Due to the decentralized nature of many American institutions of higher education, leadership at the department level is needed to bring about cultural change within academic departments. The department represents the unit in which day-to-day work activities take place for the majority of faculty and academic staff (Roach, 1976). Faculty and academic staff may be employed by a university, but they tend to identify with their immediate "home" department (Mills, Bettis, Miller, & Nolan, 2005). A university president may publicly call for cultural change efforts, whether diversifying the student body or making faculty careers more family-friendly, but cultural change must take place at the department level for institutional efforts to be successful, and this will require department chairs to be transformative leaders. This raises the question, can department chairs can be transformative leaders?

This article uses the issue of work and family in higher education to frame the argument that department chairs can be transformative leaders – bringing about the cultural changes called for by university presidents. The central administrations of many American institutions of higher education are working to improve the family-friendliness of their campuses through the adoption of various policies and programs to make academic careers more flexible for caregivers (see for example, American Council on Education, 2005). However, the availability of family-friendly policies is not transforming the climate of these institutions (Drago, Crouter, Wardell, & Willits, 2001; Quinn, Lange, Riskin, & Yen, 2004). The issue of work and family is ideal for framing discussions of leadership and cultural change because family-friendly policies tend to be symbolic, ambiguous, and inconsistently implemented, requiring leadership to transform the workplace culture so that employees feel safe to use the policies (Blair-Loy & Wharton, 2002). This article includes the following six sections:

- An introduction to the issue of work and family in higher education
- The nature of departmental climate and culture and the need for department-level leadership to lead toward change
- Definitions and studies of leadership
- The intersection of critical theory and leadership
- The transformative qualities of leadership
- Transformational leadership among department chairs.

Several terms used in this article warrant definition. The term *leadership* describes the wide range of structural and dynamic relationships between the department chair and his or her department. It represents the influence of the department chair in shaping the directions in which the department develops. Further definition of leadership is provided later in this article from the literature. *Caregivers* are people who provide care for others, whether biological or adopted

children, spouses/partners, parents, or other family members (Barker, 2003). Caregivers provide primary support for their dependents and typically, but not exclusively, are women (Williams, 2000b). *Policies*, whether federal, state, or institutional, formally govern the operations of institutions of higher education (Tierney, 1988). *Climate* refers to the overall "feel" of the department's working environment (Tierney, 1997). *Culture* refers to the prevailing norms of behavior and the predominantly shared values of a department (Schein, 1992; Tierney, 1988). *Schemas* are models developed by individuals to help them make sense of the world around them (Valian, 2004). Schemas are related to biases and stereotypes, but do not necessarily have a negative connotation. *Social justice* refers to fair and equitable social structures (Capper, 1998). It is associated with the concepts of social change, social responsibility, and change for the common good.

Work and Family in Higher Education

Despite the growing attention given to the issue of work and family in higher education as seen in the number of articles in academic journals (see for example the special edition of ACADEME, "Balancing Academic Careers and Family Work," 2004), the climate and culture of many American universities is unsupportive of faculty with caregiving responsibilities (American Association of University Professors [AAUP], 2001; Finkel & Olswang, 1996; Mason & Goulden, 2002; Williams, 2000a, 2000c). Universities have been adopting family-friendly policies formally over the past decade to facilitate work and family balance and alleviate hindrances to the careers of faculty members with caregiving responsibilities (Drago & Williams, 2000; Finkel & Olswang, 1996; Friedman, Rimsky, & Johnson, 1996). However, where climate and culture are not conducive to work and family balance, faculty are not utilizing the policies (Drago et al., 2001; Gappa & MacDermid, 1997).

Even where so-called family-friendly policies exist, faculty are not confident that they will be seen, or rewarded, as "ideal workers" if they openly integrate personal and professional responsibilities (Drago & Colbeck, 2003). While this impacts women faculty disproportionately (AAUP, 2001; Finkel & Olswang, 1996; Hensel, 1991; Mason & Goulden, 2002; Park, 1996; Williams, 2000c), all faculty who are primary caregivers to children, parents, or sick partners are affected (Drago et al., 2001; Gappa & MacDermid, 1997; Perna, 2001). Because institutionalized family-friendly policies are not transforming climate and culture at the department level, especially in large, decentralized universities (Drago et al., 2001; Quinn et al., 2004), leadership within the

department will need to bring about cultural transformation (A. W. Astin & Astin, 2000; Gappa, 2002; Valian, 2004).

Nature of Departmental Climate and Culture

Joan Williams (2000a, 2000b) theorized that departmental climate and culture are not supportive of work and life balance for faculty as a result of earlier socialization that defined faculty members as 'ideal workers,' or workers who could devote a lifetime to work without career disruption or distraction. When senior faculty members were in graduate school being trained and socialized for faculty careers (for discussion of anticipatory socialization of faculty, see Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001 and Tierney & Rhoads, 1994), faculty members were typically ideal workers. Single faculty, male or female, tended not to have children or responsibilities outside of work, and married faculty, who were primarily male, had wives at home to provide care for the household (AAUP, 2001; Finkel & Olswang, 1996; Hensel, 1991; Hochschild, 2003; Williams, 2000a, 2000b).

The senior faculty who were socialized to ideal worker norms are predicted to be the driving force behind departmental climate and culture because, owing to their status, their interactions set the standards for the department (A. W. Astin & Astin, 2000; Boice, 1992; Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001). The interactions of the senior members of a department become the unwritten norms of the department, which have more control over faculty behavior than the written policies have (Birnbaum, 1988). As department chairs tend to be selected from the ranks of senior faculty who were socialized to value ideal worker norms, these unwritten norms are predicted to value and reward faculty who are ideal workers.

In addition to the socialization faculty receive to the ideal worker norms discussed by Williams, human beings develop "schemas" to help them interpret the world around them. Schemas about gender (gender schemas) influence how people interpret the behaviors of both men and women (Valian, 1998, 2004). Gender schemas influence the evaluation of both men and women; typically, men are overrated and women are underrated (Valian, 2004). Schemas work at the subconscious level to influence the decisions and assessments *of* both genders *by* both genders. Leadership is important to bringing about cultural change, but a leader's mandate or policy initiative cannot alter the schemas of any individual (Etzkowitz, Kemelgor, & Uzzi, 2000; Rapoport, Bailyn, Fletcher, & Pruitt, 2002; Valian, 2004). However, leaders can model behaviors in an effort to change others' schemas (Etzkowitz et al., 2000). For example, the department chair can

question the accepted norms of faculty career inflexibility at department meetings and support faculty use of flexible policy options.

To stop the perpetuation of disadvantage caused by gender schemas and ideal worker norms, critical self-reflection is needed by every member of the academic community, but department chairs and senior faculty need to take the lead. Department chairs, however, are often not prepared to be change agents or transformative leaders (Filan & Seagren, 2003; Gmelch & Miskin, 1995; Lucas, 2000; Wolverton, Gmelch, Montez, & Nies, 2001). Department chairs tend to be faculty who are recognized leaders in their scholarly fields (A. W. Astin & Astin, 2000). Most accept the position with little to no leadership training beyond participation in departmental committees (Seagren, Cresswell, & Wheeler, 1993). Regardless, most institutional policies are implemented at the department level, providing the department chair with considerable power and, potentially, undermining institutional efforts for change. This power structure has been seen as a flaw in institutional policies because department chairs, who are typically white men, can interpret and enforce policies at their discretion (Armenti, 2004). However, department chairs also have the power to grant their faculty teaching releases and flexibility beyond the institutional policies (Drago & Colbeck, 2003).

Even when department chairs interpret family-friendly policies in line with institutional goals, departmental climate and culture can prevent successful policy implementation. Climate and culture cannot formally override policy, but the absence of a supportive environment can undermine policy implementation by discouraging utilization and can block efforts to create an inclusive environment (Kabanoff, Waldersee, & Cohen, 1995; Keup, Walker, H.S. Astin, & Lindholm, 2001; Kezar & Eckel, 2002; Simsek & Louis, 1994; Tierney, 1988). Therefore, transformative leadership at the department level is needed to bring about cultural change so that faculty with caregiving responsibilities feel safe utilizing the policies designed to support them.

Discussions of Leadership

Many discussions of leadership center on a single individual who is the "head" or primary leader of an organization – the person in the traditional position of power – and yet, many claim that leaders can come from the ranks of followers. An assumption in studies of leadership is that leadership and management are different. While leadership and management are similar, they differ in their purpose; management is intended to supervise and "manage" people, whereas leadership focuses on visionary ideals and leading people to achieve new goals (Foster, 1989a). It is leadership, therefore, that is needed to

transform the unsupportive climate and culture in academic departments to create inclusive environments for faculty with primary caregiving responsibilities.

William Foster (1989b) provides a useful introduction to the study of leadership. He discusses the two primary traditions in leadership research: 1) political-historical; and, 2) bureaucratic-managerial (Foster, 1989b). The political-historical tradition focuses on the role of the individual in shaping and making history. Within this category are James MacGregor Burns' definitions of transactional and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership includes exchange relationships, e.g., quid pro quo, while transformational leadership has a "vision to liberate minds and bodies" (Foster, 1989b, pp. 41-43). The second tradition in leadership research, the bureaucratic-managerial model, focuses on the authority of the office, or positional leadership. Bureaucratic-managerial leadership is goal-driven by production measurements – not social change, but economics (Foster, 1989b).

According to Foster (1989b), leadership must be: 1) critical – assessing traditions for injustice/inequity and questioning the status quo; 2) transformative – acting for social change; 3) educative – presenting analysis and vision and increasing awareness of inequity; and 4) ethical – not power wielding, but working for community rather than personal gain. Leadership is communal and shared (Foster, 1989b). Virtually echoing Foster, Alexander Astin and Helen Astin (2000) claim four assumptions underlie their discussion of leadership: 1) leadership is concerned with fostering change; 2) leadership is inherently value-based; 3) all people are potentially leaders; and 4) leadership is a group process. Both Foster and A.W. Astin & Astin are reflected in the nine elements claimed by Mike Bottery (1992) that leadership must be: critical, transformative, visionary, educative, empowering, liberating, personally ethical, organizationally ethical, and responsible. Additional qualities of leadership include that it is a reciprocal relationship (Tierney, 1989) and that it is fluid, shared, not positional, courageous, and pedagogic (Smyth, 1989a). A leader is a change agent, not just someone in a position of authority, and leadership is a collective or group process (A. W. Astin & Astin, 2000).

Inherent in many discussions of leadership is the concept of power. Anthony Giddens (1979) defines power as "the transformative capacity through which people are capable of achieving certain outcomes" (p. 88.). Leaders utilize the power of their position in different ways. The concepts of "power over," "power through" and "power with" define three ways positional power can be used by leaders (Duncan & Skarstad, 1995; Fennell, 1999). The concept of "power over" is recognized as a traditional, hierarchical leadership style, and one that is frequently associated with masculinity, whereas "power with" is a distributive form of leadership that is more associated with a feminine style. There is a traditional expectation that women and men leaders differ in their use

of power (Valian, 2004). Similarly, leaders are assessed, in part, based on whether their use of power fits with the schema for their gender (Duncan & Skarstad, 1995; Valian, 2004). Department chairs, as leaders of the departmental unit, can use their positional authority (power over) to endorse family-friendly policies, but by using collaborative leadership (power with) they can achieve "buy-in" from the department community, especially the senior faculty, for cultural change that truly supports faculty with caregiving responsibilities.

Critical Theory and Leadership

Critical theory is “a sustained and formal attempt to analyze social relations and the impact of class, power, and ideology” (Foster, 1989a, p. 11). Studies of leadership that utilize a critical framework focus on power dynamics to explore instances of exploitation and abuses of power in relationships (Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2006). Additionally, feminist critical leadership theory examines gendered differences in power dynamics and gendered repercussions in seemingly "gender-neutral" policy decisions (Capper, 1998; Shaw, 2003). Similarly, critical race theory explores racial differences in policy and power outcomes (Capper, 1998). Critical leadership theory questions the pretense that leadership is, or should be, value-free or race-, gender-, or class-neutral. It challenges traditional, hierarchical leadership models as socially constructed, calling for a new approach to leadership that is empowering, collaborative, and inclusive (Kezar et al., 2006). Critical leadership is a form of activism that works for social change by transforming power dynamics (Kezar et al., 2006). Few studies of leadership in higher education have utilized a critical framework (Kezar et al., 2006), but several studies have addressed critical leadership in K-12 settings (see for example, Smyth, 1989b).

Again, the issue of who has power is a key focus of critical analyses of leadership. It is the privileged group that usually has control and is hesitant to relinquish it, thereby giving up their advantaged and privileged status (Gibson, 1986; Starratt, 1993). For example, community building efforts that do nothing to change the power base tend to have negative consequences because efforts made by those in power tend to reinforce the status quo instead of modifying the existing power structure (Furman, 1998). Specific to higher education, the tenure structure, and caregiving faculty who need career flexibility, it is doubtful that many junior faculty, who do not yet enjoy the protections of tenure, feel safe or comfortable discussing their needs or opinions if these differ from those of the senior faculty or those in power (Norman, Ambrose, & Huston, 2006). Efforts to change the culture of academic departments will need to consciously address whether the power system silences junior members of the community.

Critical reflection needs to come from all members of a department, otherwise individuals risk being perpetuators of disadvantage. Critical leadership theory calls for inclusive leadership practices that will help all participants recognize how their actions may perpetuate oppressive and exclusionary relationships (Smyth, 1989a). By adhering to outdated notions of what faculty should look or act like (i.e., ideal workers), some faculty members and department chairs are perpetuating oppressive and exclusionary relationships. By definition of the terms, oppressive and exclusionary relationships work against the inclusion of new groups in higher education. Rather than creating a supportive environment that is inclusive of new members, perpetuating exclusionary norms creates disadvantages for new types of faculty members, including faculty with primary caregiving responsibilities. Beyond impacting who succeeds as a faculty member, these disadvantages influence who becomes a department leader and has influence in the department.

While some of these disadvantages may seem inconsequential, seemingly trivial imbalances are cumulative (Valian, 2004). The "Matthew Effect," named in reference to a biblical story in Matthew, describes the phenomenon of accumulated advantage and disadvantage (Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Creamer, 2003; Merton, 1968). According to the Matthew Effect, persons in possession of something will have an easier time accumulating more of it than will persons without it; persons with power accumulate power. The need to question power structures, including who benefits and who loses in social situations, is considered the "ethic of critique" (Grogan, 2004). The ethic of critique is needed to actively address social injustices and it should be institutionalized so culture change does not rely on charismatic leaders (Grogan, 2004).

Critical leadership theorists see leadership as a social process inextricably connected to values (Kezar et al., 2006). Critical analyses of leadership identified other "ethics" in addition to the ethic of critique. The "ethic of care" challenges the notion that leadership should be impartial and promotes empathy and compassion in leaders (Krause, Traini, & Mickey, 2001). The "ethic of justice" calls for leaders to treat people equitably (Krause et al., 2001). The ethics of critique, care, and justice work together in critical leadership (Krause et al., 2001; Starratt, 2003, 2004). Each of these ethics requires critical analysis of the intentional and unintentional outcomes of decisions and processes involved in leadership.

The Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) (1996) developed a "social change model of leadership" that contains seven core values across the individual, group, and societal levels that contribute to creating social change (the eighth value of the model). The seven values in the model include such aspects as caring and collaboration. The HERI model has been used to examine differences between the leadership styles of college men and women, finding that women

scored higher than men on all eight values defined by the social change model (Dugan, 2006). Women may have a natural tendency toward the values-based leadership styles associated with the social change model (H. S. Astin & Leland, 1991; Dugan, 2006; Kezar et al., 2006). Additionally, a common focus of leaders of color is social change (Garner, 2004; Kezar et al., 2006). Social change is a common goal of transformative leaders in general (Kezar et al., 2006). An example of social change within an academic department is shifting cultural norms from rewarding ideal workers and individual competitiveness to a culture of collaboration and support for faculty with caregiving responsibilities. Department chairs are well-positioned to lead their departments toward this end, but many may require additional leadership development to do so effectively.

Transformative Qualities of Leadership

Some researchers and theorists have defined leadership as requiring transformative elements, which separate it from administration and management (Bottery, 1992; Burns, 1978; Cameron & Ulrich, 1986; Foster, 1989b). From this perspective, leadership is seen as supporting and enabling transformation, whether in attitudes or oppressive structures (Foster, 1989a). There are many transformative qualities of leadership, in addition to a specific type of leadership called “transformational leadership" that is discussed in the next section.

Transformative leaders focus on bringing about change to the organizational culture, whereas transactional leaders focus on performing the day-to-day tasks associated with maintaining organizational culture (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). By this definition, many current department chairs are acting as transactional leaders as they perpetuate traditional (i.e., ideal worker) values. A purpose of transformative leadership common in the literature is creating a democratic community that supports all its members, providing them with power to voice their own valid concerns (Foster, 1989a; Lincoln, 1989; Watkins, 1989). For the purpose of transforming the climate and culture of an academic department, a chair can encourage active participation by faculty, staff, and students to create a democratic community that values the voice of every member, not just the senior members. To bring about change, transformative leaders must understand the lives of their constituents (Tierney, 1989) and be able to critically assess institutional structures that perpetuate oppression (Starratt, 1993). Both of these abilities utilize critical theory in assessment and action in order to recognize the needs of constituents and to question whether existing structures are benefiting some group members at the expense of others. A critical department chair may recognize the need for career flexibility among junior

faculty and publicly question whether inflexible tenure structures disproportionately bar female faculty from attaining tenure and promotion.

Departmental change, therefore, is facilitated by enabling faculty, staff, and students to create a democratic community based on a distributive leadership style. Women tend to utilize distributive leadership styles that empower their followers, rather than dominating them (Howard-Hamilton & Ferguson, 1998). Shared or distributive leadership is regarded as empowering, democratic, collaborative, and transformational (Kezar et al., 2006; Tierney, 1989). In her study of leadership in schools facing challenges, Alma Harris (2004) found that successful leaders used approaches that distributed leadership, approaches based on democratic and transformative principles that were people-centered and centrally concerned with encouraging others to lead. Similarly, William Tierney (1989) found that one of the characteristics of a successful college leader, as appreciated by her "followers," was that she “led by letting us lead” (p. 172).

Joseph Blase and Jo Roberts Blase (1994) offer three assumptions regarding distributive, or as they call it, “facilitative-democratic” leadership: 1) leaders and followers can change roles, 2) leaders help others "recognize the complexities of schools as social organizations set in myriad contexts," and 3) constraining forces must be minimized or eliminated (pp. 129-130). The first assumption, that “leaders and followers can change roles,” is not unique to J. Blase & Blase (see also Foster, 1989b; A. W. Astin & Astin, 2000; and Bottery, 1992), but it is particularly relevant to departmental leadership. Department chairs tend to be rotated for fixed terms from the ranks of senior faculty members. As such, this year’s 'leader" may have been last year’s "follower," and he or she will probably return to being a "follower" within the next few years. The second assumption resonates with critical leadership in that leaders help their constituents see socially constructed norms as changeable. Regarding the third assumption, in academic departments the "constraining forces" that impede the transformation of departmental climate and culture include faculty socialization to ideal worker norms and traditional gender schemas, the overcoming of which requires the motivation to change and a safe environment in which to do it. Unlearning previously unquestioned beliefs and schemas is a difficult process that requires a psychologically safe environment (Cameron & Ulrich, 1986; Hoffman & Burrello, 2004; Schein, 1992).

Department chairs need leadership development to prepare them to transform the climate and culture of academic departments to be supportive of faculty with caregiving responsibilities. To empower members of a community, a leader must model, build, and support a trusting environment (A. W. Astin & Astin, 2000; J. Blase & Blase, 1994). If institutional leaders model transformative leadership with the people who report to them and encourage others to use transformative leadership styles, it can spread through an institution, changing its

culture (A. W. Astin & Astin, 2000). It stands to reason that if a department chair could do the same thing that it would spread through the culture of the entire department, as well. In this way, department chairs can transform their departments to be inclusive, democratic, and supportive environments for all faculty.

Transformational Leadership among Department Chairs

A foundational work on transformational leadership is *Leadership* by James MacGregor Burns (1978). He defines transformational leadership as primarily concerned with the end goal of creating democratic and diverse communities by raising the consciousness of both leader and follower (Burns, 1978). Transformational leadership is similar to traditional forms of leadership because it is leader-centered, individualistic, and hierarchical (Bensimon et al., 1989; Kezar et al., 2006).

Kim Cameron and David Ulrich (1986) identify a “five step agenda” used by many transformational leaders and discuss how the steps apply to leadership in higher education. The five steps transformational leaders use to bring about change are: 1) creating readiness, 2) overcoming resistance, 3) articulating a vision, 4) generating commitment, and 5) institutionalizing implementation (Cameron & Ulrich, 1986, p. 13.). The focus of Cameron and Ulrich (1986) is on high-level college and university leadership, but these steps also apply to department chairs who wish to transform departmental climate and culture.

The first step, "creating readiness," addresses the need for the academic department to prepare for, or "buy-in," to the necessity for change and be ready for change to occur. To achieve this readiness, the department leader must effectively convey his or her critical analysis of the negative aspects of the departmental culture to the rest of the departmental community, especially the senior faculty. Critical and transformative leadership is needed to change a dysfunctional culture by helping group members to unlearn outdated or faulty assumptions and to learn new assumptions, and the first part of this learning process is seeing that change is needed (Cameron & Ulrich, 1986; Schein, 1992). Regarding cultural change around work-family flexibility in faculty careers, the chair can help the department be ready for change by sharing empirical data on how inflexible tenure structures disproportionately negatively impact the careers of women with children and how it is a (debunked) myth that women faculty with children are less productive across their careers (Committee on Maximizing the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering, 2006).

The second step, "overcoming resistance," recognizes the need for a departmental leader, most likely the chair who has positional authority, to create a

safe environment in which group members can cope with the need for change and the trauma of the learning process, thereby overcoming resistance to change through the creation of an environment conducive to change (Cameron & Ulrich, 1986; Hoffman & Burrello, 2004; Schein, 1992). Unlearning previously unquestioned beliefs and schemas is a difficult process that requires a psychologically safe environment (Hoffman & Burrello, 2004). For the transformation of departmental climate and culture to occur, leadership within the department will need to both convey the need for change and create the safe environment in which change can occur. To create a safe environment, the department chair can set ground rules for meetings and department interactions that call for respecting the opinions of all members. Similar to discussions of "safe space" in the literature from the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning that also draws heavily on critical theory, this "safe" space is not meant to be one free from conflicting ideas, but one where all members can move beyond their "comfort zone" without fear of repercussion (Wulff, 2005).

The final three steps, likewise, tie in to discussions of critical and transformative leadership. The third step, "articulating a vision," entails the department chair sharing his or her view of what the department will look like after undergoing cultural transformation. This resonates with the goal of social change prevalent in transformative leaders. Regarding cultural change and supporting work-family flexibility in faculty careers, the department chair can share a vision of a department where all faculty members are supported and can achieve their highest potential as teachers and researchers while being role models of work-family balance for the next generations of faculty. Chairs can adopt language connecting academic career flexibility to excellence from various sources, including the American Council on Education’s report “An Agenda for Excellence” (2005) and the National Academies’ report “Beyond Bias and Barriers” (2006).

The fourth step, "generating commitment," speaks to engaging all department members in recognizing the need for change and in the change process itself. While the leader-centered nature of transformational leadership focuses control with the leader, this step might also be effectively implemented through distributive forms of leadership. Related to creating readiness for change, department chairs need to create opportunities for department members, particularly the senior faculty, to "buy in" to the change process, thereby engendering a sense of ownership among all department members with respect to achieving cultural change and creating a supportive environment for caregivers. As an example of this type of opportunity, a department chair can form a task force of faculty members to generate strategies for change, sharing leadership with department members and encouraging active participation in departmental cultural transformation.

Finally, the fifth step, "institutionalizing implementation," resonates with the notion that systems and processes must be changed so that cultural change is not associated with a charismatic leader. At the department level, the chair can create structures that distribute leadership democratically so that department norms are not at the whim of the sitting chair. A faculty committee on department norms could meet regularly or on an ad hoc basis to establish cultural norms related to "family-friendly" meeting times, service and teaching distribution, and other aspects within the local control of the department. At the college or university level, leadership development opportunities for department chairs could be institutionalized so that all chairs have the opportunity to gain the skills to be critical, transformative leaders.

Transformational leadership exists in higher education (Kezar et al., 2006). A study of leadership among deans found that deans blended transactional and transformational leadership approaches and that transformational leadership results in higher stress levels among deans than transactional leadership does (Gmelch & Wolverton, 2002). Studies of leaders at other levels in higher education, similarly, identified the blend of transactional and transformational leadership approaches to be most effective (Bensimon, 1993; Komives, 1991). Many of the hierarchical structures in higher education, such as the tenure and promotion processes, may be well served by transactional leadership (Gmelch & Wolverton, 2002). Transforming the climate and culture of a department to be supportive of faculty with caregiving responsibilities, however, will require critical, transformative leadership from the department chair.

Conclusion

This article uses the context of work and family to assert that leadership from within academic departments can, and must, transform department climate and culture. Transforming departmental climate and culture to support faculty with caregiving responsibilities will require a shift from rewarding ideal workers, individualism, and competitiveness to rewarding community and collaboration. The shift has already begun, but the reward structure does not reflect it because the adoption of institutional policies is not changing the climate and culture of academic departments. A democratic community is needed to create dialog for change in higher education, but department-level leadership is needed to create a supportive environment in order for this to happen (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Department chairs need to create these arenas within their departments, but they seldom receive leadership development that would facilitate the process.

Compounding the problems caused by a lack of leadership development for department chairs, there is a wide variation in the skills and styles chairs bring

to their leadership role. The satisfaction and success of faculty members depends a great deal on the department chair, but not all department chairs are ready to be advocates for their faculty (Gappa, 2002). Rather than adopting family-friendly policies and then leaving implementation up to the discretion of individual department chairs, institutional efforts to improve the situation for faculty with caregiving responsibilities need to address the leadership development department chairs receive.

Various organizations, such as the American Council on Education, the Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences, and others, offer national leadership development workshops for department chairs, but these workshops do not address the institutional contexts in which chairs operate. Additionally, the time and expense required to travel to national workshops reduces the number of department chairs from a campus receiving leadership development. Institution-based leadership development opportunities for chairs would serve three purposes: to expose all chairs to critical and transformative leadership principles, to prepare chairs to be agents of change within their departments, and to create a collegial network among department chairs to encourage peer mentoring, assist with dual career hiring, navigate important but infrequently used policies such as tenure clock extensions, and more (Quinn, Yen, Riskin, & Lange, Forthcoming).

As issues of accountability, global competition, and various other challenges make leading academic institutions an increasingly complex task, department leaders will be expected to do more within their departments – whether at research extensive universities or at community colleges (Gappa, 2002). If university presidents and provosts wish to change the climate of higher education, and to ensure that the best and brightest faculty are hired and retained, they will need to invest in the leadership development of department chairs and faculty who may become department chairs. This leadership development must include the broad spectrum of critical and transformative aspects of leadership, as well as an introduction to transformational leadership. Chairs do not need to be "transformational leaders," by the definition set forth by Burns (1978) or Bensimon et al. (1989) in order to be transformative leaders. They can use any number of transformative styles of leadership to achieve cultural transformation within their departments, thereby creating supportive environments for faculty with caregiving responsibilities.

References

American Association of University Professors. (2001). *Statement on principles on family responsibilities and academic work.* Washington, DC: http://www.aaup.org/Issues/FamilyWork/Policy/policy.htm.

American Council on Education. (2005). *An agenda for excellence: Creating flexibility in tenure-track faculty careers [Executive Summary]*. Washington, DC: http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/2005_tenure_flex_summary.pdf.

Armenti, C. (2004). May babies and posttenure babies: Maternal decisions of women professors. *Review of Higher Education, 27*(2), 211-231.

Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change*. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Astin, H. S., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence, women of vision: A cross-generational study of leaders and social change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Balancing academic careers and family work. (2004). *Academe, 90*(6).

Barker, R. L. (2003). *The social work dictionary* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Bensimon, E. M. (1993). New presidents' initial actions: Transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal for Higher Education Management, 8*(2), 5-17.

Bensimon, E. M., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). *Making sense of administrative leadership: The 'L' word in higher education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organizations and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Blair-Loy, M., & Wharton, A. S. (2002). Employees' use of work-family policies and the workplace social context. *Social Forces, 80*(3), 813-845.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. R. (1994). *Empowering teachers: What successful principals do*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member: Support and fostering professional development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bottery, M. (1992). *The ethics of educational management: Personal, social and political perspectives on school organization*. London: Cassell.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Cameron, K. S., & Ulrich, D. O. (1986). Transformational leadership in colleges and universities. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 2). New York: Agathon Press.

Capper, C. A. (1998). Critically oriented and postmodern perspectives: Sorting out the differences and applications for practice. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 34*(3), 354-379.

Clark, S., & Corcoran, M. (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 57*(1), 20-43.

Committee on Maximizing the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering. (2006). *Beyond bias and barriers: Fulfilling the potential of women in academic science and engineering (Executive Summary)*. Washington, DC: National Academies: http://newton.nap.edu/execsumm_pdf/11741.

Creamer, E. G. (2003). *Policies that part: Early career experiences of co-working academic couples.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Portland, OR.

Drago, R., & Colbeck, C. (2003). *The mapping project: Exploring the terrain of US colleges and universities for faculty and families*: The Pennsylvania State University.

Drago, R., Crouter, A. C., Wardell, M., & Willits, B. S. (2001). *Final report of the faculty and families project*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University: http://lsir.la.psu.edu/workfam/facultyfamilies.htm.

Drago, R., & Williams, J. (2000). A half-time tenure track proposal. *Change, 32*(6), 46-51.

Dugan, J. P. (2006). Explorations using the social change model: Leadership development among college men and women. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(2), 217-225.

Duncan, P. K., & Skarstad, K. (1995). *How women administrators are perceived by others: A case study examining the relationship between leadership temperament, use of power, and success.* Paper presented at the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Etzkowitz, H., Kemelgor, C., & Uzzi, B. (2000). *Athena unbound: The advancement of women in science and technology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fennell, H.-A. (1999). Power in the principalship: Four women's experiences. *Journal of Educational Administration, 37*(1), 23-49.

Filan, G. L., & Seagren, A. T. (2003). Six critical issues for midlevel leadership in postsecondary settings. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2003*(124), 21-31.

Finkel, S. K., & Olswang, S. G. (1996). Child rearing as a career impediment to women assistant professors. *Review of Higher Education, 19*(2), 123-139.

Foster, W. P. (1989a). The administrator as a transformative intellectual. *Peabody Journal of Education, 66*(3), 5-18.

Foster, W. P. (1989b). Toward a critical practice of leadership. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 39-62). London and New York: Falmer Press.

Friedman, D. E., Rimsky, C., & Johnson, A. A. (1996). *College and university guide to work-family programs: Report on a collaborative study*. New York: Families & Work Institute.

Furman, G. C. (1998). Postmodernism and community in schools: Unraveling the paradox. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 34*(3), 298-328.

Gappa, J. (2002). Academic careers for the 21st century: More options for new faculty. In J. C. Smart & W. G. Tierney (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. XVII, pp. 425-475). New York: Agathon Press.

Gappa, J., & MacDermid, S. M. (1997). *Work, family, and the faculty career. new pathways: Faculty career and employment for the 21st century working paper series, inquiry #8*: Association of American Higher Education.

Garner, R. (2004). *Contesting the terrain of the ivory tower: Spiritual leadership of African-American women in the academy*. New York: Routledge.

Gibson, R. (1986). *Critical theory and education*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure, and contradictions in social analysis*. London: Macmillan.

Gmelch, W. H., & Miskin, V. D. (1995). *Changing an academic department*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Gmelch, W. H., & Wolverton, M. (2002). *An investigation of dean leadership.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Grogan, M. (2004). Keeping a critical, postmodern eye on educational leadership in the United States: In appreciation of Bill Foster. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(2), 222-239.

Harris, A. (2004). Successful leadership in schools facing challenging circumstances: no panaceas or promises. In J. H. Chrispeels (Ed.), *Learning to lead together: The promise and challenge of sharing leadership* (pp. 282-304). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hensel, N. (1991). *Realizing gender equality in higher education: The need to integrate work/family issues*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Higher Education Research Institute. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook version III*. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

Hochschild, A. R. (2003). *The second shift* (Reissue ed.). New York: Viking Press.

Hoffman, L. P., & Burrello, L. C. (2004). A case study illustration of how a critical theorist and a consummate practitioner met on common ground. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(2), 268-289.

Howard-Hamilton, M. F., & Ferguson, A. D. (1998). *Women students' leadership styles and practices.* Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Miami, FL.

Kabanoff, B., Waldersee, R., & Cohen, M. (1995). Espoused values and organizational change themes. *The Academy of Management Journal, 38*(4), 1075-1104.

Keup, J. R., Walker, A. A., Astin, H. S., & Lindholm, J. A. (2001). *Organizational culture and institutional transformation*: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, DC. ED464521.

Kezar, A., Carducci, R., & Contreras-McGavin, M. (2006). Rethinking the "L" word in higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 31*(6), 1-218.

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2002). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education: Universal principles of culturally responsive concepts? *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(4), 435-460.

Komives, S. R. (1991). The relationship of hall directors' transformational and transactional leadership to select resident assistant outcomes. *Journal of College Student Development, 32*(6), 509-515.

Krause, J. K., Traini, D. J., & Mickey, B. H. (2001). Equality versus equity. In J. P. Shapiro & J. A. Stefkovich (Eds.), *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas* (pp. 76-90). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Critical requisites for transformational leadership: Needed research and discourse. *Peabody Journal of Education, 66*(3), 176-181.

Lucas, A. (2000). *Leading academic change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mason, M. A., & Goulden, M. (2002). Do babies matter? The effect of family formation on the lifelong careers of academic men and women. *Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 88*(6), 21-27.

Merton, R. K. (1968). The Matthew Effect in science. *Science, 159*, 56-63.

Mills, M., Bettis, P.-., Miller, J. W., & Nolan, R. (2005). Experiences of academic unit reorganization: Organizational identity and identification in organizational change. *The Review of Higher Education, 28*(4), 597-619.

Norman, M., Ambrose, S. A., & Huston, T. A. (2006). Assessing and addressing faculty morale: Cultivating consciousness, empathy, and empowerment. *Review of Higher Education, 29*(3), 347-379.

Park, S. M. (1996). Research, teaching, and service: Why shouldn't women's work count. *The Journal of Higher Education, 67*(1), 46-84.

Perna, L. W. (2001). The relationship between family responsibilities and employment status among college and university faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 72*(5), 584-611.

Quinn, K., Lange, S. E., Riskin, E. A., & Yen, J. (2004). *Exploring part-time tenure track policy at the University of Washington: Final report to the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation*. Seattle: University of Washington: http://www.engr.washington.edu/advance/resources/Final_Report_to_Sloan.pdf.

Quinn, K., Yen, J., Riskin, E. A., & Lange, S. E. (Forthcoming). Leadership development workshops for department chairs: A model for enabling family-friendly cultural change. *Change: The magazine of higher learning*.

Rapoport, R., Bailyn, L., Fletcher, J. K., & Pruitt, B. H. (2002). *Beyond work-family balance: Advancing gender equity and workplace performance* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Roach, J. H. L. (1976). The academic department chairperson: Function and responsibilities. *The Educational Record, 57*(1), 13-23.

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Seagren, A. T., Cresswell, J. W., & Wheeler, D. W. (1993). *The department chair: New roles, responsibilities, and challenges*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Shaw, K. M. (2003). Using feminist critical policy analysis in the realm of higher education: The case of welfare reform as gendered educational policy. *The Journal of Higher Education, 75*(1), 56-79.

Simsek, H., & Louis, K. S. (1994). Organizational change as paradigm shift: Analysis of the change process in a large, public university. *The Journal of Higher Education, 65*(6), 670-695.

Smyth, J. (1989a). A "pedagogical" and "educative" view of leadership. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership*. London: New York: Falmer.

Smyth, J. (Ed.). (1989b). *Critical perspectives on educational leadership*. London; New York: Falmer Press.

Starratt, R. J. (1993). *The drama of leadership*. London: Falmer.

Starratt, R. J. (2003). *Centering educational administration: Cultivating meaning, community, responsibility*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Starratt, R. J. (2004). *Ethical leadership* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. *The Journal of Higher Education, 59*(1), 2-21.

Tierney, W. G. (1989). Advancing democracy: A critical interpretation of leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education, 66*(3), 157-175.

Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 68*(1), 1-16.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (1994). *Faculty socialization as cultural process: A mirror of institutional commitment*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 93-6. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Valian, V. (1998). *Why so slow: The advancement of women*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Valian, V. (2004). Beyond gender schemas: Improving the advancement of women in academia. *NWSA Journal, 16*(1), 207-220.

Watkins, P. (1989). Leadership, power, and symbols in educational administration. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 9-37). London: New York: Falmer Press.

Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001). *Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education: A perilous passage?* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report; Vol. 28, No. 3. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Williams, J. (2000a). How the tenure track discriminates against women. *Chronicle of Higher Education Career Network*.

Williams, J. (2000b). *Unbending gender: Why work and family conflict and what to do about it*. Oxford: University Press.

Williams, J. (2000c). What stymies women's careers? It's personal. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 47*(16), B10.

Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W. H., Montez, J., & Nies, C. (2001). *The changing nature of the academic deanship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Wulff, D. H. (Ed.). (2005). *Aligning for learning: Strategies for teaching effectiveness*. Boston: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Author

Kate Quinn is special assistant to the executive vice provost and project director for Balance@UW. Mailing address: Balance@UW, University of Washington, Campus Box 352137, Seattle, WA 98195-1237. Email: kquinn@u.washington.edu