticals, and money allocations to academic divisions are some of the concerns Shankel lists. He adds that “credibility in that particular office is probably especially important” in a university such as the University of Kansas, where a great deal of emphasis is placed on “faculty participation in governance.” Shankel believes that this need for credibility actually helped him be successful in his interim role as Acting Vice Chancellor.

One of the greatest assets that I had in that position and that I've had in positions since then is that I think I have a fair amount of credibility around the campus. I think most people, with a few exceptions, believe that I'm really interested in the welfare of the University; that I won't make any decisions that I think will damage the University. That I'm committed both emotionally and intellectually to the welfare of the University, and consequently, I think in most areas of the University I have good credibility and that's probably the greatest asset I had moving into that position and other short-term positions subsequent to that.

While serving as Acting Vice Chancellor, Shankel did not create “any dramatic differences in the position,” but feels that Academic Affairs maintained its momentum and “didn't suffer any credibility damage.” He refers to it as a “relatively calm period” and says that the major achievement was “putting together budgetary requests for the Academic Affairs areas for the upcoming fiscal year which would have begun on July 1, 1986 and

allocating the resources that came to the Academic Affairs area in approximately April of 1986.” Shankel maintains that he learned something in each of his interim positions, or as he puts it, “I certainly came away from all these experiences having learned some things.” The role as Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs broadened his perspective of the institution and taught him “a lot more about the needs and goals and aspirations of the academic units of the University.”

Acting Executive Vice Chancellor: Lawrence Campus

Following the six month period as Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Shankel returned to the Department of Microbiology and to his role as Special Counselor thinking that he had completed his time as an administrator.

I said at that point that was it. That was the end of it. Then in about December of 1986, Bob Cobb [who] had been my successor as Executive Vice Chancellor decided that he had done that job as long as he wanted to and I think, philosophically, Bob had kind of come to the point where he felt like the University maybe ought to abolish the job of Executive Vice Chancellor.

Dr. Cobb submitted his resignation at that time and Chancellor Budig approached Shankel about returning to his former position as Executive Vice Chancellor. Cobb replaced Shankel as EVC and now Shankel stepped in as Cobb’s interim replacement, a situation that Shankel describes as “quite comfortable.”

I felt comfortable with the working relationship I had with the Chancellor. Which I think is a critical relationship for that office, because more than any other office, that office interacts directly with the Chancellor and so it was important to have a comfortable feeling about that relationship, and I did.

Not only did Shankel feel comfortable in his working relationship with Chancellor Budig, but also refers to him as a “good friend.” This added to the working relationship as Shankel remembers that he,

felt very comfortable working there and going across the hall to talk to him when I had questions, or problems, and he felt very comfortable coming over and stopping into my office whenever there was something he wanted to talk about, or that he thought we needed to chat about.

Shankel recalls that as “permanent EVC I had a lot of goals for the office and goals for the University,” whereas in the acting EVC role he “didn’t have any long-range goals.” He anticipated that it would be about a six month appointment, so long-range goals were not among his objectives. Instead, Shankel says that he “tried to support the Vice Chancellors who were working with me at that time” because he believed that they were “good people who had the University’s best interest at heart.” Shankel specifically saw himself “serving in the coordinating role for the campus and making sure that things continued to move, and that we kept moving as a team to accomplish the University’s goals that the Chancellor had established during that time period.” That time period was one in which Chancellor Budig was “beginning to plan for Campaign Kansas,” the largest fund-raising effort in the history of the institution. “That was going to occupy a lot of Gene Budig’s time” and Shankel feels that he “was able to fill a valuable role” because Budig “placed a lot of confidence in my judgment.” Shankel and the Vice Chancellors carried on the decision-making process required by the leadership at that time, checking in with Budig “on the major decisions.” Organizationally, Shankel says that he did not make “any dramatic or undramatic changes” because he thought that the office staff and

the Vice Chancellors were “a good group.” As he finished his interim appointment, he suggested to Gene Budig that “as the new Executive Vice Chancellor came and as he became more comfortable with that person, it might be more appropriate to give that office more financial responsibility than it had in the last two years.”

Executive Vice Chancellor: Lawrence Campus

Shankel left his permanent appointment in the EVC position in 1980 having lost some of the enthusiasm with which he had started the position. This was due in large part to changes within the administrative structure implemented midway through his tenure. Shankel's successor also left the position with some reservations as to its role within the organizational structure of the institution. When Shankel finished his term as Acting EVC, he recommended some possible changes that might make the position more effective in the future. In addition to these recommendations, Shankel also learned “that I enjoyed working that six months with Gene Budig more than I enjoyed my last couple in that office just before I left the first time...When I left that office in 1980, I was probably somewhat burned out after six and one-half years.” He continues, “When I came back into it in 1987, it was kind of fun to do it again, especially knowing it was for just a short time.”

Following his interim appointment as EVC, Shankel focused his attention once again on faculty life and serving as the Special Counselor. Three years later, following the resignation of another Executive Vice Chancellor, Budig approached Shankel about serving in an acting capacity and he once again accepted. Shankel remembers that when he and Budig first discussed the position, it was to be on a one year appointment.

However, shortly after entering the position, Budig told Shankel he wanted Del to serve as the Executive Vice Chancellor for two years, rather than as an Acting EVC for a shorter period of time. "So I quickly removed acting in front of my title and my correspondence and agreed to it for a two year period. I think in my mind it quickly turned into a regular two year position" and he continued conducting the affairs of the position as he did on two previous occasions in his professional life.

Chancellor: University of Kansas

In the spring of 1994, the Chancellor confided in Shankel that he was interested in taking a position with the American League of Major League Baseball and that if he decided to take the position, he wanted to recommend Shankel as his interim successor.

At the time of these conversations, Shankel recalls that "[I] wasn't particularly looking for anything along that line in that stage of my life," and kept "suggesting other people" who were qualified for the position.

But [Budig] kept trying to convince me that I would be the best person to continue some of the initiatives that he had gotten started during his years as Chancellor, that I understood what his goals were for the University and he would really like to recommend to the Board of Regents that I be appointed if this happened.

Shankel eventually agreed that if Budig chose to leave and the Board of Regents selected him as the person to serve as Acting Chancellor, he would do it. He also believed that the task might not be as difficult as it was the first time he served as Acting Chancellor. Toward this end, Shankel asked for two prerequisites if he were to take the position. First, he asked that his family not have to move into the Chancellor's residence and second, he

wanted no restrictions with respect to his ability to make personnel changes. “[The Board] said, we just want you to be Chancellor of the University and you don’t have to live in the residence. They gave me what I thought was a very generous salary. I agreed to do it.”

Organizationally, Shankel says that he “felt like faculty morale was pretty good” at the time that Budig considered leaving. He also thought that “most of the faculty believed that the administration was working toward the same goals that the faculty had.” Shankel remembers that “we had some reasonably decent years with the Legislature” and he felt that the Medical Center “was in better shape than it had been before.” Personally, Shankel says he,

had been through it once. I knew how to touch some of the bases and a little bit about how to go about the job, I thought. Plus, I’d had the advantage of watching Gene Budig in the job for thirteen years and following his career fairly closely.

Based upon these organizational factors and personal reasoning, Shankel entered the position feeling “fairly comfortable” about his “ability to assume it and continue the initiatives that Gene had gotten started.”

As Special Counselor to the Chancellor, Shankel was well aware of the initiatives that Chancellor Budig had underway. Shankel says that the administration was dealing with several issues coming “to fruition at the Regents’ meeting” in the Spring of 1994. In these meetings, the concept of linear tuition and tuition accountability were identified as items of utmost interest to the University of Kansas. The University and the Regent System had also been through the process of Program Review within the last few years and had “one more year of reallocation of funds resulting from Program Review.” Shankel says, “Those were some of the major initiatives

that I wanted to see carried through” as Acting Chancellor. He also “wanted to make sure whoever came in at that time gave appropriate recognition to Gene Budig for what he had accomplished during the time he was here.”

Shankel translated many of these initiatives into personal and institutional goals for his interim tenure.

Some of the goals I had for the year were to just continue to work on tuition accountability, to continue endowment fundraising at a reasonably successful level, to continue to move toward the linear tuition concept, to make sure people didn't forget the great job that Gene Budig had done for 13 years, to try to keep the Medical Center on course, to persuade the GTA's not to unionize.

In reflecting on those goals, Shankel says, “Overall, I think the year was a very good year and a very productive year.” He maintains that “morale on campus had been pretty good during the year,” but that this was hurt toward the end of the year “when the Legislature actually had to take some kind of serious budget measures.” He says “That was my perception, anyway, that people were feeling good about the University.” He lists several accomplishments contributing toward a productive year:

I think we got the enrollment decline turned around a little bit...we had a reasonably good year at the Medical Center...the hospital will finish the year in the black and make money for the State...I thought that we had some good student achievements during the year. We had two Truman Scholars and two other students got major awards. The athletic program continues to operate in a very sound manner...I think the Alumni Association had a good year. I think students in general felt like the year had gone pretty well...I think another thing that we accomplished was we worked fairly effectively with Kansas State University.

Shankel says that he and the President of Kansas State, “had a good working relationship” and combined efforts in moving toward linear tuition and tuition accountability as well as “trying to get the legislature to reduce

the magnitude of the cuts in higher education.” Finally, Shankel says that the University was able to bring Gene Budig “back on campus a couple times and he received some appropriate recognition.” However, amongst the accomplishments, Shankel lists “three major disappointments” which were “one, the legislative action cutting as much as they did; two, the results of the GTA election; and three, the necessity of closing the Heart Transplant Program at the Medical Center.”

Within the constructs of Acting Chancellor, Shankel attempted to curb the enrollment decline, stave off major budget cuts, convince the GTA’s not to unionize, convert to a linear tuition model with the acquisition of tuition accountability, and maintain the morale of the University community. Shankel says that the position did not change much while he was working toward these goals because he “had so much respect and admiration for Gene Budig” that he made a decision at the beginning of his tenure not to make changes that would be “different from Gene’s.”

I had made the conscious decision that I wasn’t going to do anything during my term in that office that would kind of denigrate the things that Gene had done, or indicate that I had major disagreements with the way he had done things in that office. I think it was a very conscious, deliberate decision not to make major changes.

During the approximately ten months of his appointment, Shankel had a personal goal “to continue to do some teaching” and he taught “about two-thirds of the introductory microbiology class, Principles of Microbiology, each semester.” He says that he did it for two reasons.

One is that I really enjoy teaching and I would have missed the interaction with students if I hadn’t had that. Second reason, really was that there had been a fair amount of discussion among the Legislature and Regents about the University not paying enough attention to undergraduate teaching and I

thought it would be really useful if I personally demonstrated that we are concerned about undergraduate education and that administrators teach, and research distinguished professors teach, and everybody is involved with the process.

In trying to maintain the responsibilities of an Acting Chancellor and continue to teach, Shankel says he “did a little better job this time of pacing” and making sure he got a “reasonable amount of rest each night.” Toward the end of the ten month term on April 20, 1995, he was rewarded with a special honor by the Board of Regents. In a University student newspaper article, reporter Teresa Veazey (1995) wrote of the occasion:

With an outpouring of support, the Board of Regents voted unanimously yesterday to remove the word “interim” from Del Shankel’s title of interim chancellor.

Shankel, professor of microbiology, was named the 15th chancellor of the University of Kansas and will hold the job until Robert Hemenway takes over in June.

Once the Regents meeting began, a motion was made to add Shankel’s title change to the agenda. Although most people expected the title change, Shankel was pleasantly surprised.

His voice choked with emotion as he expressed his appreciation.

“Thank you very much from the bottom of my heart,” Shankel said, on the verge of tears.

He received a standing ovation.

Summary

Not all interim leaders are alike, or cut from the same mold. It was the purpose of this study to delve into the experiences of one individual who repeatedly served in interim capacities. Prior to engaging in a discussion of leadership and interim leadership, it was first necessary to provide the reader with a brief synopsis of that individual’s life. Without this synopsis, the picture would be incomplete and discussion would lose a sense of

perspective and relevance. The story, in and of itself, provides the reader with insight into who Del Shankel is as an individual. The reader gains insight into what affected or influenced Shankel in the past that directed him toward a life of education, educational leadership, and more specifically, interim positions of educational leadership.

The brief sketch of Del Shankel's life provides a context for the remainder of this study as it attempts to look at the professional experiences of an interim leader. That context includes a family history heavily laden with an emphasis on education. The impact of having an educator for a father who also served as President of a Canadian junior college cannot be underestimated. Shankel's childhood, the influence of his parents and relatives, a childhood disease coupled with the importance of the family doctor are just some of the significant contributing factors to the development of his personality and character. The education that he received in the Canadian system coupled with his father's independent educational beliefs contributed to an educational experience that might be considered unique in comparison to that of American children of his generation. One must also consider the role of the church and its impact on Shankel's education and home life. The schools that he attended from grade school through college were all church affiliated. His father, relatives, and brother were all employed in educational or ministerial roles associated with the church. Another influence that is repeatedly mentioned throughout the story of Del Shankel's life is his continued respect and admiration for teachers. The leadership roles that Shankel found himself in as a high school and college student both in and out of the classroom may be especially significant to this study. The role of sports contributed to the development of his personality

and to his continued support of intercollegiate athletics throughout his professional career. The fact that he played in the high school and college orchestra provides a contrast to the athletic facet of his youth and continues to be displayed in his eclectic appetite for University events. His love for reading, his family background, his leadership experiences, and his varied interests may have all pointed to a career in education. The early teaching opportunities presented to him in college, in the army, and at San Antonio Junior College reinforced this affinity for a professional career in education.

In looking specifically at the interim leadership aspect of Shankel's life, several significant factors emerge from the story. His willingness to accept positions of less than permanent tenure and to do so with little hesitation may be the most significant factor of all. On two occasions this willingness to accept additional responsibility led to future permanent administrative positions that were of higher rank than former interim positions. This was the case in the permanent appointment as Assistant Dean of the College and his first appointment as Executive Vice Chancellor of the Lawrence Campus. Shankel's spirit of participation may have something to do with the eclectic experiences of his childhood education, the leadership roles that he experienced as an athlete and class officer, his heavy involvement as a college undergraduate, or the tutelage of his professors at the University of Texas. Shankel's commitment to teaching and research while serving in the various administrative capacities as well as his loyalty to the University itself are also factors within his professional life that may have contributed to repeated interim appointments. Finally, his role as Special Counselor to the Chancellor is a factor that must be considered when one reads the story of Shankel's path of interim

leadership. As Special Counselor, Shankel kept abreast of the administrative decisions central to the University while maintaining a full-time faculty appointment. From this vantage point, the Chancellor was able to appoint him to interim leadership positions without significantly altering the structure of the administration or upsetting the momentum of the unit in need of leadership.

Chapter V

Career Path

As is the case with any story of one individual's life, the professional career of Del Shankel is unique unto itself. The previous section provided the reader with a brief biographical sketch of that life in an attempt to provide a context for a discussion of interim leadership as it was experienced by one individual. This chapter begins with an in-depth discussion of his experience and narrows the focus of the manuscript to the central topic of interim leadership. With the general outline of that career presented, certain details now must be examined and discussed that provide insight into the way in which Del Shankel emerged as an interim leader. An examination of these points may provide the initial step in theorizing about how other interim leaders emerge in higher education. The details which follow pertain specifically to points in Del Shankel's career that were determined to have significantly impacted Shankel's administrative career path and led to his continual emergence in interim positions of leadership at the University of Kansas.

A Review of the Positions

Del Shankel started his professional career as an assistant professor of microbiology in 1959 and spent the next five years working toward tenure, which was awarded in 1964. The traditional path to an administrative position within the academic sector includes the acquisition of tenure. The awarding of tenure could be viewed as the first significant turning point in the professional administrative career of Dr. Shankel. It is also important to note

that Dr. Shankel's discipline was located in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and referred to as a traditional academic field. His role as a professor within a traditional academic field is one that Dr. Shankel believes gave him some degree of credibility with the faculty. When asked if other faculty think about or value such a role, he elaborated:

I'm sure they do whether they do it consciously in thinking about it, or whether it's a subconscious feeling that "he can't be so bad after all. He's sort of one of us." It may be just subconscious, I'm not sure. It's a result of a thought process, but I think subconsciously the faculty have always felt that I continued to function as a faculty member, and be a faculty member, and that was undoubtedly helpful.

From his role as a microbiology faculty member, Shankel was able to launch a career in university administration. Not only did Shankel hold seven interim appointments at the University of Kansas, but he also served in six permanent administrative positions. The time served in interim positions totals approximately six years of service to the institution and a compilation of the years served in both permanent and interim administrative capacities totals twenty-one years of service as an administrator at the University of Kansas. The progression that Shankel followed through these positions, both permanent and interim, is a path of increased responsibility and broadened experience. While not all positions would be considered a move up in the administrative hierarchy, all appointments were within the ranks of senior administration and maintained at least an equivalent level of responsibility. (See Table of Positions)

Turning Points

While each of the leadership positions is important in its own right, it appears that several represent what might be called turning points in the professional career of Del Shankel. This is not to say that each position did not represent a significant time in the life of Del Shankel, nor is it to diminish the contribution that he made to the institution in each role. Rather, it appears that certain experiences or decisions that were made while in particular positions, or at particular points in his career, had significant impact on the emergence of Shankel's unique career path.

It was noted that the acquisition of tenure in a traditional field may be considered the first of such turning points. The second point of significance was the decision to accept a first administrative appointment as Acting Chair of the Department of Microbiology. Shankel remembers this move as simply "part of being a good citizen of the Department to do it when I was asked to." On the other hand, just as he likely would not have the opportunity to accept an advanced academic administrative position without the acquisition of tenure, neither would he likely be singled out as a candidate for an Assistant Dean position had he not accepted the challenge of serving as an Interim Department Chair. In reflecting on the life or career of an individual, one decision seems to lead to another, yet at the time that the decisions are made, they are not often made with the end result in mind. In reflection, agreeing to serve as Acting Chair can be viewed as a critical move in the professional career of Del Shankel and yet at the time, he saw the decision as "being a good citizen," thinking this was something that he would do for one year and then return to his role as an Associate Professor in hopes of becoming a full Professor.

The next significant turning point in Shankel's administrative career was predicated upon his performance as the Acting Chair of Microbiology. George Waggoner, the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences approached Shankel and Dave Paretsky, Chair of Microbiology, about the feasibility of Shankel becoming an Assistant Dean shortly after his return to full-time faculty life. Following some reflection, Shankel accepted the position and spent the next six years serving as an Assistant and Associate Dean in the College administrative office. More than holding the positions themselves, the aspect that qualifies this time period as a turning point is the experience that was gained in these positions. According to Shankel, the experience was especially significant in two ways. First, because of the diversity of curriculum that exists within a college of arts and sciences, an administrator at this level is able to experience the "whole gamut of problems" that one might later experience as an administrator at the university level. Shankel indicated that there were some similarities between the social sciences in the College and the Schools of Education and Social Welfare at the University level. He also compared the needs of the humanities to the Schools of Fine Arts and Journalism, and the concerns of the natural sciences with those of the Schools of Engineering and Pharmacy. "I think spending a period of time in an administrative position in the College of Arts and Sciences is really a great training ground for someone because you do encounter the whole range of problems that you're likely to encounter." By interacting with the various disciplines housed in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Shankel believes that he became accustomed to dealing with diverse faculty, students, and issues. This experience was valuable to him as senior administrator at the

University level when he had to be responsive to even broader constituencies.

Not only did Shankel consider these six years of exposure to the extensive curriculum of the College to be an asset, he refers to it as “the most crucial time” in the development of his professional career. He considers this to be such an important time because of the training that he received through the exposure to different departments and faculty concerns. In addition to his individual responsibilities and learning experiences, the mentoring that he received at the hands of George Waggoner and Frances Heller, as well as his fellow colleagues who also served as Assistant and Associate Deans, added to his development as an administrator. It was during this time that he learned how to juggle half-time administrative responsibilities with “an active research” and “active teaching program,” which ultimately resulted in time consumption that would be comparable to a “one and one-half times position.”

The second reason that the years spent in the College office were so crucial was that Shankel believes this was the time period in which he established his credibility with the faculty that aided him throughout the remainder of his professional administrative career.

I think it was probably during that six or seven year period that I developed a lot of credibility with the faculty - a large segment of the faculty - the faculty in the College and the faculty in other schools that I had an opportunity to work with. They came to believe they could count on me to do what I said I would do and to fulfill my responsibilities. So I think that was important and I suspect that was a time period when I learned one other very important lesson from George Waggoner and that is the importance of tying your responsibility and accountability together.

The next significant turning point in that administrative career occurred during Shankel's appointment as the Acting Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Again, the appointment was not as significant as what transpired while he was in the position. During this time period, Shankel developed confidence as a leader and started to look upward in the administrative hierarchy for future positions. This confidence was exhibited in his decision to apply for the Executive Vice Chancellor position created under the direction of newly appointed Chancellor Archie Dykes.

I was asked by a number of people to be a candidate for that position, and I thought about it, and decided it would be an interesting challenge. As much as I had enjoyed working with George [Waggoner], I guess I developed enough confidence during that year as Acting Dean that I felt maybe I could handle this. So I agreed to be a candidate for it and ended up getting selected.

The year as Acting Dean and the confidence gained in that time led Shankel to think that, "I really could be successful in administration at that kind of level in the University" and when the opportunity arose he was "willing to take a shot at it." His appointment as Executive Vice Chancellor mirrored an earlier experience wherein Shankel served in an interim capacity, stepped down when the full-time administrator returned from sabbatical, and was then appointed to a more senior administrative capacity.

The culmination of his experience as the first Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) of the Lawrence Campus represents a fifth turning point in the professional life of Del Shankel. Shankel enjoyed his first three years EVC, but following an administrative overhaul by Chancellor Dykes in 1977, his role as EVC became less rewarding. In reflecting how he felt when he left the office after serving as EVC for six and one-half years Shankel said, "I

was probably somewhat burned out.” The significance here is that for the first time in his career, Shankel decided to leave a full-time administrative appointment and go on a one year sabbatical leave with no definite plans to re-enter administrative work, and with no way of knowing that his administrative career was far from over.

The initial resignation from the EVC position was submitted in the spring of 1979, but the resignation of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs caused Shankel to withdraw his own resignation for a year so as to maintain stability within the administrative structure. Shankel's resignation became effective for the summer of 1980 and a sabbatical was awarded for the 1980-1981 academic year. Instead of going on sabbatical, the resignation of Chancellor Dykes resulted in Shankel being awarded his first Acting Chancellorship. Once again, while an Acting Chancellorship is significant in itself, the true turning point of this period is that Shankel gained enough confidence in his abilities to lead a major university that once the Acting Chancellorship was completed, he sought the presidency of several other institutions.

I think it changed me. I was glad I had the experience. I felt like I had done it reasonably well. After being gone on sabbatical - I went on sabbatical for the fall semester - decided that maybe I kind of missed some of the excitement of being involved in everything, being a critical participant in everything, and decided to look at two or three other administrative positions. The top job here was filled here very well, I thought, and so I did look at three other positions during the next couple years after that.

This decision to seek other positions directly led to the seventh turning point in Shankel's career. As part of the search process, Shankel was offered the Chancellorship at the University of Maryland College Park. He originally

declined the offer, but agreed to visit the campus a second time for further negotiation. Following the return trip, the Shankels stood firm in their decision not to accept the position. "We came home and that was the point where we decided I would complete my career in Lawrence." While the decision to turn down the Chancellorship of another major university and the decision to stay at the University of Kansas for the rest of his professional life may be viewed as two separate decisions, Shankel speaks of them in conjunction with one another. As he tells the story of the decision to not accept the Chancellorship, it becomes clear that Shankel also reached a point cognitively where he would no longer seek administrative positions at other institutions. This provided the groundwork for allowing the story of Del Shankel's career to unfold in a unique manner and may be the most significant turning point in Del Shankel's career.

I decided I wasn't going to be a candidate for any positions after that. We were quite happy here and I was probably reaching the age where if they were looking for people like that, at that time, weren't going to look at somebody beyond my age as a chancellor or presidential candidate. So we just decided, "That's it." We made that decision. We were going to complete our career in Lawrence.

In eliminating the possibility of seeking administrative positions at other institutions, however, Shankel did not close the door to possibilities of gaining further administrative positions at the University of Kansas.

Chancellor Budig was the man most responsible for Del Shankel emerging as interim leader on so many occasions. In the fall of 1981, immediately following Shankel's first Interim Chancellorship and as Gene Budig became the fourteenth Chancellor of the University of Kansas, Budig appointed Shankel as Special Counselor to the Chancellor. This position

allowed Shankel to return to his role as a full-time faculty member and yet provided office space for him in the Chancellor's suite where he was able to stay close to the heartbeat of the administrative operation and have easy access to the Chancellor. Within this role, Shankel met with Chancellor Budig on a weekly basis for an hour or more to "talk about whatever was on his mind and whatever I could tell him that might be useful."

It was something that Gene Budig asked me to do when he arrived and it was something I enjoyed very much doing and it kept me a little bit involved in what was going on in the institution. I think I was able to provide some valuable insights for Gene, at least initially, about the history and traditions of the University and how the University is operated. So it was something I enjoyed doing and hope he found useful.

This provided for continual communication between Shankel and Budig, and also allowed Del to, "still have some involvement and keep up with what was going on" as he sat in on administrative meetings and remained in touch with the actions of the State Board of Regents. It was also from this role that Budig repeatedly summoned Shankel to serve in five interim capacities and one two-year permanent stint as Executive Vice Chancellor. The Special Counselor role "enabled me to stay involved and knowledgeable and that was very important in being able to step into those other roles periodically." Therefore, the decision to stay at the University of Kansas followed by an appointment as Special Counselor to the Chancellor set in motion a chain of events that allowed Del Shankel to repeatedly emerge as an interim leader.

This chain of events was not without a foundation that was laid by a previous set of circumstances, or turning points, that occurred earlier in the professional life of Del Shankel. The acquisition of tenure, followed by

serving as Acting Department Chair may be seen as the earliest turning points. Six and one-half years as Assistant Dean and Associate Dean in the College considered by Del to be the “crucial years” in his professional life and a year as Acting Dean gave him the confidence to aspire to further administrative posts at the university level. A decision to resign as Executive Vice Chancellor provided the Board of Regents with an opportunity to name an experienced senior administrator as Interim Chancellor without upsetting the structure of the current administration. These turning points created a foundation of experience upon which the rest of Del Shankel’s leadership career could be built. The decision to stay at the University of Kansas and the appointment as Special Counselor to the Chancellor completed the scenario that allowed for Shankel’s continued appointments to interim leadership positions.

Attributes

In studying the concept of interim leadership as it was experienced by one individual, it is necessary to study that individual. This was done by providing the reader with a biographical sketch of Del Shankel’s life, emphasizing his professional life. The focus on his professional life was further emphasized by discussing specific turning points in his career that were critical to his repeated emergence as an interim leader. These turning points will continue to be addressed throughout the manuscript, but in analyzing the career path of an individual, one must also take a closer look at that individual’s personal attributes that contributed to the development of a particular career path. In essence, what characteristics or attributes contribute to the emergence of an interim leader? A review of the

professional life of Del Shankel uncovers several themes which then allow for a conceptualization of how certain attributes and/or characteristics lent themselves to his development as a leader and as an interim leader.

Faculty Credibility

After an in-depth review of Del Shankel's professional life and careful consideration of the many qualities others attributed to him in the course of this study, one particular characteristic stands out as the most identifiable contributor to the development of Del Shankel's career as an interim leader. His credibility as a faculty member as well as his credibility with other faculty members appears to be a resounding theme in his own professional life and in the perspectives of others. This credibility appears to be the result of a combination of his commitment to teaching and research, and a perceived personal honesty and trustworthiness.

A commitment to teaching and research, or what one might call the traditional faculty role, is an important and interesting factor in the public and university persona of Del Shankel. Throughout the interviews, he would refer to credibility with the faculty as an asset, particularly in his role as Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. He defines credibility as having,

a history and a tradition and a reputation of treating people fairly, responding honestly to questions, trying to act always in the best interest of the University and being perceived as having acted according to your abilities, anyway, in the best interest of the University and I think that's what it leads to - credibility. People know they can believe what you say. You say you will do something, you do it, and to an obligation you fulfill that obligation, and you're going to work primarily for the betterment of the University and not for any personal agenda that you might or might not have.

I tried very hard to maintain credibility just by following those basic principles. If I made a commitment, I would try very hard to fulfill that commitment. I tried never to say something that I didn't believe was true. I tried to always act, in what I perceived to be, the best interest of the University. At least the people could differ about whether it was in the best interest of the University, but if I did it, I did it because I believed it was in the best interest of the University.

Shankel's career path reveals three elements that support this trait. First, Shankel continued to teach undergraduate courses and maintain a graduate research lab throughout his entire professional life, including the periods served in administration.

I always continued to teach during my administrative positions. Always continued to have a lab and graduate students...meant that switching back to a faculty role, I had credibility with my colleagues in the faculty. They generally accepted me back in that kind of role. For example, I was frequently, during those terms when I was not in some administrative position, I was urged to run [as] a candidate for the Senate or asked to serve on various Senate committees and things. And so I think the fact that I continued to function like a faculty member, in many respects, made it relatively easy to transition back into the faculty in between administrative positions.

Second, because he maintained his teaching and research lab, the University community may have viewed him as a faculty member who was called upon to represent them within the administration from time to time as opposed to one who had left the faculty role to pursue administration as a career. Shankel attributes much of the credibility that he gained among the faculty to his years as an Assistant and Associate Dean in the College. Colleagues seemed to agree that much of this faculty credibility was tied to the fact that he continued to behave as a faculty member throughout each administrative appointment. As noted, in his thirty-seven year career at the University of Kansas, Del Shankel spent twenty-one years in his interim and

permanent administrative capacities. In most instances, someone who spent this much time in administrative positions would be regarded primarily as an administrator. One faculty colleague, who also served in administrative capacities, describes why this might not have been the case with respect to Del Shankel.

I think the fact that he has been able to teach at the freshman and sophomore level all the time that he has, and he's also had graduate students, I think that is hard to do because most people don't know how demanding the kinds of administrative jobs that he has filled truly are. I mean, they're seven days a week and 16 hours a day if you don't absolutely watch out, and to have done all these other things and to manage them all quite well. I think they have a further virtue in this sense; that they give you a continued perspective of the University you don't have if you spend all your time as an [administrator] and if you spend all your time in administration [you] eventually perceive your world as "an administrator," of which the faculty probably have, rightfully have, some degree of suspicion. Again this is George Waggoner. He had the feeling that everybody ought to do teaching, research, and service and if your service was an administrative officer, that didn't dissolve you from doing teaching and research, and Delbert learned that lesson better than the rest of us did, but we all continued to teach and maybe do some research, but he was I think, more proficient at the various legs on this stool, how many three or four legs it is, yet, than most of the rest of us. (B16-17)

Another colleague who worked with Shankel in administrative capacities viewed Shankel as a "professor" who was filling administrative roles, elaborating on this point further:

It's not that he returned to it, he always had it. He never left it. A number of your administrators maybe have teaching roles, but they're not like Dr. Shankel's teaching roles. I don't think Dr. Shankel commits himself from his teaching roles. He didn't split apart from it and become less involved. He was probably less involved, yes, but he didn't let it slide. He didn't kind of toss it aside and make it second. When he was a Professor working with his students, he was a Professor working with his students. When he was Chancellor, he was Chancellor. He

separated the two to a certain extent, but he never relinquished the Professor part. The students always knew that they could get to him. They might have to wait, but they would be able to talk to him. His students in his lab, he always made time for the people in his lab. It wasn't as much time as they probably had before, but he was still their mentor, he was still their consultant, he was still their instructor. I bet there is not one of Dr. Shankel's students who did not feel close to him in the professional way. They call him and still write to him and still ask for recommendations. They still keep in touch with him and he keeps in touch with them. (A6)

Third, as Special Counselor to the Chancellor, Shankel was able to enter a period in his professional life wherein his primary role was that of a faculty member and his secondary role as Counselor allowed him to stay connected to the administration, moving in and out of interim administrative capacities. It is at this point one sees how the University community could be confused about the actual institutional role of Del Shankel. While it is possible to sketch a chronological outline of Shankel's professional career, it becomes difficult to envision Shankel's career path per se. This is partially due to the fact that he held so many different positions, several of them more than once. It is also due to the fact that, after being named Special Counselor, Shankel was a full-time faculty member who served in interim administrative capacities. Depending upon the demands of the particular interim position, he continued in the full-time faculty role, or reduced his teaching and research load, but he never fully left the faculty role.

Role within KU Culture

In addition to his faculty position in a traditional field, Shankel also attributes some of his success to a "unique educational background" that may have given him greater understanding of, and perspective for, different

sectors of the academic community at a major research institution. To understand this perspective better, consider the culture of the University in which Del Shankel established credibility and lived his professional life, a culture that he describes as collegial in nature. While major research institutions are rarely referred to as collegiums (Birnbaum, 1988), it is in comparison to other research institutions that Del Shankel makes his comment. He describes KU as more collegial than “most universities like us,” and maintains that many large research universities are land-grant institutions and are more apt to have an autocratic administration. A form of governance, “That just doesn’t fit well here. It doesn’t fit our patterns and traditions.” Shankel describes those patterns and traditions in terms of involvement.

I’ve done about, roughly 30 accreditation visits with the North Central Association to other universities. I’ve visited other universities as a scientific lecturer, attended meetings at other universities, and in all of those, I haven’t yet seen a university where I think that faculty, students, colleagues, governance, plays as significant a role as it does at KU. We have an unusual amount of involvement of faculty and staff in governance at the University and I think that’s probably, in general helpful, but there are times when it slows decision-making down because you have to do more consultation here than you might some place in order to have your decisions accepted and reinforced and acted on. I think it’s a very healthy atmosphere. I think there is generally a pretty good feeling between faculty and “administration.” It flares up with some particular issue occasionally, but overall I think there is a good feeling here. That’s probably due to the strong tradition we have of faculty/staff involvement in the governance of the University and the student involvement. We have a lot of student involvement also.

It is within this culture that Del Shankel lived his professional life and emerged as a leader and interim leader on multiple occasions. At a major

research university, standing in one's discipline is held in high esteem (Clark, 1991) and Shankel continued to emphasize his own contribution to scholarship through the graduate labs that he maintained and through his role as a contributing faculty member. By continuing to nurture his faculty standing, the perception among other faculty members may well have been that Shankel was a part of their community as opposed to a part of the administrative hierarchy. If this was the case, then when Shankel was appointed to leadership positions, he may have been viewed in the true collegial sense of "first among equals" (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 89). When asked how he fits in this culture, Shankel indicated that it depended upon which time period or position was being discussed.

When I was in a traditional faculty role for many of the various years, I saw myself functioning much like most other faculty members, except in the last, clearly in the last 15 years. After I finished the term as Executive Vice Chancellor and started as Special Counselor, I saw myself as having an additional obligation beyond what most faculty members had and that was to, since I had this title as Special Counselor to the Chancellor, I had an obligation to help him as much as I could; and to give him advice when he asked for it, or when I thought he was stumbling into something that might lead us in the wrong direction, which I can't remember ever happening. I would have told him that I think I had an obligation to try to be helpful to the administration because of the experienced background that I had.

Shankel's credibility within the University community appears to have remained consistent throughout his professional life. Even though he sees his role changing over the years, no one else seems to feel that he challenged the culture or their perception of him as one of them.

Work Ethic

Willingness to participate, accept responsibility, and hard work are significant contributing factors to Del Shankel's career path and his perception of how or why he emerged as an interim leader within the culture of one major research institution. These factors represent some of the foremost values in Del Shankel's professional life. From his perspective, the willingness to accept responsibility, the desire to be involved, and an affinity for hard work when coupled with his commitment to teaching and maintaining his role as a contributing faculty member form the basis of Shankel's value system. It is this value system that apparently fit well with the culture of the organization within which Shankel operated and was rewarded by repeated interim and permanent appointments to leadership positions.

When asked to accept the Acting Chairmanship of the Department, he did so believing that he was "being a good citizen of the Department," and added, "one of the things that I have always enjoyed is being involved. It seems that involvement and participation and being involved was important to my psychic needs." When asked why he was selected to serve in interim leadership capacities on so many occasions, Shankel pointed first to his willingness to "pitch in and do things and help out" and elaborating on this point, he added several other variables as well.

I think one of the things that has been characteristic of my career is that I've been willing to work hard and to accept responsibility when the opportunity was given to me. I think there are an immense number of people out there who are brighter than I am. Some people who work harder, but probably not too many, but I think the fact that I was willing to do this, and then I think the kind of unique educational background that I have had something to do with my ability to do that.

Shankel also lists integrity, loyalty, compassion, and rational decision-making as guiding principles in his professional life. He defines integrity as “being honest about what the problems are and what you think the solutions are.” Loyalty to the University is a value that Shankel stresses in himself and appreciates in others as well. Compassion is a value that he indicates may, at times, be “overlooked” by administrators and should be integrated into a rational decision-making process when difficult situations arise, especially with respect to personnel.

These guiding principles and Shankel’s willingness to accept responsibility and work hard contributed to his repeated interim appointments. Without this work ethic, opportunities may have presented themselves and been overlooked. Therefore, a career in administration may have been prevented from starting, or may have ended after a few initial appointments.

Personal Characteristics

Critical turning points in a career path, perspectives of the culture in which one emerges as an interim leader, and values that facilitate development of an interim career path within a given organizational culture are important aspects of understanding Del Shankel as interim leader. The picture is incomplete, however, without addressing the personal characteristics that may have helped or hindered the development of this interim leader.

General Descriptors

During the course of interviews with colleagues, certain descriptors

were used repeatedly to portray Del Shankel as a leader and as an individual. Honest, committed, humble, intelligent, trustworthy, credible, experienced, having eclectic interests, caring, compassionate, selfless and loyal to the University, leads by example, even-tempered, slow to anger, objective, mediator, smooth, personable, patient, and humorous are the characteristics that surfaced on a continual basis while visiting with individuals who worked with Shankel over the years. It must be noted that this is a compilation of characteristics from interviews with seven different people and that the terms were used in answer to questions of how Del Shankel emerged as an interim leader so many times, or why he was successful in those roles.

Leadership Traits

The data are full of quotes pertaining to each of the characteristics listed above, but two quotes indicative of the descriptions given of Shankel's ability to emerge as an interim leader and his leadership behavior in those positions follow:

Well, I think because he's so good at what he does and when he takes a task, he takes it to heart and he's going to do it. He doesn't accept it unless he's going to do it and people know that. He won't do something half-way. He's there and he's willing to do it. I think probably because he wants to do it. He's always been there. People know that he will do it...I think people also know that he is going to be objective about it and that when he takes an interim one, he's not there to make the decisions and make change unless it needs to be done. He's there to take care of things and maintain them. Make sure that nothing falls in the cracks. (A5)

I think he does a very good job in whatever he does, but he's uniquely qualified for some of these, what you may call them, odd acting positions like Acting Director for Intercollegiate Athletics because he has an academic perspective and he also

has some of the [other] perspectives. Part of the job of Athletic Director is keeping peace between the two, and Delbert is one of the most even tempered people I have ever met, and I've never, oh I've seen him out of sorts one time and he had ample provocation. He may be out of sorts more than that, but he has a very good disposition. (B12)

Colleagues did not attempt to portray Del Shankel as a hero or an invincible leader. Rather, they tried to explain why it is that Shankel repeatedly emerged as an interim leader. The list of characteristics is an accumulation of the best qualities that these same colleagues witnessed in Shankel at various points in his professional life. Several traits were described so often that they emerged as themes and could be grouped into categories that allow the reader to view Del Shankel through the eyes of his colleagues.

Many of the colleagues spoke of Del as a leader who was able to put personal aspirations behind him and seek the best situation for the organization. Some referred to this as modesty, while others saw this as a basic desire to be involved with the organization and help it promote itself. One respondent attempted to describe how this characteristic was reflected in Del's decision-making process,

... they would never say, I can't imagine someone saying that he did that out of desire for personal aggrandizement or anything like that. They might not agree with his decisions, but I don't ever think they would ever doubt that he made them on the basis of what he had thought through to be the best for the University. (P137-138)

Shankel was also described as a quiet leader who led by example, as an objective mediator, and as a caretaker of the University. One colleague describes how these personal characteristics contributed to the credibility that Shankel achieved among the faculty.

I know that they think of him as a good colleague, that he clearly impresses the majority at first as a servant of the common good in whatever role he has played. So you put together the academic competence, the congeniality, the even disposition, the fact that people trust him; you put all those together...he's been a success as an administrator interim or otherwise. (B19)

Personable

Shankel's likable personality contributed to his reputation as "one of us" and as being approachable by faculty, staff, and students.

...but I certainly saw him in social groups and he was very, very personable. I think everybody thought he was a great guy. The reason they thought he was so great because he was always interested in what everybody else was doing and he seemed to know what other people were doing. I thought that was a...once again, that takes a lot of work and effort and he did it. (C22)

He's so friendly and so nice. He has a beautiful smile. The thing about Del, we always laughed, and it didn't make any difference when he came into a room, he'd walk into the room and he was there five or ten minutes and he didn't walk out, he backed out. He never went out the door and if he was going out that door and we were sitting there, he'd be backing out and opening that door and talking and smiling at you. (D28)

Colleagues also say that Shankel's ability to interact with people is enhanced by his patience and the ability to mask his anger, or as one respondent put it "stay on an even keel and smile" (Q141). Another colleague reiterated this point saying, "I've only seen Dr. Shankel mad once...He has always been able to keep his cool with people" (A9).

Interests

In addition to Shankel's leadership traits and personality

characteristics, colleagues commented on his involvement on a University softball team, his noontime racquetball matches, and a unique sense of humor. Those who worked more closely with him suggested that these were and continue to be the means by which Shankel vents his frustration or finds release. One colleague suggested that Shankel's eclectic interests are crucial elements in tying his professional and personal life together.

He really enjoys a great number of things and so he knows about a lot of things. People see him at a lot of events and over time they say, "This is a person who does, even though he's is a microbiologist, or even though he is an administrator, he obviously does have an interest in music, or he obviously appreciates the theater, or he obviously values the Spencer Art Museum, or what else?" (P134)

Shankel says that his varied interests are due to parents introducing him to music and reading early in life, and believes that a sincere interest in the arts added to his credibility with faculty and staff involved in areas that, in his words, at times "get ignored a little bit."

I think for me it was something I enjoyed and they knew I enjoyed it and they were pleased that it was something that I valued. My interests in the humanities and literature and reading gave me a base of support in the humanities and the fact that I am a scientist and continue to function as a scientist helps there.

These interests, coupled with Shankel's personal characteristics, leadership traits, and approachability, as observed by friends and colleagues played a part in constructing the persona that allowed Del Shankel to emerge as an interim leader.

Influences

Who or what influenced Del Shankel's professional life? This manuscript attempts to describe how Shankel became an interim leader. In doing so, it must address the variables that influenced his professional life and therefore may have contributed to his interim leadership.

Role Models

In attempting to describe Del Shankel as a leader, it is important to consider who may have influenced his professional development and leadership style. While the impact of particular individuals cannot be directly measured, knowing who they were may then allow one to understand Del Shankel, the person, that much better. Through many hours of interviews with Shankel, several names consistently arose as influences in his professional life. These individuals were his father, Orville Wyss, Dave Paretsky, George Waggoner, Frances Heller, Ray Nichols, and Gene Budig.

Shankel attributes his father with being a "major influence in many ways." He was a man who devoted his life to education, served in various administrative and teaching capacities, was President of Oshawa Missionary College, and eventually finished his career as a faculty member at Shankel's alma mater, Walla Walla. Cecil Shankel was not only a professional educator, but together with his wife emphasized the importance of education and books at home.

Shankel was influenced in his early life by many teachers and he speaks of several in his graduate program that may have influenced his teaching methodology both positively and negatively. Of those teachers, Shankel speaks of Orville Wyss as a major influence in his professional life.

Orville Wyss “was an outstanding microbiologist, but more importantly a superb human being. He tried to take good care of his graduate students as well as inspiring us in demanding that we perform.” The following quote illustrates the type of individual that Professor Wyss was and the kind of influence that he had.

He was compassionate. When my mother died when I was in graduate school, I’d called to tell him that my mother had died and a few minutes later, and this was in the evening, he showed up at my door in his bedroom slippers and asked me if I had money to travel out to be with my father for awhile and I told him I was going to have to get a bank loan and he gave me some of his personal funds. He said, “Go stay with your father for as long as necessary.” He was just a very decent human being as well as an outstanding scientist.

As he assumed his succession of administrative positions, Shankel’s role models shifted from those who influenced his faculty persona to those who provided insights into academic administration. Shankel credits Dave Paretsky as “the guy who hired me at KU” and mentions his name repeatedly in telling the story of coming to KU, the early years before tenure, his initial interim appointment as Acting Chair, his appointment as Assistant Dean, and as a point of reference throughout the rest of his career. Frances Heller and Ray Nichols are two individuals who were mentioned almost as often as Paretsky, but had different roles in influencing Shankel’s professional life. Heller was an Associate Dean when Shankel was hired as an Assistant Dean in the College office and one whom Del “certainly learned a lot from.” He served as an instrumental influence during the six and one-half years that Shankel refers to as the “most crucial” time in the development of both his professional credibility and administrative career. Nichols influences surfaced throughout Shankel’s career. Shankel

indicated that one of his major lessons as Acting Chair was learning to go to Ray Nichols with any budgetary problems, a process that Shankel followed throughout his many other permanent and interim positions.

While Cecil Shankel, Orville Wyss, Dave Paretsky, Frances Heller, and Ray Nichols all influenced the professional life of Del Shankel, George Waggoner and Gene Budig probably had the greatest impact. Shankel himself used the term "mentors" when referencing Orville Wyss, George Waggoner, and Gene Budig. "I certainly learned a tremendous amount from working with Gene Budig in the thirteen years he was Chancellor at the University of Kansas," is one way that Del Shankel referred to Gene Budig during many hours of discussion. Shankel referenced Gene Budig more frequently than any other individual, indicating the influence Budig had on his professional life. As Shankel spoke of moving in and out of his interim positions, he consistently referred to his role as Special Counselor and working closely with Gene Budig in the same breath. Budig was someone that Shankel admired, respected, and considered to be a good friend. He went so far as to say that his most enjoyable years at the University of Kansas may well have been the last five years that he worked with Budig as Special Counselor and in various interim capacities. In these capacities, Shankel became a confidant for the Chancellor. In turn, Budig was able to utilize Shankel's skills and knowledge by appointing him to positions of interim leadership during times of transition.

If Gene Budig is considered Shankel's role model in the latter part of his professional life, then George Waggoner can be considered the major influence in the early part of his career. Waggoner's role might even have had greater impact than Budig's, because the lessons that were learned

early in Shankel's professional life influenced leadership behavior throughout the remainder of that career. This relationship started when Shankel served as Acting Chair of the Department of Microbiology. He mentioned on several occasions that this role provided him with an opportunity to become better acquainted with Dean Waggoner. This experience was soon followed by what Shankel refers to as the most "crucial" period of his professional life when he served six and one-half years as an Assistant and Associate Dean in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences under the leadership and mentorship of Waggoner. It was during this time that Shankel believes he established credibility with faculty in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences as well as faculty with whom he worked in other schools across campus.

I think George was one of the great people I've ever known at being able, and willing, to delegate responsibility and authority with it. If he chose projects to do and make us responsible for them and hold us accountable. But we had the authority to do what we thought was right We could always go ask him if he thought what we were doing was the right way to do it, but he would give us the responsibility to do something and the authority to carry it through and that, I think, the tying of those two together, I think is the pretty important principle that I learned from him at that stage.

It was Waggoner that targeted and selected Shankel for promotion to such a position. Later, he selected Shankel as his interim replacement while he went on sabbatical leave. This appointment eventually led to another promotion. Therefore, not only was Waggoner a role model, but he also served as a catalyst to Shankel's early administrative appointments. According to one of Shankel's colleagues,

Del got his initial administrative upbringing in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences under George Waggoner. According to everyone I've ever heard from, George Waggoner

in his prime, was a consummate groomer of talent. He brought people in, he gave them a variety of opportunities, he really groomed them to go on to other things and he gave them broad enough opportunities that he would prepare them, not for a narrowly focused role and as a result, a lot of the people who came in as Assistant or Associate Deans under George Waggoner had a very broad experience and they ended up as Vice Chancellors or Presidents or Vice Presidents in a lot of institutions. (P133)

Another respondent who had learned under the tutelage of Waggoner as well, described the process of this mentorship as follows:

So it was a training ground. The principal training here was not administrative experience, but an opportunity to see how George Waggoner interacted with members of the faculty, brainstormed about what was going on, and what should be going on, and what could be going on in higher education...I'd like to feel that he was a mentor and certainly a friend and a model of what people can become in a higher education administrator. (B14)

As these quotes indicate, Waggoner not only impacted the life of Del Shankel, but influenced many others as well. Shankel acknowledges that influence and credits Waggoner with many lessons learned along the way. Whether it was Waggoner, or Budig, or even Orville Wyss, Del Shankel eventually became the leader that he was, in part, because of the influence of each of these role models.

Background

In examining the potential influences in the life of a leader that eventually lead to the development of leadership characteristics, one must reflect upon experiences that molded and influenced his or her personality prior to the onset of that person's professional life. This is true in the study of Del Shankel's professional life history.

A handful of variables seem to contribute significantly to the selection of a career in education and the evolution of a leadership role within that career. Family, church, education, sports, friends, childhood illness, medical school, military service, teaching opportunities, and graduate school stand out as the foremost influences in Del Shankel's background that contributed to the development of his professional life. Within these various aspects of Shankel's life existed individuals who served as influences, if not role models, as well as leadership opportunities. These all contributed significantly to the development of a personality that would be amiable to a career in higher education and prone to a leadership role within that environment.

It was within the family that Del Shankel was exposed to the value of education. As mentioned, his father not only was an educator, but maintained some individual theories that played out in the education of his children. The value of books and music was also passed to Shankel from both parents. Extended relatives in missionary service and the role of the church in the family belief system had considerable impact on the development of a value structure that emphasized the role of service to others and which eventually blended with a professional career in education. These family values were reinforced by an education in church affiliated schools. School teachers served as early role models and school became a place where Shankel was not only successful in the classroom, but in extra-curricular activities as well. Many of his early leadership experiences came through these extra-curricular activities related to student government, student publications, or athletics. Sports were a tremendous influence on Shankel, not only in providing him with leadership

opportunities, but in the development and nurturing of friendships. Sports became a lifelong interest that allowed him a physical outlet, an arena to build and nurture relationships with others, and an avenue of entertainment. Sports eventually became a part of his professional life when he oversaw the initial women's athletics program at the University of Kansas, served as interim Athletic Director on two separate occasions, and served as the University Faculty Representative to the Big 8 Conference, a position that he still holds.

Just as family, church, education, and sports all impacted the development of Shankel's character, friends, the influence of teachers, a childhood illness, the admiration for a family doctor, one year in medical school, and a stint in the army all played a significant role in telling the story of Del Shankel's life and how he came to be a scientist and an educator. Friends reinforced his leadership abilities in school and extracurricular activities. One friend played a part in the decision to attend Walla Walla. Respect for various teachers reinforced Shankel's life experiences and his parents high regard for education. While in bed with undulant fever, Shankel developed an interest in reading that contributed to his success in education and an undergraduate degree in English literature. The childhood illness also introduced Shankel to a family doctor who became an early role model. Admiration for Dr. Hines, the church, missionary relatives, and an affinity for school contributed to young Del Shankel's goal of becoming a missionary doctor. A loss of idealism and an aversion to practicing on animals after one year of medical school changed this ambition for Shankel. However, the medical school training led to an appointment in the army as a medic which then introduced him to the field of

bacteriology. This encounter, linked with positive experiences in education as both a student and a teacher, eventually led Shankel to graduate school at the University of Texas and a career in higher education.

In retrospect, it might appear that events and influences in Del Shankel's life serendipitously fell into place in such a way that fate intended for him to become an educator and an educational leader, but this would be denying the spirit of the individual and the right to choice through free will. When one factors in the concept of choice, an argument can be made that forces aligned in such a way that each experience and influence built upon previous experiences and influences and a professional life in higher education emerged. This same method can be applied to Shankel's professional life and was presented in the context of turning points, attributes, and influences. Each of these elements built upon one another, eventually leading to the emergence of a professional life replete with leadership positions in higher education and more specifically, interim leadership positions.

Chapter VI

Interim Leadership

The purpose of this study was to begin the process of describing the phenomenon of interim leadership. In so doing, the professional life history of Del Shankel was studied and to this point presented from the perspective of a biographical sketch, significant turning points in his professional career, personal attributes that lent themselves to leadership behavior, and influences and background experiences that may have assisted in the development of leadership roles. More specifically, these points were brought to bear on the phenomenon of interim leadership. To this point in the manuscript, the presentation of the data described who Del Shankel was as an individual, why he may have been selected for such roles, when he was selected for or appointed to such positions, and the nature of those positions. To complete this picture of interim leadership as Del Shankel experienced it, the research must go a step further and interpret who Del Shankel was within these roles or positions. This interpretation is best achieved by engaging in a discussion of Shankel's definition of interim leadership and his description of the leadership style he employed as an interim leader.

Definition of Interim Leadership

Shankel provides a definition of what he believes interim leadership to be.

It means a combination of somewhat unique challenges and opportunities. The unique aspects of it are that when you are in an interim position, it's more difficult to make long-term decisions and long-term plans. You have to be sensitive to

both kinds of programs, ideas, and concepts that were put in place by your predecessor and the kinds of initiatives that your successor may want to begin and you have some obligation not to try to make changes that are too dramatic in nature, but at the same time you have an obligation to keep the institution moving forward and to not allow things to slide back from where they were. To maintain a sense of momentum and feeling of continued progress. I think the unique and interesting challenge of an interim position is that to try to maintain that balance between continued momentum and progress, and sensitivity to the past, and openness for changes in the future.

This is a definition that Shankel believes applies to “almost any interim position” that he held and not just to any one specific role in his professional life. He acknowledges that while the challenges, opportunities, or restrictions within the positions may differ to some degree, “I don’t think the basic definition varied.” In addition to this definition, when asked about the phenomenon of leadership itself, Shankel maintained that leadership “involves a little more emphasis on the long-range in looking ahead to what’s going to be best down the road.” However, he cautions that this should not be to the exclusion of daily activities, saying that while it may require “a little less” of the daily attention to tasks, “if you let the day to day responsibilities slip and get out of control...your future may get ruined.”

Shankel’s definition of interim leadership indicates that while serving in an interim role, it may be difficult to focus on the long-term decisions and plans that he regards as being essential to leadership. In addition, he asserts that sensitivity to “concepts that were put in place by your predecessor and the kinds of initiatives that your successor may want to begin” can be quite challenging. The conclusion of Shankel’s definition suggests that the solution to these potentially opposing forces lies in the

concept of change and the process by which change is implemented or resisted.

Change

Shankel suggests that the “unique and interesting challenge of an interim position” is the challenge of balancing the opposing forces of “continued momentum and progress” and “openness for changes in the future” with “sensitivity to the past.” Simply stated, an interim leader must decide whether to maintain the current situation or implement change. Two critical factors in this equation are the desires of the interim leader’s predecessor and the plans of the eventual successor. According to Shankel, maintenance does not imply standing still, but rather, “continued momentum and progress.” This further complicates the equation as the interim leader must decide what progress can be achieved without being perceived as drastic change.

Shankel’s view of interim leadership goes beyond the boundaries of the job description to include the dimension of time. “I don’t think somebody going into a position for a year or less is in a very good position to try to initiate major changes.” In his own experience he points to his six and one-half year tenure as Executive Vice Chancellor as a permanent position wherein he initiated what he considered to be important changes. Otherwise, he saw his interim positions as roles of maintaining the current situation or momentum.

I don’t think you should devote a lot of time and effort to trying to make major changes when somebody else is going to come in at the end of that time. They have a totally different set of changes in mind. Change is always upsetting a little bit to people and you don’t want to have constant turmoil because of

a whole series of changes going on.

In speaking of his role as Acting Athletic Director, Shankel states that,

there is no way you can bring about dramatic changes in the program in a short time, unless you're going in with an agreement and an understanding with the Chancellor or President who appointed you that there are changes that need to be made.

This concept could easily be extended to any interim position, replacing Chancellor with Dean, or Director, or Board if necessary. Shankel further adds that if such change is agreed upon, then the interim administrator must know that he or she "will be supported at the highest levels in making those changes."

The notion of maintaining the status quo or what he referred to as continued momentum of the organization was a recurring theme throughout the interviews with Shankel, indicating that this philosophy was not simply verbiage, but something that he practiced as an interim leader. Whether as Department Chair, Dean, Athletic Director, Academic Vice President, Executive Vice Chancellor, or Chancellor, the theme of "maintaining the strength and momentum of the [unit]" consistently recurs in Shankel's telling of his experiences.

While Shankel cautions against major change, it also appears that he differentiates between levels or severity of change. When speaking of his challenges and accomplishments during stints of interim leadership, Shankel often speaks of "no dramatic change" within the context of maintaining the momentum of a department or sector. Shankel also makes it clear that in some interim positions, he recognized the need for change. For example, during his first appointment as Acting Chancellor,

I thought there were some specific changes that needed to be

made during that first term. They were not particularly structural changes or dramatic changes or changes in direction. They were, I think, more changes in atmosphere and changes in approach and changes in the way we dealt with faculty on issues and things of that nature, rather than big changes that would be very apparent to anybody just looking from the outside.

At times, he was restricted from implementing some forms of change, as in the case of his first Acting Chancellorship. The Board of Regents restricted him from making any changes in administrative structure or personnel. Shankel agreed to these conditions, but says he, "Later regretted that at times." He learned that some change, or at least the ability to implement change could be a powerful tool in the hands of an interim leader. By the time he was appointed Acting Chancellor for the second time, Shankel made sure that he had a commitment from the Regents to implement administrative personnel changes if necessary. "This time I didn't know of any problems in that area...[but] I didn't want my hands tied and have people out there knowing that my hands were tied if I ran into difficult situations."

Just as there were interim positions wherein he saw the need for some change, there were others wherein he made a conscious decision against change of any kind. Upon entering the second Acting Chancellorship, Shankel made such a decision.

I had so much respect and admiration for Gene Budig and the way that he had operated in general, that one of the conscious decisions I made at the beginning of my tenure, was that I was not going to make many changes aside from my own style being somewhat different from Gene's and my own personality being different from his.

This particular decision may indicate that Shankel was amenable to what differing situations or circumstances dictated, or some might interpret this

decision as an effort to avoid tarnishing Budig's reputation. Regardless, although Shankel believed that change was necessary at times, he preferred to maintain the momentum of the units that he directed and certainly did not believe in drastic change while serving in interim capacities.

Shankel asserts that "a clear understanding" between the interim administrator and the individual(s) to whom that administrator reports is the essential ingredient in the process of change. This theme was reiterated throughout discussions of Shankel's interim positions. In describing his experiences as Acting Chair, he advised that anyone looking to assume a similar interim position should have a clear understanding of several issues, all related to the parameters of responsibility within that particular role.

I think it would be to make sure you have a clear understanding from your boss, and if you are going to do it just on one year, and your previous as in my situation, former Chairman is returning after a year on sabbatical. I'd say make sure you have a clear understanding of what they want to have accomplished during that year. Have a clear understanding of the amount of flexibility that you have in dealing with problems that may come up. Have a clear understanding of the issues on which they wish to be consulted before you make major changes, or major issues, or types of major decisions on which they wish to be consulted since they are going to come back into the position and have to live with what you do. I'd say have as good of an understanding as possible of the university structure so that you know where to go to get problems solved as they develop during the time you are in that position. Those would be the critical pieces of advice.

Shankel reinforces the need to understand decision-making parameters when he speaks about the role of Acting Dean. Specifically, he advises that an individual "have a clear understanding of what it is that the Dean you are replacing for the interim period expects will happen during that time."

Shankel clarifies his position on this issue when speaking of his role as

Acting Executive Vice Chancellor.

I think the main advice there, is to make sure that you have a good basic understanding with the Chancellor as to what your role is. What the expectations are? What degrees of responsibility and authority you have. I've always been a strong believer that responsibility and authority ought to go together. If you are responsible for something, you ought to have the authority to deal with it. If you don't have the authority to deal with it, you shouldn't be held responsible for it. But I think in the EVC positions, [it is] particularly important for the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chancellor to have a shared understanding.

He also recommends that if the individual that is replaced is coming back to the position, one should not "hesitate to call and ask for advice if you think you need it or ask for background issues that you think you need." Finally, he again addresses the concept of degrees of change: "Try to make those decisions that need to be made without trying to bring about large changes during the brief interim period."

Within Shankel's concept of change it is critical for an individual entering an interim position to do so with an understanding of the parameters of responsibility and expectations from the individual who is to return to that position. If no one is returning to the position, as was the case during Shankel's tenure as Acting Athletic Director and Acting Chancellor, then the understanding must be with that position's superior. As Chancellor, Shankel says, "Make sure that you have a clear understanding from the Board of Regents about the parameters of what you can or can't do. Make sure that you're philosophically in tune with those parameters." Not having such agreement or clarification of parameters led to an uncomfortable situation during Shankel's first Acting Chancellorship.

I think one of the things that I learned during that year, that this reminded me of, is that when I took that job at that time, one of

the things that the Board of Regents said to me is that they wanted me to agree not to make any major changes in the administrative structure of the University, or any major administrative changes and I think I later came to understand what some of the motivation might have been for that and regretted it, in at least one or two cases, having made that commitment. There were a couple of changes I would like to have made during the year that I felt I couldn't.

Within his various leadership positions, Shankel experienced both the freedom to create change and restrictions upon his ability to create change. From these experiences, Shankel developed a definition of interim leadership as well as a perspective on the role of change within interim leadership. Shankel contends that an individual serving in an interim position for less than one year is not in a good position to create dramatic or drastic change. While he never specifically defined what he meant by dramatic or drastic, he used these terms repeatedly in describing the type of change that should be avoided while serving in an interim role and indirectly defined it by describing patterns of behavior that were acceptable as well as unacceptable. For example, he indicated that an interim leader should have the ability to make personnel decisions, while leading the institution or unit in a new direction would be considered unacceptable or possibly dramatic. Finally, he emphasizes more than once that if major change is needed, then there must be a clear understanding between the interim leader and his or her superiors as to the parameters of that change.

Morale

Morale was an important factor in Shankel's discussion of interim leadership. He often mentioned boosting the morale of a unit as one of his greatest accomplishments as an interim leader. Shankel asserts that much

of interim leadership is “a matter of maintaining momentum or maintaining morale. Building trust with staff and other constituencies.” From his perspective, the changes he implemented as an interim leader were “more changes in atmosphere and changes in approach and changes in ways we dealt with faculty on issues and things of that nature rather than big changes that would be very apparent to anybody who is looking from the outside.” For example, in his first term as Acting Chancellor, Shankel felt that faculty morale needed a boost especially among women and minority faculty members.

One of the things that I set as a goal for that year was to try to improve faculty morale particularly in some specific areas and beyond that, I just wanted to do a good job and keep the University moving ahead, build on the momentum that I thought we had and make sure the University had as good a year as possible.

Shankel maintains that an interim leader must be able to evaluate the level of morale for the unit that he or she is charged with directing. As an example, he contrasts his second term as Acting Chancellor with his first experience by saying that “faculty morale was pretty good” during his second term and that maintaining morale did not require as much effort as it did during his first term.

As Acting Director of Athletics (AD) Shankel faced a great challenge in building morale. When he assumed the reigns of the Athletic Department the first time, he did so following the resignation of a well liked Athletic Director. The second time that he was charged with directing the Department, he followed the resignation of an Athletic Director who had served for a period of six months. In both cases, morale was a major concern.

I think that it was important to maintain the morale of the Athletic Department staff during that time. To give the coaches and the athletes and the staff a feeling that there was somebody in the University who cared about them. They had just been jilted by an AD that they liked and respected, I think, and so there was some feeling of loss and I felt that I needed to do things that would rebuild morale and enable them to feel valued in the University community. Give them a sense that the University still cared about athletics. That we were going to continue to support a strong athletics program. That we were going to try to do things ethically and honestly and still be successful, which I think is always a major complication of an Athletic Director.

In addition to his experiences as Acting Chancellor and Acting AD, morale was a priority of Shankel's in each of his interim positions. As Acting Chair he says, "my goals were to maintain the strength and momentum of the Department...To make sure that the morale of the Department was maintained for the year." He offers advice for any Acting Dean: "try to maintain the morale of the organization and maintain the feeling of momentum and things that are sitting still for a period of time." As Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Shankel says, "I felt that my job was to keep the office together, keep the morale up as much as possible in the interim situation. Keep the momentum of the office." Shankel asserts that his role as Acting EVC differed from his role as EVC, in that he didn't set any long-range goals as the Acting EVC, but rather "tried to support the Vice Chancellors who were working with me at that time." These comments indicate that Shankel viewed evaluation and fostering of morale as priorities while serving in interim positions.

Associates

As Del Shankel maintained momentum, fostered morale, and created some change as an interim leader, he did so with the assistance of many associates. Throughout the interviews, credit was always given to support staff within the various units. This often was in response to a question asking what assets were most effective in helping accomplish the tasks at hand. First and foremost, Shankel talked about his associates or the staff that assisted him in the role that he was filling at the time. This may reflect his style of leadership, or it could be regarded as a personal or professional value, but it also seems an inherent part of Shankel's definition of interim leadership. It is a recurring theme within his description of interim leadership and emerges as a variable that contributes greatly to his ability to function as an interim leader.

The following quote pertains to Shankel's Acting Chairmanship of the Department of Microbiology, but is representative of comments made with respect to his other interim positions.

I remember that during that year and most of the years the Department had incredibly and good dedicated departmental secretaries [who] helped to keep us on the straight and narrow way and knew the University well and knew how to make things work in the University and how to solve problems, where to go to get Facilities Operations, or Buildings and Grounds as we use to call them then. If we needed something done from them, they knew who to call and who to contact. They were very helpful and we had a man who ran our microbiology prep room, at that time, who prepared the media for the student labs and did the ordering for the Department and things like that, a man named Howard Brown and he was a tremendous asset for the Department over the years including the year that I was Acting Chair. Very hard working, very dedicated, very anxious to help students make sure they had the materials they needed to do their lab work and I think beyond that just a group of really good colleagues in the Department who were willing to pitch in

and help get things done so the Department would continue to move forward.

Shankel often followed dialogue such as this with a laundry list of names of individuals who contributed to "maintaining the momentum" of the operation. The list was not simply one of people whom he wanted to thank, but rather an acknowledgement of those who had contributed. Shankel's appreciation of that contribution was directly tied to his belief that some change may be necessary during the tenure of an interim leader, but can only be accomplished if the appropriate individuals are in place to "maintain the momentum."

Shankel suggests that one of the first tasks of an interim leader is to assess his or her staff. This assessment is not just to determine who is willing to participate, but also to determine what talents may be used most effectively. In response to questions about specific interim positions Shankel advises an Acting Dean, "Assess your Associate Deans carefully. Assign responsibilities according to their abilities and interests. Don't hesitate to share the responsibilities." To an Acting Athletic Director he says, "Make sure that you have very good associates in the department, on whom you can rely and you can trust." To the Acting Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, he urges, "Make sure you have a good set of Deans that you can trust. Make sure you got a good office staff who compliment your abilities." He further explains that having quality individuals surrounding an interim leader can alleviate some of the pressure to learn new and complicated procedures that may be a part of that position, but not part of the leader's natural repertoire of skills.

I think that a mistake that I've seen people make in positions like Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and in Deans

positions is, I've seen some people go into those positions and never grasp some of the easy mechanics and operations of the budget and never develop an understanding of how they could use the budget to achieve their goals in their office, or their area, and I think if you don't want to devote the time and energy to doing that yourself, you have to be absolutely sure that you have somebody bright and trustworthy and knowledgeable who does that and brings all of the information to you that you need to make decisions and so on.

Shankel maintains that an interim leader's appreciation for support staff and ability to assess skills is essential to maintaining the momentum of a unit. In his definition of interim leadership, it appears that Shankel views associates as one of the keys to striking that "balance between continued momentum and progress, and sensitivity to the past, and openness for changes in the future."

Evolution of Leadership Style

In pursuing the definition of interim leadership it is necessary not only to ask one's viewpoint, but also how one incorporated such a viewpoint into his or her practice. Del Shankel contends that he did not enter his first interim leadership role with a developed concept of a particular leadership style and that his style evolved throughout his professional life. He viewed his initial appointment as Acting Chair as "something I would do for this one year and then I would go back to being an Associate Professor of Microbiology and work hard hoping to be promoted to full Professor," not as something for which he should develop a style in expectation of future administrative appointments. By the time he was named Acting Dean, Shankel had spent six and one-half years in the Dean's office and "had begun to realize that I had learned some things from watching my father as

an administrator.” He also credits George Waggoner, Frances Heller, and Dave Paretsky with teaching him a great deal about administrative processes, “all of which I thought were useful to know in terms of how you provide leadership, and how you develop loyalty, and how you share decision-making in appropriate ways.”

While Shankel began to assimilate aspects of leadership traits and behaviors from various individuals,

I couldn't say that I had begun to consciously formulate it into a set of principles by which I was going to operate, or anything like that...It was more, I had the opportunity to learn a lot of things which I thought were useful and applicable and that I should use, but I hadn't consciously put them in a personal administrative philosophy or anything like that.

As Acting Chancellor, he maintains that he still did not have a style that he claimed as his own. “I would say by that time I had learned enough from other people that I had worked with that I adapted it into a leadership style that I felt comfortable with. I don't think it was original with me.” By the time that Shankel served as Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, he was 59 years old and says, “when you reach that age, you don't change your style very dramatically in many ways. Your style is pretty well formed.” He maintains that this style did not change as he served as Executive Vice Chancellor and Chancellor one more time. However, age not only had a confirming effect upon his style, it possibly mellowed his approach to some degree. Between serving as Acting Chancellor in 1981 and serving again in 1994-95, Shankel suggests,

I may have learned enough in the interim that I tried to use a little bit more of a team approach in consensus building. I probably had less ego involvement in it at age 67 than I did at age 54 or so. I probably was a little more egocentric about the position the first time than I was this time. I was a little more

amenable to use more of a team approach.

Consensus Building

As the previous quote indicates, Del Shankel's leadership style evolved toward building consensus among interested parties. He suggests that achieving consensus, or the team approach, was not always his priority. As his style evolved he became more comfortable with this approach and came to view it as his style of leadership. "I try to be a team builder, I try to develop consensus." When asked to capsule the process by which this style of leadership evolved, Shankel stated that "it evolved through a whole series of experiences in the University."

I learned back in elementary school that, and confirmed in high school, that I could not successfully resolve conflict by getting my head beaten in by some of my cohorts and I think through the experiences I've had working with George Waggoner in the College where we had some conflict situations develop that I was involved in resolving and then with the whole series of experiences I've had. I think I've learned that it's important to hear all sides of a position. To try to bring conflicting participants, or representatives of conflicting participants together to see if a resolution can be mediated and then when you've gone as far as you can with that, you have to make a decision that will be viewed by most people, at least, as fair.

As Shankel aged and gained experience his belief in the value of consensus building increased as well, but it wasn't simply age that influenced his ability to be comfortable with soliciting the opinions of others. Upon making the decision not to accept the Chancellorship at the University of Maryland, Shankel also decided that he wasn't going to be a candidate for any other positions and would complete his career in Lawrence. This decision may have allowed Shankel to relax to some degree and be more

open to allowing others to share in the decision-making process. As he stated earlier, he became less egocentric as he aged. One could surmise that the aging process coupled with the decision to not pursue administrative positions outside of the University of Kansas may have reduced any impetus for a personal leadership agenda and made him more open to the team building approach which places higher value on the opinions of others. This perspective is seen in the following quote concerning his decision to accept the second Acting Chancellorship.

I knew that I wasn't taking this job with any anticipation that I might move on to another academic administrative position anywhere else any time. I wasn't setting out to prove anything. All I wanted to do was to do a good job and reflect the University well and make sure that things got done well and no big personal agenda in the job that time.

Shankel implies that having a personal agenda is an attempt by an individual to prove something. From his discussions of leadership over time, it appears that as Shankel matured in his career he became less interested in getting his own way, proving a point, exerting authority, or climbing the administrative ladder - in other words, in proving something. This apparent decline in personal agenda may have allowed him to grow further as a consensus builder. One colleague indicated earlier that when Shankel made a final decision after gathering the facts and trying to achieve consensus, it was natural that some individuals or groups would disagree with the final decision, but those same individuals or groups trusted that Del Shankel was doing what he thought was best for the University.

Shankel's leadership style evolved as he assimilated much of what he saw in the leadership practice of role models, but it was during his time as Executive Vice Chancellor that he truly adopted consensus building as a

style and developed the skills necessary to implement it properly. “I learned a lot more about how to deal with consensus because I had to coordinate the work of all the Vice Chancellors and reach consensus with that group and with Faculty Governance on issues that were important in the University.” Shankel also remembers that he not only tried to build consensus, but often found himself as the “intermediary between those groups and the Chancellor.” From these experiences he “learned to present both sides and try to bring the sides together when there were differences of opinion on issues. I guess I developed a lot of consensus building skills and team building skills during that time.”

At one point in the interview process, Shankel was asked to draw a cognitive map of the University of Kansas. What eventually emerged was a concise replication of the administrative structure of the organization with the people and State of Kansas, alumni and friends, and the Federal Government at one end, and students at the other. In between, a place was designated for the Board of Regents, the Chancellor, central administration, each administrative layer of the organization on both the Lawrence and Medical Center campuses, faculty, and support staff. The map was complete with lines connecting the various constituencies and dotted lines representing less formal patterns of communication. After initially describing the chart, Shankel noted that it was drawn in such a way that one could view the hierarchical reporting lines from either direction. In other words, one could view the structure of the organization from the vantage point of the students, through support staff, faculty, administrative layers, central administration, Chancellor, Regents, to the State of Kansas.

This mental map is important to understanding the leadership style of

Del Shankel because it indicates that while he views the institution in terms of an organizational chart, he does not necessarily see the authority in that structure as flowing from the top down. Rather, he notes that the authority may originate from the other end of the spectrum through a means such as student or faculty needs. Shankel speaks of building consensus where he still sees himself "as a player on the team that is trained to advance the University." This notion of a team player fits his description of authority within the organizational chart. When asked to elaborate upon the concept of the team approach, Shankel answers by referring to the Asian style of leadership. "I certainly learned about [it] during my sabbaticals in Japan and my working with Japanese colleagues...I think for me, at least, that's the style I'm comfortable with. I have become more comfortable with it as time has gone on."

Colleagues took note of Shankel's attempts to build consensus and often referred to Shankel as a mediator who "is really and mentally a leader by example" (P136).

He's always been a mediator. He has been a mediator between faculty and administration. Between faculty [and] students. Between students and students. Dr. Shankel's always involved with students. He's always taught. He's always been involved with mentoring students, with being a counselor and I think that's part of being a mediator, too. Because he counseled both the people that were needing the mediation, or both the groups that were needing the mediation. He didn't just mediate between groups, he counseled people as well. I mean, he was like a counselor and a mediator at the same time. That was just his style. But no, he's always been a mediator. (A3)

Another colleague suggests that this approach allowed Shankel to be more effective than other administrators when schools or departments were

struggling because he could see “things in arbitrary terms so he’s throwing the punches and at the same time can articulate a solution” (B19). This same colleague suggested that this style allowed Shankel to deal with “imperfection” better than others (B19). Yet another colleague provided an analogy to describe Shankel’s style of leadership and decision-making.

I think Del’s position was, it’s more important to keep the water smooth and put a little oil on top of them. Now that is just the way it is. Different people have different personalities and at different times at the University, or in different positions at the University, that’s exactly what you need. At other times at the University, you need something different...I think he had a knack of not making waves. He kept things very smooth and there was no, not even hardly a ripple in things, and he could talk to people and talk to people and finally smooth all these kinds of things out and I think that’s probably his greatest attribute. (C21)

In trying to build consensus, Shankel first tried to “provide suggestions and recommendations” to his colleagues for things that he thought needed to be done. Secondly, he would “not hesitate to make decisions” that needed to be made after making every possible effort to reach consensus. This meant that if consensus could not be reached, he made the decisions that he thought were “in the best interest to the University.” However, Shankel cautions that he tried to “avoid hasty decisions” and says that he may have even tried to “avoid some of them too long sometimes,” but was willing to make that sacrifice in an effort to build consensus. “I try to be a team builder. I try to develop consensus. I will make decisions that need to be made after obtaining as much information as possible to enable me to make rationale decisions.” Rational decision-making, or following a logical process of gathering information, is something that Shankel says is very important to him and hopefully is part of consensus

building. One colleague indicated that Shankel was “noted as a person who doesn’t rush into things. His mode of changing things is not necessarily quick and fast. It’s slow and easy. So the changes that were made were not quick and fast. They were slow and easy” (A3). The same colleague maintained that faculty and administration did not always agree on what decisions needed to be made and Shankel was often the person who “had to balance” those perceptions.

Shankel suggests that the parameters of interim leadership impact the decision-making process that occurs in consensus building or any other decision-making approach. Remaining cognizant of the wishes of one’s predecessor while at the same time preparing the way for one’s successor means that regardless of the approach, that decisions need to be reviewed to ensure that they fit within this context. As Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Shankel was faced with this very situation and says that the challenge was to “make the hard decisions that had to be made” without making “too many long-term commitments that would bind my successor.”

As an interim leader, some decisions are the responsibility of the individual leader and Shankel says that he was not opposed to making the hard decision when it had to be made, but noted on more than one occasion that he “never grew comfortable with making the kinds of tough decisions that affect the professional lives of people adversely. Those are the kinds of decisions that I always agonized over most and found the most difficult to deal with.” Removing someone from an administrative position and/or someone being denied tenure were examples of decisions that Shankel “always found difficult.” He maintains that “obtaining as much information as possible” in an effort to “make rational decisions” is the first step toward

making these difficult and other less difficult decisions as well. In trying to obtain information and at the same time build consensus, Shankel contends that certain values should be integrated into the decision-making process.

Several things that I think are important. Integrity, being honest about what the problems are and what you think the solutions are is an important value to me. Loyalty is a very important value to me and I think and believe that I've been loyal to the University and I value loyalty in other people very much. Nothing that distresses me more than finding out that some associate may not have been loyal. So integrity, loyalty, compassion, I think, is an important value in administrators which is sometimes overlooked.

Integrating these values into the decision-making process while gathering the necessary information and trying to build consensus could appear to be overwhelming. Yet, Shankel maintains that "some people are more concerned about power and being able to demonstrate power and I think some people are more concerned about having an influence on the direction of the University or the direction of progress at the University." This perspective undergirds the philosophy that Shankel brought to the decision-making process in positions of interim leadership.

I don't know how other people would categorize me, but I would certainly put myself in the category of believing that, for me and for my style of my personality, influence is more important than power. I'm more interested in being able to influence the direction of the University than I am in demonstrating power to determine the future of the University.

Others recognized this concern for the direction of the University and contend that it was evidenced in his style of leadership.

He sees the whole picture. He's very objective. His priority is the University and he sees all aspects of the University. He's able to see the University as a whole not just as a faculty member, not just as an administrator and he cares. I mean that's just obvious when you meet the person. He's extremely

organized. He's organized in his thoughts and he knows people. He's very tactful. He's able to bring out the good things in people. (A4)

A consistent theme among his colleagues is the suggestion that Shankel's style is to lead quietly and by example. He sees himself as a team builder who strives to maintain momentum and foster morale. His decision-making process evolved into consensus building and he contends that while change may be needed during times of interim leadership, it should be done cautiously. Shankel also asserts that quality associates and clear parameters from superiors are the keys to any interim leader's success. These beliefs comprise in large part not only Del Shankel's philosophical outlook on leadership, but also summarize his experience as an interim leader.

Chapter VII

Discussion

In seeking to define interim leadership, an oral history of the professional life of Dr. Delbert M. Shankel was conducted. As very little has been written on the topic of interim leadership, it is believed that this study is at the forefront of the process of discovery for the phenomenon of interim leadership. In an effort to describe interim leadership from Del Shankel's perspective, it was necessary to investigate why and how he became an interim leader, his experiences as an interim leader, his definition of interim leadership, and his style of interim leadership. As the data were analyzed from this vantage point, five themes emerged: career path, institutional fit, professional influences, definition of interim leadership, and style of interim leadership. This discussion of findings will proceed through each of the five themes and will be followed by a discussion of the research questions set forth in chapter three. Implications for the literature and further research will conclude this discussion.

Career Path

During Del Shankel's thirty-seven year career at the University of Kansas he served twenty-one years in administrative positions. Seven of the thirteen positions were on an interim basis. Certain events, details, and decisions in Del Shankel's professional life significantly impacted his administrative career path and led to his continual emergence as an interim leader. Throughout this manuscript, the most important of these moments were referred to as turning points. It was suggested that the acquisition of

tenure in a traditional academic field; the acceptance of the appointment as Acting Chair of the Department of Microbiology; the experience gained during six years as an Assistant and Associate Dean in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; the confidence gained as Acting Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; the decision to resign as Executive Vice Chancellor of the Lawrence Campus; the confidence gained as Acting Chancellor and the decision to seek presidencies of other institutions; the decision to reject an offer to become Chancellor of another institution and to complete his career at the University of Kansas; and the appointment to the position of Special Counselor to the Chancellor set the stage for Del Shankel to complete a unique professional career as an interim leader.

It was posited by this author that the acquisition of tenure is almost a necessity for faculty to proceed through administrative positions in the academic sector. By gaining tenure in a traditional academic field, Shankel enhanced his credibility with the faculty community. Accepting his initial interim appointment was the essential step to beginning an administrative career, a step and responsibility that was not a requirement of his job as a faculty member. Without accepting this additional responsibility, his administrative capabilities would not have been noticed by the Dean of the College and the door to an administrative position at the next level probably would not have been opened to him. The years spent as an Assistant and Associate Dean were said by Shankel to have been the most crucial years in his professional administrative development. It was during this time that he was exposed to a wide variety of issues, a diversity of curriculum, faculty from a range of disciplines, and was in daily contact with administrative role models.

While it was significant that Shankel accepted the Acting Deanship of the College, the critical aspect of this position was that he gained confidence in his ability to lead at that level and sought further administrative positions. The turning point associated with Shankel's first stint as Executive Vice Chancellor was his decision to resign, because it occurred shortly before the resignation of the current Chancellor and serendipitously positioned Shankel to be selected as the Acting Chancellor. Having served as the institution's number two executive for six and one-half years prepared him for such a role and his absence from the formal structure of the administration allowed the Board of Regents to name him as Acting Chancellor without disturbing that structure.

As was the case with previously mentioned positions, Shankel's time as Acting Chancellor was significant for many reasons, but it was once again the confidence that he gained in his ability to lead an institution that was the important turning point. Because of this confidence, he sought the presidencies of several other institutions and was offered a chancellorship at another major research institution. The decision to reject the offer and complete his career at the University of Kansas was the seventh turning point toward the development of his career in interim leadership. The eighth and final turning point that shaped Del Shankel's interim leadership path was the decision by Gene Budig to appoint him as Special Counselor to the Chancellor. This position allowed Shankel to continue as a full-time faculty member and yet stay abreast of the administrative pulse of the institution. Budig was then able to continually appoint him to various interim administrative positions without having to educate a new interim appointee. This also allowed the institution to move forward without disturbing the

current administrative structure by reshuffling responsibilities of current administrators.

A review of these turning points reveals that much of how Del Shankel's career developed was a matter of happenstance. He had no way of planning or manipulating circumstances such that his career path would develop as it did. However, he did take advantage of opportunities that presented themselves. To some degree he controlled what might appear to be fate by accepting responsibility and participating in the organizational community. The experience that was gained through each opportunity opened doors to further opportunities. This is the central point identifying the turning points in his career. Much can be learned from reading the story of his faculty life and each of his administrative positions, but by identifying turning points this study attempted to discover a career path that might be identified in the experience of other interim leaders.

In the existing literature career paths are discussed as ladders and sequential positions are identified that lead from one title to the next. "The normative career trajectory is developed by establishing those sequentially ordered, common positions that commence with a single or fixed-entry position and culminate in a single fixed top position" (Moore, Salimbene, Marlier, and Bragg, 1983, p. 501). In looking at Del Shankel's experience as an interim leader this study found that while his experience in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences followed more of a traditional ladder model, his professional path from then on was anything but a ladder. His positions were up and down the hierarchical ladder, both interim and permanent, and in and out of administration. His position as Special Counselor to the Chancellor and the effect that it had on his career path adds an entirely new

aspect to notion of ladders and career paths.

Institutional Fit

Why did Del Shankel emerge as an interim leader at the University of Kansas? The turning points within his career path may describe how he became an interim leader, but do not fully explain why. A review of the data suggests that Del Shankel's fit with the culture of the University was such that when an interim leader was needed, his persona filled the need repeatedly. Four factors significantly contributed to this cultural fit. Those factors were his credibility with the academic community, his work ethic, his personal characteristics, and time.

Shankel's credibility as a faculty member continually surfaced in discussions with colleagues. His commitment to teaching and research even while serving in administrative roles was well known among members of the University community. The importance of being a contributing faculty member continually surfaced in conversations with Shankel and when asked about his credibility with the faculty, he acknowledged that it was important to him and contributed to his career development. This reputation was developed and maintained for three reasons. First, he continued to teach undergraduate courses and maintain a graduate research lab throughout his entire professional, including periods served in administration. Second, the University community seems to have viewed him as a representative of the faculty among the administration rather than as a full-time administrator because he remained a productive faculty member which showed that he valued faculty and faculty concerns. This is important in an environment where faculty often view members of the

administration as an opposing force (Etzioni, 1991). Third, as Special Counselor to the Chancellor, Shankel was able to maintain his role as a contributing faculty member, showing that he valued faculty life over a long period of time while also staying abreast of the administrative concerns of the institution. While Special Counselor, the Chancellor was able to continually appoint him to various interim administrative positions without Shankel having to leave his faculty role.

The second factor that contributed to Shankel's fit with the institution was his work ethic, defined here as his willingness to participate within the organization and accept additional responsibility. It may be that Shankel's early life experiences predisposed him to behave in a certain way as a member of a community. The involvement in school and extracurricular activities throughout his youth, adolescence, and into college seems to foreshadow an adult pattern of involvement. Shankel said that participation and being involved were important to his "psychic needs." Being a good citizen of the community was something that he valued alongside his willingness to work hard and accept responsibility. This work ethic had some impact on the perception colleagues held of Del Shankel, particularly individuals who were responsible for identifying him as a candidate for interim roles.

In addition to Shankel's credibility as a faculty member and his work ethic, his personal characteristics contributed to institutional fit. Colleagues had clear views of Del Shankel's personality and demeanor. When asked about his leadership ability, respondents described his personal characteristics. These characteristics seem tied to his emergence as a leader and his repeated selection as an interim leader. The laundry list

included: honest, committed, humble, intelligent, trustworthy, credible, experienced, eclectic interests, caring, compassionate, selfless, loyal to the University, leads by example, even-tempered, slow to anger, objective, mediator, smooth, personable, patient, and humorous. Shankel's colleagues identified these attributes specifically with the manner in which Shankel led departments, units, or the University. They noted that he put personal interests behind those of the organization, led quietly, led by example, and was also described as a caretaker of the University.

The fourth contributing factor to Shankel's fit with the institution was the element of time. The time factor is closely connected to the concept of turning points within Shankel's career path. Simply stated, Shankel's role as a faculty member, work ethic, and personal characteristics fit the culture of the institution throughout three and one-half decades. His abilities and availability also fit the needs of seven interim positions throughout that time period. Repeatedly, he was the right person for the job at the right time. If one considers the range of positions that Shankel filled as an interim leader, then it must be recognized that something more than mere ability to fill a job requirement is at work. To be the right person for the job on so many occasions would indicate that Shankel fit a cultural need at the University of Kansas on a repeated basis.

What was the culture of the University that Shankel fit so well? Shankel views the University of Kansas as collegial in nature. During his career, he served as a member of various accrediting boards for the North Central Association and in that role reviewed close to thirty institutions. Based upon those observations as well as experiences at additional institutions where he lectured or attended meetings, Shankel came to

believe that KU is more collegial than other institutions that are similar in structure, size, and mission to the University of Kansas. In drawing this distinction, Shankel maintains that autocratic leadership does not “fit well” at KU, emphasizing that it runs against the “patterns and traditions” of the institution. He asserts that those patterns and traditions include more faculty, staff, and student involvement in University governance than at other institutions. If the University of Kansas truly does incorporate more faculty in the governance of the institution and if Shankel is correct about the collegiality of the University, where a leader is viewed as “first among equals” (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 89) then an individual with Shankel’s credibility, work ethic, and characteristics would be a good fit as an interim leader in that culture.

Influences

Turning points in Del Shankel’s career path help to explain how he became an interim leader. Factors contributing to his fit with the institution shed light on why he emerged as an interim leader at the University of Kansas. Analysis of the data pertaining to the influences in his youth and role models in his professional life further enhance this description of Del Shankel’s path to becoming an interim leader. As one listens to, or reads the story of, Shankel’s youth a list of variables appear to have predisposed him toward a career in higher education as well as a leadership role within that arena. Similarly, as one listens to or reads the story of his professional life, a handful of individuals are mentioned repeatedly as having an impact on that life. In the process of reviewing these variables and these individuals, meaning is added to the description of Del Shankel’s life

experience and development as an interim leader.

Family, church, education, sports, friends, childhood illness, medical school, military service, teaching opportunities, and graduate school all influenced the development of Shankel's professional life. The story of how each of these variables contributed to Del Shankel becoming a Professor of Microbiology at the University of Kansas has already been presented in this manuscript. For the purpose of discussion, let it be said that when the story of Shankel's life is reconstructed, it weaves through each of these components of his life and each factor links one stage of development to the next until the culmination of all these events is the beginning of his professional career. However, this is not where the impact of these elements stops. As would be the case in any individual's life, Shankel's early experiences influenced the rest of his life. The leadership opportunities afforded to Shankel in school and extracurricular activities, particularly in sports, had a lasting influence on his behavior as a professional and on his openness to additional leadership responsibilities. These experiences coupled with Shankel's home environment and the values that were reinforced by the family church all contributed to his willingness to participate in the organizational community to which he belonged as a professional.

Providing Shankel with early role models was an important part of the influence provided by his home, school, and church environment. Shankel's father was an early prototype of what Del would later become as a professional. Cecil Shankel spent most of his own professional life in the dual role of an educational administrator and teacher. The data from interviews with Shankel are replete with references to the influence of

teachers throughout all stages of his educational career. Extended family members who served in educational and ministerial roles within the church also provided Shankel with early role models committed to service.

The influence of role models did not stop as Shankel's early life came to a close and his professional life at the University of Kansas began. The image of his father and his commitment to both teaching and administration served as a model for Shankel's own behavior. Orville Wyss, Shankel's graduate advisor, served as a model for Shankel's faculty career. Dave Paretsky hired Shankel at KU, was his first Department Chair, appointed him to his first interim administrative position, and served as an early administrative model. Frances Heller was an Associate Dean in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences during the period that Shankel refers to as the most crucial years in his professional administrative development. Much of the mentoring that he received during those years came from Frances Heller. Ray Nichols was the Chief Budget Officer at the University throughout much of Shankel's early administrative life and served as a counselor on many issues in this area.

Finally, the two most significant role models during Shankel's professional life were George Waggoner, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and Gene Budig, Chancellor of the University of Kansas. Waggoner served as the primary role model for the early half of Shankel's administrative career and appointed Shankel as Acting Dean in his own absence. Shankel credits Waggoner, whom one colleague referred to as a "groomer of men," with teaching the importance of accountability in leadership.

Budig was the chief role model for the latter half of Shankel's

administrative career and an individual that Shankel often referred to as a close friend. Shankel says that he learned a “tremendous amount” from the Chancellor during their thirteen years together. Budig may also be viewed as a catalyst to Shankel’s administrative career longevity naming Shankel as Special Counselor, appointing him to four interim leadership positions, one permanent administrative post, and recommending him to serve as Acting Chancellor upon Budig’s own resignation.

The importance of each of these role models to Del Shankel and his leadership practice is that they taught Shankel how to be a leader in the cultural setting of the University of Kansas. For example, George Waggoner emphasized to his associates the importance of maintaining a faculty role while serving in administration. At that time at the University of Kansas, this was culturally important. By following that advice and emulating Waggoner’s behavior, Del Shankel fit the culture of the institution. Shankel continued to learn about and adapt to the institutional culture as he worked with Gene Budig and from his role as Special Counselor he continued to move in and out of leadership positions because of his fit with the institutional culture.

Definition of Interim Leadership

When asked to define interim leadership, Shankel provided the following definition:

It means a combination of somewhat unique challenges and opportunities. The unique aspects of it are that when you are in an interim position, it’s more difficult to make long-term decisions and long-term plans. You have to be sensitive to both kinds of programs, ideas, and concepts that were put in place by your predecessor and the kinds of initiatives that your successor may want to begin and you have some obligation

not to try to make changes that are too dramatic in nature, but at the same time you have an obligation to keep the institution moving forward and to not allow things to slide back from where they were. To maintain a sense of momentum and feeling of continued progress. I think the unique and interesting challenge of an interim position is that to try to maintain that balance between continued momentum and progress, and sensitivity to the past, and openness for changes in the future.

Shankel prefaces his definition by saying that interim leadership provides for both challenges and opportunities. Shankel may be saying that an interim leader is faced with problems as well as chances to solve problems, or make a difference. He uses the term "unique" to indicate that these challenges and opportunities may be different from the situations encountered by individuals in permanent positions of leadership. His definition also provides interim leaders with two boundaries to work within: the past and the future. He illustrates these boundaries three different times. First, he says that it is more difficult to make long-term decisions and long-term plans as an interim leader because an interim leader has to be sensitive to the programs, ideas, and concepts put in place by the interim leader's predecessor (past) while also being sensitive to the initiatives that the interim leader's successor may want to begin (future). Second, he says that an interim leader has "some" obligation to not make dramatic changes (past) while also having an obligation to keep the institution moving forward, not sliding back, maintaining a sense of momentum and a feeling of continued progress (future). Third, he summarizes his previous comments by breaking the boundaries into three time frames. He indicates that the true challenge to an interim leader is to maintain a balance between sensitivity to the past (past), continued momentum and progress (present), and openness for

changes in the future (future). It is the role of the interim leader to find that balance and to walk a tight rope between past and future while leading in the present.

In Del Shankel's discussion of interim leadership and how his definition applied to his own practice, three factors surfaced as important aspects within that experience. How he dealt with implementing or not implementing change, morale amongst his constituency, and the role of associates were all central to Shankel's experience with interim leadership. As noted, Shankel contends that an interim leader must strike a balance between the past and the future. He also asserts that a leader in an interim position for one year or less is not in a good position to initiate major change. Shankel did not directly define what he means by major or dramatic change, but an analysis of the data revealed that he believes decisions such as personnel changes or reassignment of responsibility among members of the unit may be necessary during periods of interim leadership, so do not constitute major or dramatic change. On the other hand, leading a unit or an institution in a new direction is dramatic and not recommended for an interim leader. He also emphasizes that if major change is needed, a clear understanding must exist between the interim leader and that leader's superiors as to the parameters of that change.

Another important factor in Shankel's discussion of interim leadership was the morale of his constituency and he indicates that it was a major priority in each of his interim positions. He asserts that a large part of interim leadership is maintaining momentum, maintaining morale, building trust with staff, and building trust with other constituencies. He also believes that when he did implement change as an interim leader, the change was in the

way that internal business was conducted. He calls these changes changes in atmosphere and changes in approach, changes that would enhance the morale of faculty and staff. In order to implement such changes, Shankel contends that one of the first responsibilities of an interim leader is to evaluate staff morale.

The third factor contributing to Shankel's experience as an interim leader was the role of associates. He gives much credit to the staff and colleagues who worked with him in each of his interim positions for all accomplishments. He believes that if any change is to be implemented at all, then the appropriate associates must be in place to carry through the initiatives. He also asserts that another task of an interim leader is to assess the abilities of his or her staff. The interim leader must evaluate the willingness of associates to participate, determine what talents exist amongst the staff, and then assign responsibilities according to abilities and interests. He recommends that an interim leader not hesitate to share responsibilities with staff and maintains that an interim leader's appreciation for associates and the ability to assess skills are essential to maintaining the momentum of a unit.

Style of Interim Leadership

It is within the process of decision-making that leadership style is most notably exhibited. The style with which Shankel carried forth his responsibilities as an interim leader, enacted the decision-making process, and implemented his views of interim leadership evolved over a thirty-seven year career. He indicated that while serving in early interim appointments, he was merely trying to be a good member of the higher education

community, but began to assimilate aspects of leadership style from various role models into his own administrative practice as he moved up the administrative ladder. By the time he served as the Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Shankel says that he was 59 years old and his style was “pretty well formed.” While others described Shankel’s leadership as objective and his role as that of a mediator throughout his leadership career, Shankel maintains that his style evolved toward consensus building as he aged and became less egocentric. Turning down an offer to be chancellor of another institution and deciding to finish his career at KU may be the point at which Shankel abandoned a personal administrative agenda. As he and others described, Shankel’s leadership style always exhibited some elements of consensus building; by the end of his career, his leadership style was based almost completely upon building consensus within the decision-making process.

Shankel maintains that his growth toward consensus building was a life-long process which began when he learned to control his temper on the playgrounds as a child and was solidified when he served as the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC). As EVC, Shankel was continuously placed in the role of intermediary between the various Vice Chancellors and the needs of the sectors that they represented. As noted, his role was often mediation to the point that one colleague compared Shankel’s approach in decision-making to smoothing rough waters.

Shankel described steps within the consensus building process. First, he provided colleagues with as much information as he had available and with initial suggestions from his vantage point. Second, he asked that the team gather as much information as possible. Third, he asked for input

from all interested parties. Fourth, he tried to reach consensus among these parties. Fifth, if no consensus could be reached, he was not opposed to making the final decision himself, believing that this is the ultimate responsibility of a leader who tries to build consensus. He refers to this process as rational decision-making and says that it can be complicated by the boundaries of interim leadership. Shankel believes that it is important for an interim leader not to bind his successor by making long-term decisions or plans, but not having these plans can complicate decision-making. He also admits that while he was not opposed to making the hard decision, he never grew comfortable with making decisions that impacted the personal lives of individuals, such as denial of tenure or removal of someone from an administrative role. It is in these more difficult situations that Shankel encourages leaders to infuse qualities of integrity, honesty, loyalty, and compassion into the decision-making process.

Shankel's consensus building style of leadership was part of what made him fit the institutional culture of the University of Kansas. His style of building consensus fit the collegial nature of the institution that Shankel described. As noted, his unassuming personality, his faculty role, his work ethic and willingness to contribute, the lessons he learned from role models about what was important within the institutional culture, the manner in which his career path developed, his definition of interim leadership as it pertained to striking a balance between past and future, all contributed to his institutional fit. However, his leadership style combined pieces of each of these factors and completed the equation that led to his being the right person at the right time for the University of Kansas.

Research Questions

Prior to collecting data for this study seven research questions were constructed in an effort to direct the process of discovery. Each of these questions has been addressed in the broader context of this manuscript, but will now be redressed succinctly and in order.

Question One

What is interim leadership as Del Shankel experienced it at the University of Kansas? Interim leadership as Del Shankel experienced it is the accumulation of each and every experience that he had while serving in seven interim positions. Shankel's definition of interim leadership evolved out of this complete experience. He defined interim leadership as a unique challenge and opportunity wherein it is difficult to make long-term decisions and plans, and where the interim leader must strike a balance between sensitivity to the past and openness to the future. When speaking of sensitivity to the past and openness to the future, Shankel specifically referred to concepts put in place by the interim leader's predecessor and initiatives that the successor may want to begin. The term Shankel used to describe this unique balance and sensitivity is "continued momentum and progress." Shankel's personal style of leadership, whether in interim or permanent positions, became one of consensus building in the decision-making process. Interim leadership as Del Shankel experienced it at the University of Kansas was an attempt to continue the momentum and progress of the unit that he was charged with directing through building consensus.

Question Two

Was interim leadership defined or experienced differently according to position? Shankel answered both parts of this question at the same time, noting that while the challenges, opportunities, or restrictions within the positions (the experiences) differed to some degree, the definition did not vary across the different positions. The definition did not fundamentally vary, but the decision-making process by which Shankel pursued interim leadership goals did evolve over time, moving from leader centered to consensus building.

Question Three

Did the definition or experience change over the course of time? Shankel answered this question when he said that the experiences differed to some degree, but the definition did not vary across his positions. Since these experiences and positions spanned nearly three decades, the interim leadership definition did not significantly change over time.

Question Four

Was he called upon to create change or maintain the status quo? The issue of change was central to Shankel's definition of interim leadership. He was explicit in his view that anyone serving in an interim role for one year or less should not be creating major change unless directed by immediate superiors or the governing board. Major change was never defined in the course of discussion, but Shankel indicated that he believes an interim leader must have no restrictions with respect to personnel decisions if he or she is to be effective. Shankel's own practice as an interim

leader followed his definition closely. Enhancing morale was a priority and associates were valued in the process of striking the balance between past and future, defined as “continued momentum and progress.” From reading the biographical sketch, one concludes that those who appointed him to interim positions did so with a maintenance role in mind and were confident that Shankel could and would be judicious in choosing issues wherein change might be initiated. Shankel did not believe that an interim leader should initiate significant change and was not called upon to do so. Shankel’s beliefs and style fit the needs of the institution at the times he was appointed to interim positions.

Question Five

How did these experiences differ in his various interim positions? This question is best answered by reading the biographical sketch of the various positions in the order that they were experienced and is one of the primary reasons for the inclusion of that section. The job descriptions and responsibilities of each position varied, but the parameters of his interim leadership did not. He learned that an interim leader must have the freedom to make certain changes such as personnel decisions, but to seek “continued momentum and progress” in each position by prioritizing morale and contributions of associates.

Question Six

Why was he selected to serve in multiple interim capacities on multiple occasions? Del Shankel was selected to serve in these interim positions because he brought to the table on each occasion a mixture of

attributes and conditions that were directly applicable to the circumstances at hand. He fit the culture of the institution and the needs of the positions. Shankel's consensus building style of leadership fit the institutional culture of the University of Kansas. This style evolved over the course of his professional life. It was a culmination of his previous experiences combined with his personal attributes. He did not bring the same mix of attributes to each position, but rather learned and grew as a leader such that when a new opportunity presented itself, Shankel was able to build upon previous experience and fit the needs of that position. His commitment to teaching and scholarship within a research institution, his credibility among within the academic community, and his style of building consensus fit the collegial nature of the institution that Shankel described.

Question Seven

How did he experience the shift between interim leader and faculty member? Shankel never fully left the role of faculty member even while in administrative positions. Not only was this his personal experience, but also something recognized by the University community. There was never really a period of transition back to full-time faculty work and reintroduction to the lifestyle. This was especially true following interim positions and the role as Special Counselor enhanced this situation for the last thirteen years of Shankel's career. The lack of real transition issues made it easier for him to continue to move in and out of leadership positions over time as opposed to leaving a faculty role altogether and then trying to reenter faculty life.

Implications for the Literature

The five themes that emerged from the data point toward three significant findings that impact the current literature on leadership. Little to no research has been conducted on interim leaders and therefore it could be said that every detail of the study adds to the current literature on leadership or begins a new avenue of research within that field. However, the details all contribute to the three major findings or topics. In review of the data in this study and the literature in the field, this study finds that Del Shankel was a symbolic leader, defined interim leadership as a form of transactional leadership, and practiced consensus building as an interim leader. These findings are significant in that they represent the experience of one individual interim leader and does imply that all interim leaders would be the same type of leader, define interim leadership similarly, or practice the same style of leadership.

The Role of Institutional Culture and the Symbolic Leader

Bensimon et al., (1991) and Birnbaum (1988) suggest that one way of explaining what happens in university communities is through cultural and symbolic theory. Phillips and Kennedy (1986) assert that within a cultural or symbolic frame, "shared values" define "the fundamental character of the organization" (p. 199). At a research institution such as the University of Kansas, research and teaching within the discipline are of value (Clark, 1991, p. 449). Shankel's credibility within the academic community was a result of his continued role as a contributing member within his own discipline of microbiology. This academic credibility was of even greater importance at KU, if one accepts Shankel's interpretation of the culture as

collegial. Rarely does one use collegial to describe the culture of a research institution (Birnbaum, 1988), but according to Shankel, KU governance is much more inclusive of faculty, staff, and students than other institutions of its size and mission. In a collegium, contributing members of the community are viewed as equals and leaders are viewed as "first among equals" (p. 89). The way in which Shankel became an equal in the KU culture was to be a contributing faculty member throughout his professional life and not to espouse an administrative career. The concept of a collegial culture within a research institution which is usually viewed from a more structural perspective is supported by Clark's (1991) assertion that what exists at most universities is no longer a true bureaucracy just as it is no longer a true collegium (p. 449). Multiple forces are at work within the universities of the latter twentieth century. How these forces interact and the culture that evolves would be different at each institution, making each institution unique.

Clark further asserts that how one attains status within these complex organizations is "derived...from one's standing in a discipline, and this source of standing is independent of the official scheme" (p. 449). This would further reinforce the notion that Shankel's credibility was achieved through his attention to scholarship. His ability to publish and teach while moving in and out of administrative roles is considered unusual by Etzioni (1991) who contends that most administrators sacrifice their publication record as they pursue administrative positions. Because of this loss, Etzioni believes that most faculty are unwilling to risk accepting positions as mid-level administrators (p. 447) and by inference, as upper-level administrators. Shankel's willingness to accept administrative responsibility

at all levels might be considered taking a risk by those studying collegiate administration. Etzioni also maintains that if professional faculty were in administrative positions, something he refers to as professional authority, then faculty wants and needs would be satisfied. It was asserted that Shankel's academic credibility was significant to his cultural fit and if Etzioni's theory in some way identifies with the faculty at KU, then it is possible that faculty at the University of Kansas would have viewed Shankel as a professional authority. If so, then this professional authority coupled with the collegial view of first among equals may have contributed to Shankel's ability to move in and out of administrative roles. The faculty valued him as a colleague and respected him as one of their own even as he served in administrative positions.

As Phillips and Kennedy (1986) spoke of shared values within the culture of an organization, Kuh and Whitt (1988) agreed that "the core or culture is comprised of assumptions and beliefs shared - to some degree - by members of the institution that guide decision making and shape major events and activities" (p. 29). The selection of an interim leader serves as one of these major events and Trow (1991) maintained that the symbolic leader expresses, projects, and seems to embody the "character of the institution" or its "central goals and values" (p. 355). Shankel was seen as representing the shared values of the academic community or the goals and values of the institution (teaching, research, and service to the institution). Green (1992) found that when she served as Interim President of Mount Vernon College that she became "a living, breathing symbol; the recipient of everyone's projected hopes and frustrations" (p. A18). Bolman and Deal (1991) bring these same concepts together in a way that might explain

Shankel's role in the KU culture. They explain that "most significant events and processes in organizations are ambiguous or uncertain" and that during periods of uncertainty people tend to "create symbols to resolve confusion, increase predictability, and provide direction" (p. 244). Periods of interim leadership are often periods of great uncertainty. Because Shankel embodied the values of the institution, he could be repeatedly selected to serve as a symbol of the institutional character during these times. That he was willing to define leadership in terms of predictability and maintenance of momentum and progress without radical or dynamic change (as opposed to more transformative leadership and top down change), made Shankel an ideal interim leader during periods of institutional uncertainty. This is an important finding of this research because while the literature supports the role of symbolism for those in permanent leadership positions, no discussion of symbolic leadership exists for those in interim positions. Embodying institutional character, representing core values, and providing some degree of predictability appear to be important symbolic functions of the interim leader. They also may be key characteristics of who becomes an interim leader.

A significant finding of this study is also how Shankel came to embody the values and character of the institution. Shankel's career path and life influences both contributed to his embodiment of these values. Bolman and Deal (1991) assert that culture "is continually renewed and re-created as new members are taught the old ways and eventually become teachers themselves" (p. 250). Shankel was impacted by several role models teaching him the "old ways" of the KU culture. While serving in various positions, Shankel learned how to be a leader at the University of

Kansas. George Waggoner and Gene Budig not only taught him administrative tasks, but as importantly, they taught him how to work within the culture. Waggoner emphasized the importance of maintaining a faculty role within the institution while serving as an administrator. Waggoner understood the value of this at KU and he passed it along to his students of administration. While serving as Special Counselor, Budig shared with Shankel the ways in which he and his administration were reinforcing or changing the KU culture. From this position, Shankel was also able to pursue faculty life as Waggoner had taught him. These examples indicate that Shankel learned about the culture of the University of Kansas from mentors as well as experience, and internalized that culture as he moved forward in his professional life letting the culture shape his behavior and definitions of interim leadership.

When asked to describe Shankel as a leader, most of his colleagues chose to list several traits that distinguished his leadership as well as his personality. Many of the traits mentioned (e.g., honesty, intelligence, objectivity) are the same as those found on the myriad lists generated by previous research of Gardner (1989), Cronin (1989), and Bennis (1986). Traditionally, the traits that appear in the literature are referred to by feminist scholars as based upon male experiences and are “characteristics of dominance, assertiveness, and competitiveness” (Schein, 1989, pp. 154-155). Interestingly, many of the traits that were listed by his colleagues such as care, compassion, patience, and humor are characteristics that Schein asserts need to be included in the traditional list in order to portray or develop more appropriate and effective leaders. The importance of these non-traditional traits to interim leadership is not clear from this study and

needs to be pursued further.

Shankel's credibility within the academic community, his internalization of the University culture through career experiences and mentors, and his personal traits all contributed to his institutional fit and led to his repeated emergence as an interim leader. Each of these findings is supported by previous research. However, several other aspects within these areas add to the existing literature. First, this study found that timing played a significant role in Shankel's career path as well as his fit with the institution. For example, when he resigned as Executive Vice Chancellor he then became available to serve as Acting Chancellor. Incidents in Shankel's career were selected as turning points either because he learned something significant during that period, or what transpired during that period led to a significant position later in his career. Second, influences from Shankel's early life predisposed him to a career in higher education and to leadership roles in that arena. They contributed significantly to his work ethic and willingness to participate in the University community, both of which were major factors in his fit with the institution. Neither timing nor early life experiences are mentioned with any regularity in the literature on leadership and both should be considered for further research. Non-traditional leadership traits and their role in the emergence of interim leaders, the importance of maintenance and predictability, and the role of symbolism in interim leadership are also unique findings of this research that should be explored in more detail in future research.

Transactional and Trans-vigorational Leadership

Shankel's definition of interim leadership adds to the current literature

which is replete with definitions of leadership, but none of which apply directly to interim leadership. As this study proceeded, contingency theory seemed to best explain Shankel's experience as an interim leader. It stood to reason that "adapting one's style of leadership to situational factors" (Bensimon et al., 1991, p. 395) might explain an experience wherein a leader shifted in and out of various administrative positions. However, Shankel stated that while the responsibilities and job description of each position may have differed, the same definition of interim leadership. Shankel believed the parameters of the way in which he practiced his leadership did not change.

Shankel defined interim leadership as striking a balance between the past and the future, something he referred to as "continued momentum and progress." Shankel's definition of interim leadership is similar to that of transactional leadership. According to Cronin (1988), transactional leadership is an "exchange" between parties, usually "with short-term interests in mind" (p. 53). Shankel's experiences indicate that the limited time frame within which interim leaders must operate is a defining characteristic of interim leadership. He noted that no major change should be initiated if an interim leader is serving in a position for one year or less, although such change could be initiated if it was absolutely necessary. His definition places the focus of interim leadership upon the short-term. Granted, by paying attention to what the one's successor may want to do, the interim leader pays heed to the future, but can do very little to affect the long-term. The long-term vision that is so often spoken of in leadership literature is reduced to looking forward to the goals and objectives of the immediate successor. Cronin refers to the transactional leader as a pragmatic

officeholder (p. 53), which seems to parallel Shankel's approach to interim leadership. This form of leadership also resembles what Bennis (1989) called custodial leadership in which institutional leaders simply care for an institution and hope to maintain some semblance of its former self (p. 10). As one looks at the big picture of what occurs during periods of interim leadership, an exchange occurs between the institution and the interim leader. In Shankel's case, this exchange may be interpreted as the institution being able to move forward administratively on multiple occasions without upsetting the momentum of the organization or the structure of the administration. The administration was also able to pay heed to the academic community by selecting an individual who embodied their cultural values. Shankel symbolized what the members of the community valued in the University of Kansas. For example, when Shankel was selected to serve as Acting Chancellor on two occasions, it was an opportunity for the institution to celebrate one of its own as well as its own values or culture. In a way Shankel, in turn, was able to serve the institution and hold positions of leadership which further enhanced his professional experience and sometimes led to higher ranking permanent administrative positions. As a custodian, Shankel did not try to enact change, thereby transacting with the institution the kind of leadership it wanted in a period of ambiguity and transition.

Shankel defined interim leadership as a form of transactional leadership, but his own leadership appears to have been more broadly practiced than what a strict interpretation of transactional leadership would allow for. Bennis (1989) defined transactional leadership as a two-way relationship with give and take from both sides while she says that

transformational leadership is more of a one-way process in which “leaders initiate relationships which raise followers to new levels of morality and motivation.” On one hand, Shankel evaluated his associates and assigned them responsibilities that fit their interest and abilities and on the other hand, his value of their contributions was another definable characteristic of his leadership practice. This suggests that Shankel brought an element of transformational leadership to interim leadership, but the parameters that existed within those positions as defined by Shankel prevented him from fully engaging in transformational leadership as Cronin (1988) described it. The transformational leader “so engages with followers as to bring them to a heightened political and social consciousness and activity, and in the process converts many of those followers into leaders in their own right” (p. 53).

It may be that Shankel's experience as an interim leader resembles a concept introduced by Bensimon (1989) called trans-vigorous leadership. She suggested that the definition of transformational leadership needs to be reconceptualized and that research shows that a form of leadership exists that “reconfigures rather than replaces existing goals and values.” Current definitions of transformational leadership, such as Cronin's definition, suggest that transformational leadership replaces goals and values with new ones that would drastically change the organization. Bensimon argues that these “shifts in direction” are often more “moderate” and that a more appropriate name should be created for leaders who “combine characteristics” of the transactional and transformational leader. She suggests that this type of leadership is “primarily focused on invigorating, rather than transforming, organizations” and calls it “trans-

vigorational" leadership. Shankel's emphasis on continuing the momentum and the progress of the institution as well as his concern for the morale of his associates suggests that while Shankel's definition of interim leadership describes a form of transactional leadership, his own practice as an interim leader could be viewed as trans-vigorational.

Consensus Building

This study found that, over the course of his thirty-seven year professional life, Shankel became a consensus builder. Zaleznik (1989) maintained that the consensus builder is an "antihero" or "common man" who survives the "rigors of institutional politics" (p. 95). The picture of Shankel as a common man or as a symbol representing the values of other common men fits the concept of him being a representative of the academic community within the administrative structure. Zaleznik further contends that Americans distrust charismatic leaders and that in many organizational cultures status is gained by "achievement rather than ascription" (p. 101). Shankel was not a charismatic leader (although there is not much written about the academy's trust or distrust of such leaders) and gained his status through traditional academic achievement and continued academic contribution rather than by ascription of positional authority as is often the case with administrators in a college or university setting. Zaleznik also described the consensus builder's culture as one built on pragmatism and egalitarianism (p. 101) wherein the leader can bring together issues and support through majority opinion. Zaleznik's anti-hero consensus builder characterizes Shankel's interim leadership fairly well and this description should be applied to the study of other interim leaders. Shankel's

experience adds to the literature in several ways and should be explored in further study as well. First, Shankel maintained that his style evolved over a period of time and that it was an assimilation of styles and practices that he gathered from watching role models throughout his professional life. Second, he asserted that as he grew less egocentric he became more comfortable with the team or consensus building approach. Third, he described a process that he utilized in striving to build consensus. Finally, he indicated that if consensus could not be reached it was his job, or the responsibility of the leader, to make the final decision.

Suggestions for Further Research

The purpose of this study was to begin the process of discovery of the phenomenon of interim leadership. It is the history of one individual's experience with that phenomenon, which may be like or unlike any other individual's experience. Therefore, one path of further research is to conduct similar studies on individual's who have had in-depth experience with interim leadership. Multiple qualitative studies would eventually identify multiple themes, factors, and variables within the differing experiences of those individual leaders. Once these are identified, it would be possible to construct additional qualitative and quantitative tools that address these issues and survey a larger population of individuals who have served in interim leadership positions. The eventual goal of this process would be to determine what type of individual and what type of leadership best fit interim leadership roles. Eventually, this information might inform and assist in the hiring of qualified interim leaders.

As other interim leaders are studied in the future, this research project

provides a base for future research avenues. First, are other interim leaders symbolic leaders? Several questions follow this avenue of pursuit. For example, do differing institutional cultures lead to types of leaders other than symbolic leaders emerging in interim positions? Is credibility among the academic community a factor that remains significant across the experiences of various interim leaders? Do role models play an impact on the development of other interim leaders? What other influences affect the career paths of these individuals? Do these individuals have similar career paths? Is timing a factor that should be considered in the emergence of interim leaders? Do these interim leaders have similar personal and leadership traits? Do other interim leaders display a willingness to participate in the university community as Shankel did and do they maintain a similar work ethic?

A second avenue of research would be to discover if other interim leaders define interim leadership as transactional leadership and if they implement aspects of transformational leadership into their practice. Is there further support for the theory that trans-vigorational interim leaders exist and that they combine aspects of both transactional and transformational leadership?

Third, future research might also study the styles of leadership practiced by interim leaders. Is consensus building a style of leadership that is used by other interim leaders and if so why? If so, is it a style that evolved over a period of time? Is personal ego a factor within the selection or rejection of this style? Finally, do other interim leaders follow a similar process in seeking consensus in the decision-making process?

The purpose of this study was to begin the process of discovery for

the phenomenon of interim leadership. This was done by studying the professional life of one individual who served as an interim leader on a repeated basis. Much more research needs to be done in order to understand interim leadership. This need becomes increasingly more important as the phenomenon of interim leadership is becoming more frequent in today's higher education arena. As more research is conducted and more is learned about interim leadership and interim leaders, it may one day be possible for individuals with the responsibility of selecting interim leaders to do so with guidance from the literature in higher education.

References

- Amey, M.J., & Twombly, S.B. (1992). Re-visioning leadership in community colleges. Review of Higher Education, 15(2), 125-150.
- Aronowitz, S. (1988). The production of scientific knowledge. In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), Marxism and the interpretation of culture (p. 527). Urbana: University of Illinois.
- Badaracco, J.L., & Ellsworth, R.R. (1989). Leadership and the quest for integrity. Harvard Business School Press.
- Baldrige, J.V., Curtis, D.V., Ecker, G.P., & Riley, G.L. (1991). Alternative models of governance in higher education. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education (pp. 17-29). Lexington, MA: Ginn Press.
- Barringer, B.A. (1982). The interim presidency. In S. Hutchins (Ed.), ACCT Trustee Quarterly (pp. 1-3). Annandale, VA:
- Bates, R. (1989). Leadership and the rationalization of society. In J. Smyth (Ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 131-156). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Bavelas, A. (1984). Leadership: Man and function. In W.E. Rosenbach & R.L. Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary issues in leadership (pp. 117-123). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Bennis, W.G. (1989). Where have all the leaders gone? In W.E. Rosenbach & R.L. Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary issues in leadership (pp. 5-23). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Bennis, W.G. (1986). Four traits of leadership. In J.N. Williamson (Ed.), Leader-Manager (pp. 79-89). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Bensimon, E.M. (1991). The meaning of "good presidential leadership": A frame analysis. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education (pp. 421-431). Lexington, MA: Ginn Press.
- Bensimon, E.M. (1989). Transactional, transformational, and "trans-vigorational" leaders. Leadership Abstracts, 2(6).

- Bensimon, E.M., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1991). Higher education and leadership theory. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education (pp.389-398). Lexington, MA: Ginn Press.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). How colleges work: the cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Blackmore, J. (1989). Educational leadership: A feminist critique and reconstruction. In J. Smyth (Ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 93-130). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Bogue, E.G. (1985). The enemies of leadership: Lessons for leaders in education. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T.E., (1991). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Burke, W.W. (1988). Leadership and empowerment. New York, NY: W. WarrenBurke Associates, Inc.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Chaffee, E.E. (1983). Rational decision making in higher education. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
- Clark, B.R. (1991). Faculty organization and authority. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education (pp. 449-458). Lexington, MA: Ginn Press.
- Codd, J. (1989). Educational leadership as reflective action. In J. Smyth (Ed.) Critical perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 157-178). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Cohen, M.D., & March, J.G. (1991). The processes of choice. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education (pp. 175-181). Lexington, MA: Ginn Press.
- Cohen, M.D., & March, J.G. (1991). Leadership in an organized anarchy. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education (pp. 399-420). Lexington, MA: Ginn Press.

- Cooper, J., Kempner, K., & Amey, M. (1993). Higher education leadership from a postmodern perspective. Unpublished manuscript.
- Cronin, T.E. (1989). Thinking and learning about leadership. In W.E. Rosenbach & R.L. Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary issues in leadership (pp. 45-64). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Cross, C., & Ravekes, J.E. (1990). Leadership in a different voice. AAWCJC Journal, 7-14.
- Denzin, N.K. (1989). Interpretive biography. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dill, D.D. (1991). The nature of administrative behavior in higher education. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education (pp. 369-388). Lexington, MA: Ginn Press.
- Etzioni, A. (1991). Administrative behavior and professional authority. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education (pp. 441-448). Lexington, MA: Ginn Press.
- Fincher, C. (1987). Administrative leadership in higher education. In J.C. Smart (Ed.) Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, Volume III (pp. 155-198). New York, NY: Agathon Press.
- Foster, W. (1989). Toward a critical practice of leadership. In J. Smyth (Ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 39-62). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Gardner, J.W. (1990). On leadership. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Gardner, J.W. (1989). The tasks of leadership. In W.E. Rosenbach & R.L. Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary issues in leadership (pp. 24-33). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Giroux, H. (1992). Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (1991). Series introduction: Toward a discourse of leadership and radical democracy. In S.J. Maxcy, Educational leadership: A critical pragmatic perspective (pp. ix-xiii). New York, NY: Bergin & Garvey.
- Green, M.F. (1992, February 26). The accidental president: Views of theory and reality. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A18.

- Green, M.F. (1988). Toward a new leadership model. In M.F. Green (Ed.), Leaders for a new era (pp. 30-52). New York, NY: ACE/MacMillan Publishing.
- Holloman, C.R. (1984). Leadership and headship: There is a difference. In W.E. Rosenbach & R.L. Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary issues in leadership (pp. 109-116). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Hoopes, J. (1979). Oral history: An introduction for students. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Kelley, R.E. (1989). In praise of followers. In W.E. Rosenbach & R.L. Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary issues in leadership (pp. 124-134). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Kelly, F.J. (1991). Evolution of leadership in American higher education: A changing paradigm. Journal for Higher Education Management, 7(1), 29-34.
- Koenig, A.E., & Langevin, T.H. (1992). The benefits of an interim president. AGB Reports, 34(5), 20-24.
- Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (1990). The leadership challenge. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kuh, G.D., & Whitt, E.J. (1988). The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G.B. (1995). Designing qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Maxcy, S.J. (1991). Educational leadership: A critical pragmatic perspective. New York, NY: Bergin & Garvey.
- Moore, K.M., Salimbene, A.M., Marlier, J.D., & Bragg, S.M. (1983). The structure of presidents' and deans' careers. Journal of Higher Education, 54(5), 500-515.
- Nadler, D.A., & Tushman, M.L. (1989). What makes for magic leadership? In W.E. Rosenbach & R.L. Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary issues in leadership (pp. 210-221). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Neff, C.B. (1989). The transitional presidency. AGB Reports, 31(5), 16-21.

- Patton, M.Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Perkins, J.A. (1973). Organization and functions of the university. In J.A. Perkins (Ed.), The University as an Organization (pp. 3-14). New York, NY: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Phillips, J.R., & Kennedy, A.A. (1986). Shaping and managing shared values. In J.A. Perkins (Ed.), The University as an Organization (pp. 3-14). New York, NY: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Rosenbach, W.E., & Hayman, S. (1989). Absentee charismatic leadership: Khomeini, Gandhi and Mandela. In W.E. Rosenbach & R.L. Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary issues in leadership (pp. 210-221). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Rost, J.C. (1991). Leadership for the twenty-first century. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Schein, V.E. (1989). Would women lead differently? In W.E. Rosenbach and R.L. Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary issues in leadership (pp. 154-160). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Smyth, J. (1989). Preface. In J. Smyth (Ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 1-8). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Smyth, J. (1989). A 'pedagogical' and 'educative' view of leadership. In J. Smyth (Ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 179-204). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Tierney, W.G. (1993). Building communities of difference: Higher education in the twenty-first century. Westport, CN: Bergin & Garvey.
- Tierney, W.G. (1991). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education (pp. 126-139). Lexington, MA: Ginn Press.
- Tierney, W.G. (1991). Symbolism and presidential perceptions of leadership. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education (pp. 432-440). Lexington, MA: Ginn Press.

- Trow, M.A. (1991). Comparative reflections on leadership in higher education. In M. Peterson (Ed.), ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education (pp. 355-368). Lexington, MA: Ginn Press.
- Veazey, T. (1995). Chancellor Shankel, if you please: 'Interim' dropped from Shankel's title by Regents. The University Daily Kansan, 104(141), 1.
- Watkins, P. (1989). Leadership, power and symbols in educational administration. In J. Smyth, (Ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 9-38). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Yow, V.R. (1994). Recording oral history: A practical guide for social scientists. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Zaleznik, A. (1989). The leadership gap. In W.E. Rosenbach and R.L. Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary issues in leadership (pp. 34-44). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Appendix A
Interview Protocol

Interview Protocol

The following twelve questions provided the foundation for the interview guide. While multiple avenues of questioning were followed during each interview session, these twelve questions were asked in reference to each of Dr. Shankel's administrative positions.

1. Could you describe the path that led to your appointment as (insert title)?
2. What did you see as your role in that position?
3. What was your leadership style at that time?
4. What were your greatest accomplishments while serving as (insert title)?
5. What were your greatest assets while serving as (insert title)?
6. What were your greatest challenges while serving as (insert title)?
7. While serving as (insert title) did you maintain current conditions or implement change?
8. How did the experience of serving as (insert title) change you?
9. What did you learn from your experience as (insert title)?
10. How did you change the organization, or the position?
11. What advice do you have for someone else serving as (insert title)?
12. Why did you move on to the next administrative position or return to the faculty?