THIRD EDITION

ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

KATHLEEN MANNING

"This updated, theory-rich volume is peppered with practical applications throughout, making it the tutorial that this generation of academic leaders, faculty, and graduate students need to understand and respond to routine and non-routine actions and events, on and off the campus."

George D. Kuh, *Chancellor's Professor Emeritus of Higher Education, Indiana University, USA*

"Manning has precisely condensed, updated, and translated the germinal organizational theoretical texts and meticulously interpreted the material with an intuitively global lens. The cases in *Organizational Theory in Higher Education* provide a refreshing perspective on the current trends and issues impacting higher education. Readers see and hear the voices of minoritized people and women throughout the text, which is a testament to Manning's understanding of the shifting organizational landscape of this 'mature industry.'"

Mary Howard-Hamilton, *Distinguished Research Professor of Educational Leadership, Indiana State University, USA*

"Manning highlights multiple theoretical frameworks that contribute to understanding the organization and administration of higher education. This edition is required reading for graduate students to acquire an understanding of 'traditional' and contemporary theories that explain, in part, how higher education functions. Although the text is written primarily for doctoral and master's students, it is a worthy read for administrators, faculty, and staff seeking to enhance their understanding of the complex structure that is US higher education, particularly given the current socio-political climate and the COVID-19 pandemic."

Dorian L. McCoy, *Associate Professor of Educational Leadership & Policy Studies, and Director of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA*

Organizational Theory in Higher Education

The third edition of *Organizational Theory in Higher Education* is a comprehensive and accessible treatment of organizational theory and higher education administration. Through her presentation of both traditional and contemporary organizational theories, noted scholar Kathleen Manning offers a multi-faceted take on the models and lenses through which higher education can be viewed.

Chapters discuss the disciplinary foundation, uses, constructs, and assumptions of each organizational theory, including theories often excluded from the literature like organized anarchy, feminist, loosely coupled systems, and queer theory. Each chapter concludes with a case study and discussion questions that encourage the reader to make connections to their practice. Combining theory and practice, Manning's rich, interdisciplinary treatment enables leaders to gain a fuller understanding of the perspectives that operate on college campuses and ways to enact inclusive, ethical change in the context of new and continuing challenges.

New to this edition:

- A new chapter on queer theory that presents more socially just approaches to institutional organization;
- A new chapter on loosely coupled systems presenting the application of this theory to higher education settings;
- Revised chapters, updated theory, and new coverage that reflect current issues, such as pandemic, crisis responses, and social media;
- Several new and revised case studies to address contemporary issues and align with current realities of higher education;
- Updated and enhanced discussion questions to continue the conversation.

Kathleen Manning is Professor Emerita of Higher Education and Student Affairs at the University of Vermont, USA.

Core Concepts in Higher Education

Core Concepts in Higher Education is a textbook series for the education of new professionals, covering the core areas of study in the field of higher education and student affairs. This timely and dependable series provides the necessary tools to ensure practice is informed by theory and research. The books in this series invite students to think critically about the field to discover what has been left out and what needs to be learned and also provide frameworks and constructs for addressing challenges facing higher education. The Core Concepts in Higher Education series moves thought, action, and scholarship forward by valuing, reconstructing, and building on the foundations of the field. Through a rich combination of research, theory, and practice, this series aims to move the field into a new generation of scholarship to better prepare students for authentic leadership of our colleges, universities, and academic communities.

Series Editors: Marybeth Gasman, Stella Flores, and Edward P. St. John

Organizational Theory in Higher Education

Third Edition

Kathleen Manning

To my partner, Keith Kennedy, who has unfailingly supported and accompanied me through many personal and professional adventures.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

SERIES INTRODUCTION

It is a pleasure to include Kathleen Manning's *Organizational Theory in Higher Education* (Third Edition) in the Core Concepts in Higher Education Series with Routledge Press.

Throughout this edition, Manning has meticulously revised all the chapters from the previous edition, incorporating the latest developments in higher education. Given the profound impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on education, she addresses the changes brought about by the crisis, including the shift to hybrid and online teaching, administrative decision-making, and crisis management.

Manning introduces two new organizational perspectives—Loosely Coupled Systems and Queer Theory—alongside the existing theoretical frameworks. These additions reflect the evolving landscape of higher education and its dynamic organizational structures.

Additionally, to offer practical insights into the application of these perspectives, she presents a case study at the end of each chapter. These real-world examples illustrate how each organizational perspective can be used to analyze critical issues in higher education.

In this edition, she continues a commitment to exploring the multifaceted nature of higher education organizations. She presents a holistic understanding of these institutions, informed by diverse organizational theories, believing it is essential for improving effectiveness, building inclusive communities, and achieving positive outcomes.

Whether you are a faculty member, administrator, student, or stakeholder in higher education, this book aims to equip you with valuable insights to navigate and contribute to the transformation of our educational institutions.

Marybeth Gasman, Series Co-editor
Rutgers University

PREFACE

Colleges and universities are among the oldest institutions in the Western world. Many higher education institutions are based on organizational ideas that framed the earliest colleges and universities. It is now widely believed that these long-standing principles must change for higher education to endure and respond to the current needs of students and societies.

The COVID-19 pandemic changed everything. Higher education, long a field known for its resistance to change, was transformed overnight. Faculty and academic administrators resisting online learning became instant practitioners of this medium. Students were required to be flexible as academic calendars changed mid-year and on-campus services transitioned to a virtual environment. While there is no doubt that the paradigm has shifted, the question remains, what is the new organizational paradigm?

PURPOSE OF *ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY IN HIGHER EDUCATION*

The purpose of *Organizational Theory in Higher Education* is to provide an accessible introduction to nine organizational theories as applied to higher education institutions. Through a reading of the text, educators can better understand the dynamics driving organizational practices, administrative functions, and educational priorities. This understanding can frame effective leadership, management, and administration that shapes day-to-day educational practice.

WHAT THIS BOOK IS

This book was written as a concise treatment of the voluminous area of organizational theory, its constructs, assumptions, and uses. Eschewing an encyclopedic approach, this text concisely reviews organizational perspectives relevant to higher education. Readers are encouraged to read each perspective in the context of their personal practice and understanding of higher education institutions. Through that approach, educators can

comprehend the various perspectives and "see" the shape and nature of colleges or universities. With this knowledge, those involved in higher education institutions can better understand how these organizations operate and how to undertake institutional change and improvement.

The goal of *Organizational Theory in Higher Education* is for readers to view higher education organizations and administrative practice from several vantage points. This multi-faceted, multi-modal view helps educators better understand complex organizational dynamics and issues within higher education institutions. In fact, an analysis using more than one organizational perspective (e.g., the political combined with the cultural; queer combined with bureaucratic) may offer ideas and solutions for long-standing, formidable issues within this field.

The act of writing about organization or any theory risks readers assuming that some approaches are "true," and others "less true." The presentation of the organizational perspectives in this book is not an endorsement of their use. As a feminist and LGBTQA+ ally, I prefer that organizations reflect inclusive, socially just principles. Only a few of the organizational perspectives offered in this book are grounded in those principles. Realistically, I know that organizations adhere to dominant cultures, privilege some identities over others, and disadvantage particular ways of being. Colleges and universities retain elements of bureaucracies, embody oppressive images and messages, and privilege some participants over those who do not fit the norm of representation. Although some organizational forms have persisted in higher education institutions long past their usefulness, elements of these forms remain and need to be understood if they are to be transformed. An assumption underscoring this text is that an understanding of institutional structures and dynamics, even persistent ones with inadequate social justice practices, is essential if higher education leaders are to undertake sound, ethical practices.

This book was written with the realism of history, culture, and past organizational practices as a backdrop for discussion. Without an understanding of the historical and cultural antecedents of organizational theory, educators will misunderstand why their institution operates the way that it does. Although I, as the author, may not agree with or adhere to some organizational principles and elements presented, I sought to write about the theories accurately. The chapters contain critiques through a review of strengths and weaknesses and commentary about the effective and ineffective aspects of that perspective. I invite you to continue these critiques by adding yours.

Organizations are built in the past, exist in the present, and continue into the future. The organizational perspectives presented are both retrospective and aspirational. Retrospective through descriptions of the anachronisms and vestiges of the older theories (e.g., bureaucracy, collegium, cultural) that persist on college campuses. The presentation is aspirational through descriptions of newer theories (e.g., queer theory, spirituality, feminist) that provide updated insights and more inclusive, socially just approaches to organizational life. Readers are strongly urged to augment *Organizational Theory in Higher Education* with additional resources that extend the discussion introduced in this text. The book, *Organizational Theory for Equity and Diversity: Leading integrated, socially just education* (Capper, 2019), is an excellent choice. Capper's book extends the theories presented in this text and contains information precluded from this text due to space limitations and the book's purpose as an introduction.

The reader will, hopefully, discover a theory or theories (perspectives as they are called in this text) that resonate with them. This choice of perspective can enlarge your

worldview, open possibilities, and increase effectiveness. Readers are particularly encouraged to wrestle with perspectives with which they disagree. Elements of the less preferred ones may exist at your institution. Understanding organizational perspectives with which you disagree can empower you to see aspects of the institution hidden if only one, especially a favorite, perspective is employed.

Each of us has an opinion about how organizations do or should operate. Although these individual opinions inform how we exist in organizations, they can often lead us to view organizations from a limited point of view. *Organizational Theory in Higher Education* seeks to move beyond opinions about organizations to present how others, including theorists and scholars with whom we disagree, view these organizations. Understanding organizational theory from a wide perspective enables college and university participants to possess a broad, multifaceted view of organizational operations.

WHAT THIS BOOK IS NOT

Although tempting to include, *Organizational Theory in Higher Education* does not delve deeply into leadership, student development theory, and other relevant higher education theories. There are many existing texts that discuss these theories and readers are urged to enhance their knowledge of higher education organizations through these sources. In addition to these non-organizational theories, time, space, and desire to keep the book manageable precluded the inclusion of several well-known organizational theories (e.g., systems theory, theories of action, espoused theories). Equally tempting was to provide a comprehensive, thorough overview of the organizational perspectives included. This approach would negate the goal of providing an accessible introduction to higher education organizational theory. A third temptation was to cover current issues impacting organizational functioning including unionization, state legislatures, and federal financing, among others. This text, however, focuses on organizational theory with cases to illustrate how practice and theory intersect. Professors using this text are urged to supplement the book with content about current trends impacting higher education. Because the higher education environment changes quickly, readers are encouraged to follow trends within the field and use those as context for understanding how colleges and universities work.

US higher education is a complex system of diverse institutional forms including four- and two-year, community colleges, public and private, for-profit and not-for-profit, highly competitive and open admissions, urban and rural. Each aspect of the system demands expertise and a thorough understanding of that form. Although the structures, forms, and functions discussed in this book have relevance across a range of higher education institutions, this book was not written specifically about community colleges, for-profit institutions, Historically Black Institutions, women's colleges, branch campuses, international campuses, and institutions with a specialized mission and purpose. Community colleges and the other institution types mentioned above are important sectors of US higher education with distinctive organizational structures and practices. They deserve a text focused on their specific forms and functions; a text which falls outside the purposes of *Organizational Theory in Higher Education*. Readers are encouraged to augment the organizational perspectives discussed in this book with their understanding of higher education functioning gained from their personal and professional experiences with different types of higher education institutions.

SUMMARY OF THE THIRD EDITION TOPICS

The third edition of *Organizational Theory in Higher Education* differs from the second edition with the addition of two new organizational perspectives: loosely coupled systems and queer theory. Loosely coupled systems is an organizational theory most familiar in pre-K through 12 education systems. The literature on loosely coupled systems was summarized in this text and applied to higher education settings. Queer theory, currently in an early stage of development in organizational contexts, its concepts, and tenets were applied to higher education institutions. All chapters from the second edition were revised to include information on the current state of higher education and updates from recent literature. A case study at the end of each chapter illustrates ways the organizational perspective can be used to analyze an issue of importance to higher education institutions. Full descriptions of additions and changes by chapter are offered below.

Chapter 1 Introduction

Higher education has changed dramatically with the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, moves to hybrid and online teaching, and crisis management prioritizing administrative decision-making. Organizational theory provides an important way to understand higher education institutions, improve effectiveness, build community, and achieve outcomes. Chapter One is an overview of the nine organizational perspectives summarized in the book and sets the context for the elements discussed: theoretical foundation; structure; metaphor; major characteristics, concepts, and principles; strengths and weaknesses; and next steps regarding the perspective. Readers are strongly advised to prepare for the discussion in subsequent chapters by reviewing Table 1.2. This table summarizes the nine perspectives by disciplinary foundation, decision-making mode, actions, mechanisms for reality creation, sources of meaning, power, structure, metaphor, examples/archetype, leadership, communication, scope of influence, reward structure, source of structure, and how co-workers are perceived. This information-rich table is an overview of the organizational perspectives and serves as a summary of each organizational perspective. Readers are encouraged to go back to this table frequently to discern the differences and similarities between and among the organizational perspectives.

Chapter 2 Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy, a theory introduced by Max Weber, is often vilified for its rigidity, resistance to change, and propensity for "red tape." Despite these criticisms, bureaucratic standard operating procedures and routinized characteristics transformed patriarchal and family-owned organizations into the modern structures recognized today. This chapter discusses bureaucracy from an organizational perspective and relates its concepts to higher education institutions. The perspective is brought into current use through a discussion of heterarchy and social networks. Given the historical nature of bureaucracy, this chapter contains few revisions from the first and second editions.

Chapter 3 Collegium

The collegium model contains longstanding, enduring forms and functions within colleges and universities. Characterized by shared governance, peer review, leadership as

first among equals, academic freedom, and loyalty to discipline, collegial concepts inform significant aspects of faculty life and higher education administration. This chapter focuses on faculty and the curriculum with an eye for how these forms shape the overall organization of colleges and universities. The perspective is brought into current use through a discussion of academic capitalism. The revised chapter for the third edition includes implications for collegial practice changes undertaken over the last 20 years and accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Chapter 4 Cultural

Originating with a theory about Japan's corporate success based on cultural values, organizational culture spread to the US in the 1980s. Inspired by the corporate organizational literature, scholars brought organizational culture concepts into higher education through the 1990s. The frequent practice of rituals, the presence of multiple campus cultures, reliance on cultural artifacts to convey meaning, and other cultural practices are examples of how organizational culture is applied to higher education institutions. Revision for the third edition entails a discussion of intellectual reconstruction and abolitionist education, theories that bring the cultural perspective into current use.

Chapter 5 Feminist

Feminist theories on organizations provide a valuable way to imagine higher education institutions. Colleges and universities, with their social justice emphasis and commitment to educational development and growth, are ripe for the incorporation of feminist theories into their functioning. Four strands of feminist theory related to organizations are discussed. Connective leadership in the context of traditional male roles is provided as an alternative to the established command-and-control style of leadership models. Earlier editions included information about queer organizational theory to bring the feminist organizational perspective into current use. Queer organizational theory is now a separate chapter. The feminist perspective is brought into current use through a brief discussion of the erasure of all genders in feminist theory and references to the chapter on queer organizational perspectives.

Chapter 6 Loosely Coupled Systems (New Chapter)

Chapter 6 is a new addition to the third edition of *Organizational Theory in Higher Education.* In the 1970s and 1980s, Weick and colleagues proposed loosely coupled systems as an organizational theory alternative to the rational, objective views on organizational functioning. Originating in pre-K-12 educational organizations, the theory was extended to higher education by Robert Birnbaum, James March, Michael Cohen, and others. Using richly crafted metaphors to describe concepts such as enactment and sensemaking, loosely coupled systems provide a means to conceive organizations in creative, imaginative ways. The perspective is brought into current use through a new discussion of decoupled bureaucracies.

Chapter 7 Organized Anarchy

The organized anarchy perspective is the only organizational theory specifically written for higher education institutions. Using a playful metaphor, Cohen and March described leadership in institutions that have multiple goals, unclear technology,

and fluid participation. Eschewing traditional bureaucratic and collegial models, organized anarchy theorists used metaphors to describe decision-making, leadership, and organizational activities. An often-frustrating organizational perspective to understand, organized anarchy theorists challenge the assumption that higher educational institutions operate as rational bureaucracies. The organized anarchy metaphor can be used to understand various old and new tensions existing in today's higher education institutions and is brought into current use through a discussion of change and innovation.

Chapter 8 Political

The chapter on politics, another traditional perspective on higher education institutions, has limited revisions from the first two editions. The organizational concepts advanced by Baldridge and colleagues are reviewed to explore the positive and constructive understanding of higher education institutions as political entities. The chapter discusses the characteristics and concepts of political organizations including conflict as normal, interest groups and coalitions, interest convergence, inactivity prevails, fluid participation, attention cues and privilege, and decision-making. Organizational democracy is newly added in the third edition to bring the theory into current use.

Chapter 10 Queer Theory (New Chapter)

Queer organizational theory is a liberating, affirming, and deeply political approach with much to offer higher education. This chapter deepens the diversity, equity, and inclusion discussions prevalent in organizations by introducing the topics of heteronormativity, heterosexism, heterogenderism, normative social relations, and gender binaries. The perspective is brought into current use through a brief discussion of its lack of representation in most higher education institutions.

Chapter 11 Spiritual

Reviews of the first and second editions of *Organizational Theory in Higher Education* indicate the spirituality chapter as one of the most provocative. This perspective dates to the mid-1990s when Zohar, Briskin, Marshall, and others saw the need to include topics such as wisdom, beauty, spirit, and soul in traditional organizational theory. This chapter reviews spiritual intelligence, leadership, and vision and their place in higher education. The perspective is brought into current use through a discussion of the ways higher education institutions can reduce the Cartesian split prevalent within the curriculum and colleges and universities as a whole.

Chapter 12 Conclusions

Organizational Theory in Higher Education seeks to provide insights about how colleges and universities work so faculty, administrators, students, and stakeholders can best utilize the potential of these institutions to achieve social change, educational excellence, administrative efficiencies, and social justice. Groups of higher education participants are discussed regarding how they can use the organizational perspectives discussed in the book to improve their practice and understanding. Discussion includes the caution that the perspectives cannot be understood from a one-size-fits-all, monolithic standpoint. Only a multi-modal, integrative perspective employing more than one perspective can most effectively understand higher education institutions.

Cases

A case study is included at the end of each chapter to illustrate the use of that organizational perspective in a practical situation. The cases were written with current higher education topics and issues in mind. Although the cases were written for specific organizational perspectives, readers are encouraged to imagine how other organizational perspectives could inform the case. In this way, the multi-model, integrative approach to organizational analysis is encouraged.

HOW TO USE THIS BOOK

Several organizational perspectives could be considered old and read from a historical perspective. Despite some outmoded points of view, these organizational perspectives (e.g., bureaucracy) were included because elements of their use remain on college and university campuses. Furthermore, characteristics and concepts in these theories, including antiquated approaches, can inform newer ways of thinking about organizations even if that thinking is cautionary. Readers can approach these chapters by thinking about the vestiges of these theories that still exist in higher education institutions.

The chapters in this book, written as stand-alone entities, can be read in any order. They can be mixed and matched depending on the needs of course instructors and others. The organizational perspectives were placed in alphabetical order so readers could make their own choices about emphasis. For some readers, the traditional perspectives (e.g., bureaucracy, collegium, cultural, political), read first, may provide a foundation for the other perspectives. For other readers, a review of the more recent, non-traditional perspectives (e.g., loosely coupled systems, organized anarchy, queer, spiritual) may be read first to more openly and creatively think about organizational functioning.

CONCLUSIONS

Colleges and universities are remarkable organizations. They have the power to transform lives and open doors previously unimagined. As educators who work in these institutions, we have accepted a calling to create organizations that best fulfill their potential. Understanding how theory and practice interrelate is one path toward meeting this goal.

Reference

Capper, C. A. (2019). *Organizational theory for equity and diversity*. New York, NY: Routledge.

1

INTRODUCTION

Higher education has changed dramatically with the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, hybrid and online teaching, and crisis management prioritizing administrative decision making. Organizational theory provides an important way to understand higher education institutions, improve effectiveness, build community, and achieve outcomes. This chapter introduces the nine organizational theories summarized in this book.

No single theory accounts for the entire range of administrative and organizational behavior. (Lutz, 1983, p. 653)

INTRODUCTION

There are many ways to view organizations. The theory or perspective used depends on the worldview, institutional position, and identities of the viewer. One person may see the organization from a cultural perspective and base their actions on symbolism, ritual, and creating meaning. A politically minded person may see the organization through the lens of power and view organizational actions as a compromise among competing goals. Yet another uses queer theory to think about how the organization can be "queered" to consider leadership approaches without the traditional male/female binary that characterizes other organizational theories. This book discusses nine organizational theories, called perspectives in this text, in the context of colleges and universities.

STRUCTURE AS SHAPE

A helpful metaphor or way to understand organizational theory is to imagine that each of the nine perspectives offered in this book describes a shape. "Organizations…[are] superimposed structures….[they are] inventions of people, inventions superimposed on flows of experience and momentarily imposing some order on these streams" (Weick, 1979, pp. 11–12). Some organizational perspectives refer to a specific and obvious shape

1

(e.g., bureaucracies, collegial, feminist). Other organizational perspectives describe shapes that are more difficult to imagine or see (e.g., loosely coupled systems, organized anarchies). Some perspectives describe organizations with diffuse structures (e.g., cultural, queer, spiritual) or structures similar to other organizational perspectives but different in approach and character. These latter theories concentrate their attention on functioning, behavior, and characteristics more than the shape. As you read the theories summarized in this book, imagine the shape of the organizations in which you are associated. How does that shape (or shapes) assist or interfere with organizational goals and purposes? Does the shape promote ease of operation, or does it impose layers or distances that complicate functioning? If you were to design an organization, what shape would you create?

The complexity of US higher education demands that administrators and faculty understand and use multiple organizational perspectives to view institutional issues and functioning. A single organizational perspective is insufficient to address many issues currently facing college and university systems. The nine perspectives (i.e., bureaucracy, collegium, cultural, feminist, loosely coupled systems, organized anarchy, political, queer theory, and spiritual) offered in this book are only several perspectives available. (Previous editions of this book included new science and institutional theory perspectives, eliminated due to space constraints and the desire to highlight a different set of theories.)

While tempting, it would be difficult for anyone to simultaneously hold all nine organizational perspectives offered here at the same time. Each person has a favorite way to view an organization and, for that matter, the world. As you, the reader, consider the organizational perspectives, imagine the ways that using a different approach from your usual might expose decisions, solutions, and ways of operating not previously available to you. Because some perspectives have increased explanatory power for specific areas or units within college and university functioning, an understanding of multiple organizational perspectives can increase effectiveness, inclusion, and equity. Increased proficiency with several organizational perspectives allows educators to explore aspects of organizational functioning that open in some perspectives but close in others. Table 1.1 offers suggestions for how some organizational perspectives correspond to some but not all areas within higher education institutions. Readers are urged to consider what can be "seen" from one perspective that is hidden by another. Skilled educators must be multi-modal to adeptly switch their views from one perspective to another to enable change, transformation, and day-to-day management.

The areas and activities listed in Table 1.1 are incomplete and written only from the perspective of this author. A reader's personal understanding of the nine organizational perspectives, their individual experiences, and specific organizational role would result in different conclusions and configurations. After reading the text, readers are urged to come back to Table 1.1, use their knowledge of the nine organizational perspectives and develop their way to "view" their organization and its functions. What organizational perspectives provide the most explanatory power for your area? Which organizational perspectives enable you to open possibilities not previously "seen"? How can knowledge of different organizational perspectives help you understand how others view the organization in which you work?

Table 1.2 summarizes the organizational perspectives discussed in this book and its approach to organizational functioning. Written from a paradigmatic perspective, the

Table 1.1   Organizational Perspectives and Possible Corresponding Functional Areas

Organizational Perspective	Corresponding Area
Bureaucracy	Administration, especially when considering the delineation of tasks and definition of roles.
Collegium	Faculty; Student Affairs staff
Cultural	Executive Officers; Faculty; Students
Feminist	Student Affairs; Academic Departments; Gender Studies; Women's Advocacy Offices
Loosely Coupled Systems	Administration; Staff; Academic colleges and schools; Academic and Administrative Committees; Boards of Trustees
Organized Anarchy	Faculty, especially regarding fluid participation; Administration, particularly regarding decision making
Political	Faculty, especially regarding reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions; Administration, especially regarding decision making; Boards of Trustees
Queer Theory	Academic and administrative departments that reject the traditional gender binary; Student Affairs; LGBTQA+ Advocacy Offices; Faculty
Spiritual	Departments and individuals seeking a holistic approach to mind, body, and spirit; Student Services Departments with direct student contact

table describes organizational elements and draws differences and similarities across the various organizational perspectives. Readers are encouraged to review this table frequently as you read the book. A first glance of Table 1.2 fails to reveal the nuances evident when a deeper understanding of the nine perspectives is obtained. Readers are encouraged to interact with the table, revising the descriptions of the element for each organizational perspective as you come to understand how the perspective operates within a college or university.

Several organizational perspectives complement each other; others are too different to effectively coexist. Higher education institutions, unlike other organizations, contain multiple organizational perspectives, even perspectives that have conflicting elements. The presence of conflicting elements does not mean that this situation is problematic or something to be "fixed." The presence of multiple organizational perspectives is a unique feature of higher education institutions; accounts for the complexity, tension, and uncertainty in the system; and, argue many, allows for multiple and simultaneous goals to be pursued.

CONCLUSION

An understanding of higher education institutions requires proficiency in several theories. Student development, enrollment management, critical race theory, cognitive, environmental, and student engagement are a few approaches necessary to act as a proficient educator in higher education settings. This book lays out nine organizational theories with an eye toward increasing understanding among faculty, administrators, staff, boards of trustees, legislators, and others involved in higher education decisions and policy. An understanding of how colleges and universities operate has

Table 1.2 Summary of Organizational Models

Organizational Elements	Chapter 2 Bureaucracy	Chapter 3 Collegium	Chapter 4 Cultural	Chapter 5 Feminist	Chapter 6 Loosely Coupled Systems	Chapter 7 Organized Anarchy	Chapter 8 Political	Chapter 9 Queer Theory	Chapter 10 Spiritual
Disciplinary foundation	Modernity	Sociology	Anthropology	Feminist theory	Psychology	Political philosophy	Sociology	Post-structuralism	Psychology
Decision-making mode	Rational decision-making	Participative decision-making	Meaning-making	Collaborative	Usually by one person	Garbage can model	Compromise; conflict	With many genders under consideration	Cooperative and collaborative
Actions based on	Technical; standard operating procedures	Consensus; discussion	Enactment	Shared purposes	Sense-making	Fluid participation	Conflict, loyalties, policy	Various means; fluid	Intellect and gut feeling; emotions allowed
Mechanism for reality creation	"Natural"; external; ideal type from nature	Shared constructions	Socially constructed	Shared meaning	Cognitive reasoning	Multiple realities	Defined by those in power	Socially constructed	Individual interpretation
Sources of meaning	Objective rules	Academic disciplines	Rituals, myths, sagas, language, tradition	Collaboration and relationships	Flux; unpredictability	Complexity	Conflict	Multiple, intersecting identities	Mind, body, spirit
Power	Legitimate	Expert; professional	Symbols, history, tradition	Egalitarian	Diffused	Diffused	Charisma; influence	Collaborative	Power emerges from all participants
Structure	Hierarchical; pyramid	Circular	Varied	Roughly circular; web	Individual units with loose connections	Varied	Flat	Varied	Varied
Metaphor	Machine	Circle	Carnival and theater	Web	Building blocks	Anarchy	Jungle	Performance	Journey

Examples/ Archetype	Military; church	Legal process; faculty senate; professional associations	Church; sports; fraternities and sororities	Corporations, colleges	K-12 and higher educational systems	Colleges and universities	Legislature; unions; private club	Colleges and universities; particularly student groups and academic departments	Corporations, colleges
Leadership	Top down; legitimate authority; leadership emanates from office	First among equals	Heroes and heroines; mythical; the stuff of saga	Rotating; transformational	In pockets	Constructed and symbolic	Coalitions; defined by power structures and influence	Located throughout the organization	Rotating; transformational
Communication	Top down; written predominates	Protracted; oral based	Explicit and implicit; oral; storytelling	Power shared through open communication and other networks	Periodic to close depending on the coupling	Intermittent	Covert	Multi-vocal	Power shared through open communication and other networks
Scope of influence	Institutional	Faculty	Institutional	Global	Institutional	Pockets	Institutional	Departmental	Global
Reward structure	Merit	Expertise in discipline; peer review	Tradition	Compromise between personal and organizational goals	Relational	Individual	Connections	Community-oriented	Compromise between personal and organizational goals
Source of structure	Nature	Academic disciplines	Culture	Whole; universe	Project or functional need	Chaos	Relationships; city-state	Through the performance in the moment	Whole; universe
How you perceive co-workers	Worker bees	Colleagues	Actors and cast	Fellow journeyers	Co-workers	Fellow professionals	Adversaries	Fellow travelers	Fellow journeyers

the potential to build community, increase equity and inclusion, and impact administrative and teaching effectiveness. Organizational theory is one of many areas of expertise needed to fully understand these complex organizations that play an essential role in US society.

References

Lutz, F. W. (1983). Tightening up loose coupling in organizations of higher education. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *27*, 653–669.

Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Introduction

Lutz, F. W. (1983). Tightening up loose coupling in organizations of higher education. Administrative Science Quarterly, *27* , 653–669.

Weick, K. E. (1979). The social psychology of organizing. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Bureaucracy

Andrews, J. G. (May–June 2006). How can we resist corporatization? Academe, *92* (3), 16–19.

Bergquist, W. H. , & Pawlak, K. (2008). Engaging the six cultures of the academy (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bess, J. L. , & Dee, J. R. (2008). Understanding college and university organization: Theories for effective policy and practice (Vol. 1). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Biberman-Shalev, L. , & Semo, G. (2022). The status of humanities and STEM disciplines in a period of crisis. In L. Bikerman-Shalev , O. Broza , & D. Patkin (Eds.), Teacher education in a reality of a world crisis: The narrative of a faculty of education in a teacher education college (pp. 153–175). Hackensack, NJ: World Scientific Publishing.

Butcher, D. , & Clarke, M. (2002). Organizational politics: The cornerstone for organizational democracy. Organizational Dynamics, *31* (1), 35–46.

Carnegie Foundation . (2021). Carnegie classifications. Retrieved from https://carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/carnegie-classification/

Chait, R. P. , Holland, T. P. , & Taylor, B. E. (1996). Improving the performance of governing boards. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Delgado, R. , & Stefancic, J. (2017). Critical race theory: An introduction (3rd ed.). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Dobbin, F. , Schrage, D. , & Kalev, A. (2015). Rage against the iron cage: The varied effects of bureaucratic personnel reforms on diversity. American Sociological Review, *80* (5), 1014–1044.

Fayol, H. (1916/2016). General principles of management. In J. M. Shafritz , J. S. Ott , & Y. S. Jang (Eds.), Classics of organizational theory (8th ed., pp. 53–65). Boston, MA: Wadsworth. (Original work published 1916).

Ferguson, K. (1984). The feminist case against bureaucracy. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Guetzkow, H. (1965). Communications and organizations. In J. G. March (Ed.), Handbook of organizations (pp. 534–573). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Guinier, L. (2015). The tyranny of meritocracy: Democratizing higher education in America. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Gulick, L. (1937/2016). Notes on the theory of organization. In J. M. Shafritz , J. S. Ott , & Y. S. Jang (Eds.), Classics of organizational theory (8th ed., pp. 84–92). Boston, MA: Wadsworth. (Original work published 1937).

Hedlund, G. (1986). The hypermodern MNC—A heterarchy? Human Resource Management, *25* (1), 9–35.

Kezar, A. (2006). Rethinking public higher education governing boards performance: Results of a national study of governing boards in the United States. The Journal of Higher Education, *77* (6), 968–1008.

Kleiner, A. (2002). Karen Stephenson's quantum theory of trust. Strategy + Business, *29* , 1–14.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2013). *Critical race theory—What it is not!* In M. Lynn , & A. D. Dixson (Eds.), Handbook of critical race theory in education (pp. 34–47). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, *11* (1), 7–24.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2002). The age of connective leadership. In F. Hesselbein , & R. Johnson (Eds.), On leading change: A leader to leader guide (pp. 89–101). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2014). The essentials of leadership: A historical perspective. In G. R. Goethals , S. T. Scott , & M. Roderick (Eds.), Conceptions of leadership: Enduring ideas and emerging insights (pp. 15–37). London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Merton, R. K. (1957/2011). Bureaucratic structure and personality. In J. M. Shafritz , J. S. Ott , & Y. S. Jang (Eds.), Classics of organizational theory (7th ed., pp. 107–115). Boston, MA: Wadsworth. (Original work published 1957)

Morgan, G. (2006). Images of organization (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mouton, N. (2019). A literary perspective on the limits of leadership: Tolstoy's critique of the great man theory. Leadership, *15* (1), 81–102.

Mullins, L. B. (2014). Pink tape: A feminist theory of red tape. Public Voices, *13* (2), 33–42.

Roethlisberger, F. J. (1941). The Hawthorne experiments: Classics of organizational behaviour. Danville, IL: Interstate Printers.

Selznick, P. (1948/2016). Foundations of the theory of organization. In J. M. Shafritz , J. S. Ott , & Y. S. Jang (Eds.), Classics of organizational theory (8th ed., pp. 116–125). Boston, MA: Wadsworth. (Original work published 1948).

Shaikh, S. A. , Lämsä, A. M. , & Heikkinen, S. (2022). Collaborative leadership in the institutions of higher education: A literature review. Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies, *27* (1), 50–59.

Simon, H. A. (1956). Rational choice and the structure of the environment. Psychological Review, *63* (2), 129–138.

Simon, H. A. (1957). Models of man: Social and rational. Oxford, UK: Wiley.

Simon, H. A. (1979). Rational decision making in business organizations. American Economic Review, *69* (4), 493–513.

Stephenson, K. (2001). What knowledge tears apart, networks make whole. Internal Communication Focus, *36* , 1–6.

Stephenson, K. (2004). The quantum theory of trust: The secret of mapping and managing human relationships. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Stephenson, K. (2005). Trafficking in trust: The art and science of human knowledge networks. In L. Coughlin , E. Wingard , & K. Hollihan (Eds.), Enlightened power: How women are transforming the practice of leadership (pp. 242–265). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Stephenson, K. (2010). Neither hierarchy nor network: An argument for heterarchy. *Perspectives*. Retrieved from www.rossdawsonblog.com/HRPS_Heterarchy.pdf.

Taylor, F. W. (1947). Scientific management. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Tierney, W. (2004). Competing conceptions of academic governance: Negotiating the perfect storm. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Weber, M. (1947/2016). The theory of social and economic organization (A.M. Henderson & T. Parsons , Trans.). London, England: W. Hodge. (Original published in 1947).

Wilde, J. , & Finkelstein, J. (November 15, 2021). A fundamental change in hiring college presidents is unfolding. Retrieved from https://www.highereddive.com/news/a-fundamental-change-in-hiring-college-presidents-is-unfolding/609978/

Collegium

Alpert, D. (1985). Performance and paralysis: The organizational context of the American research university. Journal of Higher Education, *56* (3), 241–281.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities . (2021). Policy matters: A higher education policy brief. Washington, DC: Publisher.

American Association of University Professors . (1990). Statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure with 1970 interpretive comments (10th ed.). Washington, DC: Author. (Original work published 1940).

American Association of University Professors. (1999). Recommended institutional regulations on academic freedom and tenure. Washington, DC: Author. (Original work published 1957).

American Association of University Professors . (2008). Policy documents and reports (11th ed.). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

American Association of University Professors. (2018). Data snapshot: Contingent faculty in US higher education. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of University Professors . (July 28, 2021). Contingency and upper management growth on the rise in higher ed. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of University Professors . (May 2022). The 2022 AAUP survey of tenure practices. Washington, DC: Author.

Andrews, J. G. (May–June 2006). How can we resist corporatization? Academe, *92* (3), 16–19.

Association of University Professors . (May 2021). Special report: COVID-19 and academic governance. Washington, DC: Author.

Austin, A. E. (1990). Faculty cultures, faculty values. In W. Tierney (Ed.), Assessing academic climates and culture: New directions for institutional research. (Vol. 17(4), pp. 61–74). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Austin, I. , & Jones, G. A. (2015). Governance of higher education: Global perspectives, theories, and practices. New York, NY: Routledge.

Baldridge, J. V. , Curtis, D. V. , Ecker, G. , & Riley, G. L. (1978). Policy making and effective leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Beatson, N. J. , Tharapos, M. , O'Connell, B. T. , De Lange, P. , Carr, S. , & Copeland, S. (2022). The gradual retreat from academic citizenship. Higher Education Quarterly, *76* (4), 715–725.

Beerkens, M. , & van der Hoek, M. (2022). Academic leaders and leadership in the changing higher education landscape. In C. S. Sarrico , M. J. Rosa , & T. Carvalho (Eds.), Research handbook on academic careers and managing academics (pp. 121–136). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Birnbaum, R. (1991). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Blau, P. (2019). The organization of academic work (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge. (Original published in 1973).

Bowen, W. G. , & Tobin, E. M. (2015). Locus of authority: The evolution of faculty roles in the governance of higher education. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brubacher, J. S. (1990). On the philosophy of higher education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Childers, M. E. (1981). What is political about bureaucratic-collegial decision making? The Review of Higher Education, *5* (1), 25–45.

Clark, B. R. (1963). Faculty culture. In T. Lunsford (Ed.), The study of campus cultures (pp. 39–54). Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Clark, B. R. (1980). Academic culture. New Haven, CT: Institute for Social and Policy Studies.

Clark, B. R. (1983). The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Coates, H. , & Kezar, A. (2022). Cultivating designed academics: Leading development of future work, roles and experts. In C. S. Sarrico , M. J. Rosa , & T. Carvalho (Eds.), Research handbook on academic careers and managing academics (pp. 153–163). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

DeGeorge, R. T. (2003). Ethics, academic freedom and academic tenure. Journal of Academic Ethics, *1* (1), 11–25.

Duncan, J. C. (1999). The indentured servants of academia: The adjunct faculty dilemma and their limited legal remedies. Indiana Law Journal, *74* (2), 514–526.

Dutt-Ballerstadt, R. (June 4, 2021). An extraordinary firing. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2021/06/04/universities-fire-tenured-faculty-without-due-process-are-setting-dangerous

Eckel, P. D. (2000). The role of shared governance in institutional hard decisions: Enabler or antagonist? The Review of Higher Education, *24* (1), 15–39.

Enders, J. , & Naidoo, R. (2022). The rise and work of new professionals in higher education. In C. S. Sarrico , M. J. Rosa , & T. Carvalho (Eds.), Research handbook on academic careers and managing academics (pp. 89–98). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Fredricks-Lowman, I. , & Smith-Isabell, N. (2020). Academic capitalism and the conflicting ideologies of higher education as a public good and commodity. In N. Smith-Isabell , P. Witkowsky , & M. Cuyjet (Eds.). Faculty perspectives on internationalization strategies in higher education. New Directions for Higher Education, (Vol. *2020* (192), pp. 21–27).

Gouldner, A. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. I. Administrative Science Quarterly, *2* (3), 281–306.

Gouldner, A. (1958). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. II. Administrative Science Quarterly, *2* (4), 444–480.

Guinier, L. (2015). The tyranny of meritocracy: Democratizing higher education in America. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Hackett, E. J. (1990). Science as a vocation in the 1990s: The changing organizational culture of academic science. Journal of Higher Education, *61* (3), 241–279.

Hamann, J. , & Beljean, S. (2017). Academic evaluation in higher education. In: J. Shin , & P. Teixeira (Eds.). Encyclopedia of international higher education systems and institutions. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9553-1_295-1

Haskins, C. H. (1984). The rise of universities. New York, NY: Cornell University Press.

Haviland, D. , Alleman, N. F. , & Allen, C. C. (November 2015). "Separate but not quite equal": Collegiality experiences of full time, non-tenure-track faculty members. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Denver, CO.

Hendrickson, R. M. , Lane, J. E. , Harris, J. T. , & Dorman, R. H. (2013). Academic leadership and governance of higher education: A guide for trustees, leaders, and aspiring leaders of two-and four-year institutions. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Jessop, B. (2018). On academic capitalism. Critical Policy Studies, *12* (1), 104–109.

Jones, G. A. , & Weinrab, J. (2022). The changing context of academic work: Fragmentation, institutional horizontal diversity and vertical stratification. In C. S. Sarrico , M. J. Rosa , & T. Carvalho (Eds.), Research handbook on academic careers and managing academics (pp. 36–46). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Kolodny, A. (2008, September–October). Tenure, academic freedom, and the career I once loved: We're being underfunded out of existence. Academe, *94* (5). Retrieved from www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2008/SO/

Labaree, D. F. (2017). A perfect mess: The unlikely ascendancy of American higher education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lucas, C. (2006). American higher education: A history. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

McKenzie, L. (October 21. 2020). Is it time for all student to take ethnic studies? *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/10/22/adding-ethnic-studies-college-curricula-has-long-been-controversial-moment-different

Meyer, J. W. , Ramirez, F. O. , Frank, D. J. , & Schofer, E. (2007). Higher education as an institution. In P. Gumport (Ed.), Sociology of higher education: Contributions and their contexts (pp. 187–221). Baltimore, MD:

Johns Hopkins University Press.

Munene, I. I. (2018). Introduction: The casualization of academic labor and faculty agency. In I. I. Munene (Ed.), Contextualizing and organizing contingent faculty. London, UK: Lexington Books.

Musselin, C. (2022). Foreword. In C. S. Sarrico , M. J. Rosa , & T. Carvalho (Eds.), Research handbook on academic careers and managing academics (pp. xviii–xix). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.

Musto, R. G. (2021). The attack on higher education: The dissolution of the American university. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2021). Digest of education statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Pasque, P. A. (2007). Seeing more of the educational inequalities around us: Visions strengthening relationships between higher education and society. In E. P. St. John (Ed.), Confronting educational inequality: Reframing, building understanding, and making change (Vol. 22, pp. 37–84). New York, NY: AMS Press.

Rettig, P. R. (2019). Shared governance: A more meaningful approach in higher education. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Rhoades, G. , Kiyama, J. M. , McCormick, R. , & Quiroz, M. (2008). Local cosmopolitans and cosmopolitan locals: New models of professionals in the academy. The Review of Higher Education, *31* (2), 209–235.

Rhoades, G. , & Slaughter, S. (2004). Academic capitalism in the new economy: Challenges and choices. American Academic, *1* (1), 37–60.

Rosser, V. J. (2003). Historical overview of faculty governance in higher education. In M. Miller , & J. Caplow (Eds.), Policy and university faculty governance (pp. 3–18). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Rousseau, N. (2020). The sociological imagination, neoliberalism, and higher education. Social Currents, *7* (5), 395–401.

Rudolph, F. (1990). The American college and university: A history. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.

Saltzman, G. M. (2008). Dismissals, layoffs, and tenure denials in colleges and universities. *The NEA 2008 almanac of higher education* (pp. 51–65). Retrieved from www.nea.org/home/32972.htm

Sarrico, C. S. , Rosa, M. J. , & Carvalho, T. (2022). Introduction to the research handbook on managing academics. In C. S. Sarrico , M. J. Rosa , & T. Carvalho (Eds.), Research handbook on academic careers and managing academics (pp. 1–16). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Schrecker, E. (2010). The lost soul of higher education: Corporatization, the assault on academic freedom, and the end of the American university. New York, NY: The New Press.

Shires, J. (2019). The civic benefits of the trivium. In K. Dharamsi , & J. Zimmer (Eds.), Liberal education and the idea of the university: Arguments and reflections on theory and practice (pp. 103–188). Wilmington, DE: Vernon Press.

Slaughter, S. , & Leslie, L. L. (1997). Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Spinrad, M. L. , & Relles, S. R. (2022). Losing our faculties: Contingent faculty in the corporate academy. Innovative Higher Education, 47(5), 837–854.

Teixeira, P. N. (2022). The academic labour market in changing higher education systems: A political economy approach. In C. S. Sarrico , M. J. Rosa , & T. Carvalho (Eds.), Research handbook on academic careers and managing academics (pp. 19–35). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Tierney, W. (1998). Tenure is dead. Long live tenure. In W. Tierney (Ed.), The responsive university: Restructuring for high performance (pp. 38–61). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tierney, W. (2006). Trust and the public good: Examining the cultural conditions of academic work. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Twale, D. (2013). A faculty guide for succeeding in academe. New York, NY: Routledge.

Vican, S. , Friedman, A. , & Andreasen, R. (2020). Metrics, money, and managerialism: Faculty experiences of competing logics in higher education. The Journal of Higher Education, *91* (1), 139–164.

Whitley, R. D. (1984). The intellectual and social organization of the sciences. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Worthen, M. (September 20, 2021). The fight over tenure is not really about tenure. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2021/09/20/opinion/tenure-college-university.html

Yakoboski, P. J. (2016). Adjunct views of adjunct positions. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, *48* (3), 54–59.

Cultural

Adler-Kassner, L. , Safronova, M. , Dominguez-Whitehead, Y. , Gonzalez, K. , Nguyen, S. , & Phommasa, M. (2022). Sense of place and belonging: Lessons from the pandemic. Teaching and Learning Inquiry, *10* , 1–17.

Annamma, S. A. , Connor, D. , & Ferri, B. (2013). Dis/ability critical race studies (DisCrit): Theorizing at the intersections of race and dis/ability. Race Ethnicity and Education, *16* (1), 1–31.

Bamber, M. , Allen-Collinson, J. , & McCormack, J. (2017). Occupational limbo, transitional liminality and permanent liminality: New conceptual distinctions. Human Relations, *70* (12), 1514–1537.

Bell, D. A. (1992). Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bergquist, W. H. , & Pawlak, K. (2008). Engaging the six cultures of the academy (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bess, J. L. , & Dee, J. R. (2008). Understanding college and university organization: Theories for effective policy and practice (Volume 1). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Birnbaum, R. (1991). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bollinger, S. J. (2016). Between a tomahawk and a hard place: Indian Mascots and the NCAA. Brigham Young University Education & Law Journal, *1* , 73–115.

Bott, S. E. , Banning, J. H. , Wells, M. , Hass, G. , & Lakey, J. (2006). A sense of place: A framework and its application to campus ecology. College Services, *6* (5), 42–47.

Cabrera, N. L. , Watson, J. S. , & Franklin, J. D. (2016). Racial arrested development: A critical Whiteness analysis of the campus ecology. Journal of College Student Development, *57* (2), 119–134.

Clark, B. R. (1972). The organizational saga in higher education. Administrative Science Quarterly, *17* (2), 178–184.

Clark, B. R. (1986). The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Cohen, M. D. , & March, J. G. (1986). Leadership and ambiguity (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Crichlow, W. (2015). Critical race theory: A strategy for framing discussions around social justice and democratic education. Paper presented at the Higher Education in Transformation Conference, Dublin, May 31–April 1 (pp. 187–201). Dublin, IE: Dublin Institute of Technology. Retrieved from http://arrow.dit.ie/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=st2

Deal, T. E. , & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

DeCuir, J. T. , & Dixson, A. D. (2004). "So when it comes out, they aren't that surprised that it is there": Using critical race theory as a tool of analysis of race and racism in education. Educational Researcher, *33* (5), 26–31.

Delgado, R. , & Stefancic, J. (2017). Critical race theory: An introduction (3rd ed.). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Endres, D. (2015). American Indian permission for mascots: Resistance or complicity within rhetorical colonialism? Rhetoric & Public Affairs, *18* (4), 649–689.

Frost, P. J. , Moore, L. F. , Louis, M. R. , Lundberg, C. C. , & Martin, J. (Eds.). (1985). Organizational culture. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Greenfield, T. B. (1986). Leaders and schools: Willfulness and nonnatural order in organizations. In T. J. Sergiovanni , & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice (pp. 142–169). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Gruenewald, D. A. (2003). Foundations of place: A multidisciplinary framework for place-conscious education. American Educational Research Journal, *40* (3), 619–654.

Guiliano, J. (2015). Indian spectacle: College mascots and the anxiety of modern America. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Hamada, T. (1989). Perspective on organizational culture. Anthropology of Work Review, *10* (3), 5–7.

Han, C. W. (2016). No fats, femmes, or Asians: The utility of critical race theory in examining the role of gay stock stories in the marginalization of gay Asian men. In M. Zhou , & A. C. Ocampo (Eds.), Contemporary Asian America: A multidisciplinary reader (3rd ed., pp. 312–330). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Jimenez, T. , Arndt, J. , & Helm, P. J. (2023). Prejudicial reactions to the removal of native American mascots. Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, *26* (1), 140–156.

Kuh, G. D. , Schuh, J. , & Whitt, E. Associates (1991). Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G. D. , & Whitt, E. J. (1988). The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities (*ASHE/ERIC Higher Education Report*, No. 1). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2013). *Critical race theory—What it is not!* In M. Lynn , & A. D. Dixson (Eds.), Handbook of critical race theory in education (pp. 34–47). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, *11* (1), 7–24.

Manning, K. (2000). Rituals, ceremonies, and cultural meaning in higher education. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Matsuda, M. J. , Lawrence, C. R. , Delgado, R. , & Crenshaw, K. W. (1993). Words that wound: Critical race theory, assaultive speech, and the first amendment. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Mayo, E. (1946). The human problems of an industrial civilization (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

Museus, S. D. (2007). Using qualitative methods to assess diverse institutional cultures. In S. R. Harper & S.D. Museus (Eds.), Using qualitative methods in institutional assessment (New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 136, pp. 29–40). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ouchi, W. G. (1982). Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Parker, M. (2000). Organizational culture and identity: Unity and division at work. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Patton, L. D. , McEwen, M. , Rendón, L. , & Howard-Hamilton, M. (2007). Critical race perspectives on theory in student affairs. In S. R. Harper , & L. D. Patton (Eds.), Responding to the realities of race on campus (New Directions for Student Services, No. 120, pp. 39–54). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pell, D. J. , & Amigud, A. (2023). The higher education dilemma: The views of faculty on integrity, organizational culture, and duty of fidelity. Journal of Academic Ethics, *21* (1), 155–175.

Peters, T. J. , Waterman, R. H. , & Jones, I. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Roethlisberger, F. J. (1941/2011). *The Hawthorne experiments* . In J. M. Shafritz , J. S. Ott , & Y. S. Jang (Eds.), Classics of organizational theory (pp. 158–166). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth. (Original published in 1941).

Ryan, S. (May 3, 2016). Illinois to select new mascot; Chief Illiniwek backers "not going to stop." *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from www.chicagotribune.com/sports/college/ct-university-of-illinois-mascot-chief-illiniwek-20160502-story.html.

Santiago, C. R. V. (2004). Countering kulturkampf politics through critique and justice pedagogy, race, kulturkampf, and immigration. Seton Hall Law Review, *35* , 1155.

Schein, E. H. (2010). Organizational culture and leadership (Vol. 2). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Schein, E. H. , & Schein, P. A. (2016). Organizational culture and leadership (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Scott, P. (2022). Sagas of contemporary higher education: Foreground and hinterland. Working paper no. 81, Centre for Global Higher Education.

Shaw, K. M. , Valadez, J. R. , & Rhoads, R. A. (Eds.). (1999). Community colleges as cultural texts: Qualitative explorations of organizational and student culture. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly, *28* (3), 339–358.

Solórzano, D. , Ceja, M. , & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. Journal of Negro Education, *69* (1), 60–73.

Spicer, A. (2020). Organizational culture and COVID-19. Journal of Management Studies, *57* (8), 1737–1740.

Stegman, E. , & Phillips, V. F. (2014). Missing the point: The real impact of native mascots and team names on American Indian and Alaska native youth. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

Taylor, Z. W. , & Reddick, R. J. (2020). The eyes of history are upon you: Toward a theory of intellectual reconstruction for higher education in a post-truth era. The Review of Higher Education, *44* (2), 167–188.

Tierney, W. G. (2008). The impact of culture on organizational decision-making: Theory and practice in higher education. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Tierney, W.G. , & Lanford, M. (2018). Institutional culture in higher education. In J.C. Shin & P. Teixeira (Eds.), Encyclopedia of international higher education systems and institutions (pp. 1–9). New York, NY: Springer Science + Business Media. https://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007/978-94-017-9553-1_544-1

Turner, V. W. (1986). Dewey, Dilthey, and drama. In V. W. Turner , & E. M. Bruner (Eds.), The anthropology of experience (pp. 33–44). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Turner, V. W. , & Bruner, E. M. (Eds.). (1986). The anthropology of experience. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Urrieta, L. Jr , & Villenas, S. A. (2013). The legacy of Derrick bell and Latino/a education: A critical race testimonio. Race Ethnicity and Education, *16* (4), 514–535.

van Gennep, A. (1960). Rites of passage. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Villalpando, O. (2004). Practical considerations of critical race theory and Latino critical theory for Latino college students. In A. Ortiz (Ed.), Addressing the unique needs of Latino American students (New Directions for Student Services, No. 105, pp. 41–50). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Feminist

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. Gender & Society, *4* (2), 139–158.

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. Gender & Society, *20* (4), 441–464.

Acker, J. (2009). From glass ceiling to inequality regimes. Sociologie Du Travail, *51* (2), 199–217.

American Association of University Professors . (December 9, 2020). Data snapshot: Full-time women faculty and faculty of color. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of University Women . (January 21, 2022). New report ranks the nation's 130 elite research universities for gender parity among top positions. Washington, DC: Author.

Bell, E. , Meriläinen, S. , Taylor, S. , & Tienari, J. (2019). Time's up! Feminist theory and activism meets organization studies. Human Relations, *72* (1), 4–22.

Bendl, R. , Fleischmann, A. , & Walenta, C. (2008). Diversity management discourse meets queer theory. Gender in Management: An International Journal, *23* (6), 382–394.

Benschop, Y. , & Verloo, M. (2015). Feminist organization theories: Islands of treasure. In R. Mir , H. Willmott , & M. Greenwood (Eds.), The Routledge companion to philosophy in organization studies (pp. 100–112). New York, NY: Routledge.

Calás, M. B. , & Smircich, L. (1999). Past postmodernism? Reflections and tentative discussions. Academy of Management Review, *24* (4), 649–671.

Calás, M. B. , & Smircich, L. (2006). From the "woman's point of view" ten years later: Towards a feminist organization studies. In S. R. Clegg , C. Hardy , T. B. Lawrence , & W. R. Nord (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of organization studies (pp. 284–346). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chrislip, D. D. , & Larson, C. E. (1994). Collaborative leadership: How citizens and civic leaders can make a difference. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Colby, G. (March, 2023). Data snapshot: Tenure and contingency in US higher education. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.

Ferguson, K. (1984). The feminist case against bureaucracy. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Helgesen, S. (1990). The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership. New York, NY: Doubleday Currency.

Helgesen, S. (2005). The web of inclusion: Architecture for building great organizations. Frederick, MD: Beard Books.

Helgesen, S. (2006). Challenges for leaders in the years ahead. In F. Hesselbein , & M. Goldsmith (Eds.), The leader of the future 2: Visions, strategies, and practices for the new era (pp. 183–190). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Helgesen, S. (2023). Rising together: How we can bridge divides and create a more inclusive workplace. New York, NY: Hachette Go.

Helgesen, S. , & Johnson, J. (2010). The female vision: Women's real power at work. Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Kark, R. (2004). The transformational leader: Who is (s)he? A feminist perspective. Journal of Organizational Change Management, *17* (2), 160–176.

Kezar, A. , Carducci, R. , & Contreras-McGavin, M. (2006). Rethinking the "L" word in higher education: The revolution of research on leadership: ASHE higher education report. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Kezar, A. , & Wheaton, M. M. (2017). The value of connective leadership: Benefiting from women's approach to leadership while contending with traditional views. About Campus, *21* (6), 19–26.

Komives, S. R. , Lucas, N. , & McMahon, T. R. (2013). Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Lea, T. (2021). Desiring bureaucracy. Annual Review of Anthropology, *50* , 59–74.

Lewis, P. , & Simpson, R. (2012). Kanter revisited: Gender, power and (in)visibility. International Journal of Management Reviews, *14* (2), 141–158.

Lincoln, Y. S. (Ed.). (1985). Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S. , Lynham, S. A. , & Guba, E. G. (2011). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In N. K. Denzin , & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (4th ed., pp. 97–128). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (1992). Connective leadership: Female leadership styles in the 21st century workplace. Sociological Perspectives, *35* (1), 183–203.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (1998). Connective leadership: What business needs to learn from academe. Change, *30* (1), 49–53.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2002). The age of connective leadership. In F. Hesselbein , & R. Johnson (Eds.), On leading change: A leader to leader guide (pp. 89–101). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2014). The essentials of leadership: A historical perspective. In G. R. Goethals , S. T. Scott , & M. Roderick (Eds.), Conceptions of leadership: Enduring ideas and emerging insights (pp. 15–37). London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2017). Connective leadership in an interdependent and diverse world. Roeper Review, *39* (3), 170–173.

Manning, K. , Kinzie, J. , & Schuh, J. (2014). One size does not fit all: Traditional and innovative models of student affairs practice (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Meyerson, D. E. , & Kolb, D. M. (2000). Moving out of the "armchair": Developing a framework to bridge the gap between feminist theory and practice. Organization, 7 (4), 553–570.

Morrison, A. M. (1992). The new leaders: Guidelines on leadership diversity in America. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rawlings, D. (2000). Collaborative leadership teams: Oxymoron or new paradigm? Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 52 (1), 36.

Robinson, J. L. , & Lipman-Blumen, J. (2017). Challenging our assumptions about male and female preferences for competition. Journal of Leadership Studies, 10 (4), 66–74.

Rosener, J. B. (2011). Ways women lead. In P. Wehane , & M. Painter-Morland (Eds.), Leadership, gender, and organization (pp. 19–29). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer Netherlands.

Sandberg, S. (2013). Lean in: Women, work, and the will to lead. New York, NY: Random House.

Wiegard, A. (2013). "Neither a servant nor a family member": Recognizing the unsustainable nature of stratification in our profession. CEA Critic, 75 (3), 224–234.

Loosely Coupled Systems
1

1

American Association of University Professors . (1990). Statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure with 1970 interpretive comments, (10th ed.). Washington, DC: Author. (Original work published 1940).

American Association of University Professors . (May 2021). Special report: COVID-19 and academic governance. Washington, DC: Author.

Burke, W. W. (2014). Changing loosely coupled systems. The Journal of Applied Behaviorial Science, 50 (4), 423–444.

Glassman, R. B. (1973). Persistence and loose coupling in living systems. Behavior Science, 18 , 83–98.

Maassen, P. , & Stensaker, B. (2019). From organised anarchy to de-coupled bureaucracy: The transformation of university organization. Higher Education Quarterly, 73 , 456–468.

March, J. G. , & Olsen, J. P. (1975). Choice situations in loosely coupled worlds. Unpublished manuscript, Stanford University.

Moody, J. (January 18, 2023). A harbinger for 2023? Presentation College to close. Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2023/01/19/more-colleges-will-likely-face-closure-2023-experts-say

Orton, J. D. , & Weick, K. E. (1990). Loosely coupled systems: A reconceptualization. The Academy of Management Review, 15 (2), 203–223.

Saul, S. (May 26, 2022). College enrollment drops, even as the pandemic's effects ebb. New York Times. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2022/05/26/us/college-enrollment.html

Starbuck, W. H. (2015). Karl E. Weick and the dawning awareness of organized cognition. Management Decision, 53 (6), 1287–1299.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21 (1), 1–19.

Weick, K. E. (1979). The social psychology of organizing. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Weick, K. E. (1984). Small wins: Redefining the scale of social problems. American Psychologist, 39 (1), 40–49.

Organized Anarchy

Afshar, V. (2014). Ten hottest disruptive technologies in higher education. Retrieved from www.slideshare.net/ValaAfshar/8699-educauseslideshare-v3

American Council on Education . (April 14, 2023). The American college president: 2023 edition. Washington, DC: Author.

Baldridge, J. V. , Curtis, D. V. , Ecker, G. , & Riley, G. L. (1978). Policy making and effective leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1991). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Burnes, B. (1996). Organizational change: What we know, what we need to know. Journal of Management Inquiry, 4 (2), 158–171.

Clark, D. L. (1985). Emerging paradigms in organizational theory and research. In Y. Lincoln (Ed.), Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution (pp. 43–78). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cohen, M. D. , & March, J. G. (1986). Leadership and ambiguity (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Cohen, M. D. , March, J. G. , & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, *17* (1), 1–25.

Conley, T. (January 19, 2016). 4 trends shaping higher education in 2016. *Ed Surge News*. Retrieved from www.edsurge.com/news/2016-01-19-4-trends-shaping-higher-education-in-2016

Curry, J. R. , Laws, A. L. , & Strauss, J. (2013). The buck stops elsewhere. Washington, DC: NACUBO.

Eckel, P. , Green, M. , & Barblan, A. (2015). The new (and smaller) world of higher education. International Higher Education, *29* , 2–3.

Finances Online. (2022). 19 higher education trends for 2022/2023: Latest forecasts to watch out for. Retrieved from https://financesonline.com/trends-in-higher-education/

Fourtané, S. (December 13, 2022). Technology trends in higher education 2023. *Fierce Education*. Retrieved from https://www.fierceeducation.com/technology/technology-trends-higher-education-2023

Goldman, E. (1910). Anarchism and other essays. New York, NY: Mother Earth.

Govindarajan, V. , & Trimble, C. (2010). The other side of innovation: Solving the execution challenge. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Gumport, P. (2012). Strategic thinking in higher education research. In M. N. Bastedo (Ed.), The organization of higher education (pp. 18–41). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kezar, A. (2001). Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st century: Recent research and conceptualizations (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 28). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kezar, A. (2013). Understanding sensemaking/sensegiving in transformational change processes from the bottom up. Higher Education, *65* (6), 761–780.

Kezar, A. (2014a). Higher education change and social networks: A review of research. The Journal of Higher Education, *85* (1), 91–125.

Kezar, A. (2014b). How colleges change: Understanding, leading, and enacting change. New York, NY: Routledge.

Lucas, H. (2014). Surviving disruptive technologies (Coursera), University of Maryland, College Park [online course]. Retrieved from www.mooc-list.com/course/surviving-disruptive-technologies-coursera

Maassen, P. , & Stensaker, B. (2019). From organised anarchy to de-coupled bureaucracy: The transformation of university organization. Higher Education Quarterly, *73* , 456–468.

Manning, K. (2000). Rituals, ceremonies, and cultural meaning in higher education. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

March, J. G. (1981). Footnotes to organizational change. Administrative Science Quarterly, *26* (4), 563–577.

Martinez-Saenz, M. , & Schoonover, S. (2015). The new era of "hire" education. Liberal Education, *101* (1/2), 68–71.

Meyer, K. (2010). The role of disruptive technology in the future of higher education. Retrieved from http://er.educause.edu/articles/2010/3/the-role-of-disruptive-technology-in-the-future-of-higher-education

Miller, S. D. (February 4, 2014). Welcome to the campus of 2019. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from www.huffingtonpost.com/dr-scott-d-miller/welcome-to-the-campus-of-_b_4694887.html

Musto, R. G. (2021). The attack on higher education: The dissolution of the American university. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olsen, J. P. (2001). Garbage cans, new institutionalism, and the study of politics. American Political Science Review, *95* (1), 191–198.

Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press (Original edition published 1962).

Walsh, M. (1992). Authentic anarchy and the transformation of the residence hall [unpublished manuscript]. Burlington, VT: Higher Education and Student Affairs, University of Vermont.

Political

American Association of University Professors. (2021). Special report: COVID-19 and academic governance. Washington, DC: Author.

Baldridge, J. V. (1971a). Academic governance: Research on institutional politics and decision making. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Baldridge, J. V. (1971b). Introduction: Models of university governance—bureaucratic, collegial, and political. In J. V. Baldridge (Ed.), Academic governance: Research on institutional politics and decision making (pp. 1–19). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Baldridge, J. V. (1971c). Power and conflict in the university. New York, NY: Wiley.

Baldridge, J. V. , Curtis, D. V. , Ecker, G. , & Riley, G. L. (1978). Policy making and effective leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bauer-Wolf, J. (March 31, 2023). Number of Hispanic-serving institutions climbs to 571. *Higher Ed Dive.* Retrieved from https://www.highereddive.com/news/number-of-hispanic-serving-institutions-climbs-to-571/646484/

Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. Board of education and the interest-convergence dilemma. Harvard Law Review, *93* (3), 518–533.

Birnbaum, R. (1991). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bok, D. (2015). Higher education in America. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Butcher, D. , & Clarke, M. (2002). Organizational politics: The cornerstone for organizational democracy. Organizational Dynamics, *31* (1), 35–46.

Butcher, D. , & Clarke, M. (2006). The symbiosis of organizational politics and organizational democracy. In E. Vigado-Gadot and A. Drory (Eds.), Handbook of organizational politics (pp. 286–300). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Coburn, C. (2015). Negotiation conflict styles. Retrieved from https://hms.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/assets/Sites/Ombuds/files/NegotiationConflictStyles.pdf

Cohen, M. D. , March, J. G. , & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, *17* (1), 1–25.

Delgado, R. , & Stefancic, J. (2017). Critical race theory: An introduction (3rd ed.). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Ellis, S. (2016). The political dimensions of decision making. In G. S. McClellan , & J. Stringer (Eds.), The handbook of student affairs administration (pp. 457–477). Washington, DC: NASPA.

Ferris, G. , Treadway, D. C. , Kolodinsky, R. W. , Hochwarter, W. A. , Kacmar, C. J. , Douglas, C. , & Frink, D. D. (2005). Development and validation of the political skill inventory. Journal of Management, *33* , 126–152.

Freeman, B. , Leihy, P. , Teo, I. , & Kim, D. K. (2021). Rapid, centralised decision-making in a higher education emergency. Quality Assurance in Education, *29* (4), 393–407.

French, J. R. P. , & Raven, B. (1959). The basis of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power (pp. 150–167). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Harper, S. R. (2009). Race, interest convergence, and transfer outcomes for black male student athletes. In L. S. Hagedorn & D. Horton Jr. (Eds.), Student athletes and athletics (New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 147, pp. 29–37). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, A. B. (2008). Privilege as paradox. In P. Rothenberg (Ed.), White privilege: Essential readings on the other side of racism (pp. 117–121). New York, NY: Worth.

Kezar, A. (2013). Understanding sensemaking/sensegiving in transformational change processes from the bottom up. Higher Education, *65* (6), 761–780.

Kroeger, N. (2014). "Micropolitics" and communication: An exploratory study on student representatives' communication repertoires in university governance. (MSc dissertation). Retrieved from https://www.lse.ac.uk/media-and-communications/assets/documents/research/msc-dissertations/2013/110-Kroeger.pdf

Miller, M. T. (2021). Do learning organizations learn? Higher education institutions and pandemic response strategies. The Learning Organization, *28* (1), 84–93.

Monari, P. K. , Hammond, E. R. , Malone, C. L. , Cuarenta, A. , Hiura, L. C. , Wallace, K. J. , Taylor, L. , & Pradhan, D. S. (2023). Leveraging individual power to improve racial equity in academia. Hormones and Behavior, *152* , 105358.

Morgan, G. (2006). Images of organization (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pettigrew, A. M. (2014). The politics of organizational decision-making. New York, NY: Routledge.

Pusser, B. (2015). A critical approach to power in higher education. In A. Martínez-Aleman , B. Pusser , & E. M. Bensimon (Eds.), Critical approaches to the study of higher education: A practical introduction (pp. 59–79). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rickley, M. (2023). A systematic review of power in global leadership. Advances in Global Leadership, *15* , 3–35.

Rost, J. (1993). Leadership for the twenty-first century. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Thomas, K. W. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 889–935). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Thomas, K. W. (1977). Toward multidimensional values in teaching: The example of conflict behavior. Academy of Management Review, *2* , 484–490.

Valdez, P. L. (2015). Anatomy of the Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) designation: An overview of HSI policy formation. Paper presented at Hispanic-Serving Institutions in the 21st century: A convening. University of Texas at El Paso, TX.

Wihler, A. , Frieder, R. , Blickle, G. , Oerder, K. , & Schütte, N. (2016). Political skill, leadership and performance: The role of vision identification and articulation. In E. Vigoda-Gadot , & A. Drory (Eds.), Handbook of organizational politics (2nd ed., pp. 59–94). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing Inc.

Anzaldúa, G. (2012). (4th ed.). Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Barnes, D. M. , & Meyer, I. H. (2013). Religious affiliation, internalized homophobia, and mental health in lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, *82* (4), 505–515.

Barrita, A. , Hixson, K. , Kachen, A. , Wong-Padoongpatt, G. , & Krishen, A. (2023, April 13). Centering the margins: A moderation study examining cisgender privilege among LGBTQ+ BIPoC college students facing intersectional microaggressions. Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000636.

Bendl, R. , Fleischmann, A. , & Hofmann, R. (2009). Queer theory and diversity management: Reading codes of conduct from a queer perspective. Journal of Management & Organization, *15* (5), 625–638.

Butler, J. (1990). Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity. New York, NY: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993). Bodies that matter. London, England: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2004). Undoing gender. London, England: Routledge.

Capper, C. (2019). Organizational theory for equity and diversity: Leading integrated, socially just education. New York, NY: Routledge.

Collins, P. H. (2000). Gender, black feminism, and black political economy. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, *568* (1), 41–53.

Crenshaw, K. (2017). On intersectionality: Essential writings. New York, NY: The New Press.

De Lauretis, T. (1991). Queer theory: Lesbian and gay sexualities. Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies, *1* (2), 3–18.

Lorde, A. (1982). Zami. Sister outsider. Undersong. New York, NY: Quality Paperback Book Club.

Lugg, C. A. (2016). U.S. public schools and the politics of queer erasure. New York, NY: Palgrave.

Mansfield, K. C. (2019). Queer theory perspectives on schools as organizations. In M. Connolly , D. H. Eddy-Spicer , C. James , & S. D. Kruse (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of school organization (pp. 340–357). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

McDonald, J. (2015). Organizational communication meets queer theory: Theorizing relations of "Difference" differently. Communication Theory, *25* , 310–329.

National Public Radio . (April 10, 2022). Not just Florida: More than a dozen states propose so-called 'Don't Say Gay' bills. Retrieved from https://www.npr.org/2022/04/10/1091543359/15-states-dont-say-gay-anti-transgender-bills

O'Driscoll, S. (1996). Outlaw readings: Beyond queer theory. Signs, *22* (1), 30–51.

Parker, M. (2001). Fucking management: Queer, theory and reflexivity. Ephemera, *1* (1), 36–53.

Peele, C. (May 23, 2023). Roundup of anti-LGBTQ+ legislation advancing in states across the country. Retrieved from https://www.hrc.org/press-releases/roundup-of-anti-lgbtq-legislation-advancing-in-states-across-the-country

Pryor, J. T. (January 2020). Queer advocacy leadership: A queer leadership model for higher education. Journal of Leadership Education, *19* (1), 69–83.

Pryor, J. T. (2021). Queer activist leadership: An exploration of queer leadership in higher education. Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, *14* (3), 303–315.

Pullen, A. , Thanem, T. , Tyler, M. , & Wallenberg, L. (2016). Sexual politics, organizational practices: Interrogating queer theory, work and organization. Gender, Work and Organization, *23* (1), 1–6.

Rich, A. C. (1980). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. Signs, *5* (4), 631–660.

Rich, A. C. (2003). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence (1980). Journal of Women's History, *15* (3), 11–48.

Rumens, N. (2017). Queering lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender identities in human resource development and management education contexts. Management Learning, *48* (2), 227–242.

Rumens, N. , De Souza, E. M. , & Brewis, J. (2019). Queering queer theory in management and organization studies: Notes toward queering heterosexuality. Organization Studies, *40* (4), 593–612. doi: 10.1177/0170840617748904.

Ventriglio, A. , Castaldelli-Maia, J. M. , Torales, J. , De Berardis, D. , & Bhugra, D. (2021). Homophobia and mental health: A scourge of modern era. Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences, *30* (52), 1–3.

Weinberg, G. (1972). Society and the healthy homosexual. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Spiritual

Allen, K. E. , & Cherrey, C. (2000). Systemic leadership: Enriching the meaning of our work. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Barbezat, D. P. , & Bush, M. (2014). Contemplative practices in higher education: Powerful methods to transform teaching and learning. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Berrett, D. (2014, November 13). Professors' place in the classroom is shifting to the side. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://www.chronicle.com/article/professors-place-in-the-classroom-is-shifting-to-the-side/

Block, P. (1993). Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bordas, J. (2012). Salsa, soul, and spirit: Leadership for a multicultural age (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). Outline of a theory of practice. Cambridge, UK: University Press.

Briskin, A. (1996). The stirring of soul in the workplace. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Briskin, A. , Sibbet, D. , Wendling, G. , & Scholz, H. (2021). Leading as sacred practice (e-book). Novato, CA: The Global Learning and Exchange Network.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York, NY: Harper.

Chickering, A. W. (2006). Authenticity and spirituality in higher education: My orientation. Journal of College & Character, *7* (1), 1–5.

Chopra, D. (2010). The soul of leadership: Unlocking your potential for greatness. New York, NY: Harmony Books.

Daloz, L. A. P. , Keen, C. H. , Keen, J. P. , & Parks, S. D. (1996). Common fire: Lives of commitment in a complex world. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Ferguson, K. (1984). The feminist case against bureaucracy. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Ferren, A. S. , & Anderson, C. B. (2016). Integrative learning: Making liberal education purposeful, personal, and practical. In M. M. Watts (Ed.), Finding the why: Personalizing learning in higher education (New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 145, pp. 33–40). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, *14* (6), 693–727.

Gardner, H. (1993). Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1995). Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (2003). Multiple intelligences after twenty years. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 21.

Gardner, H. (2006). Multiple intelligences: New horizons in theory and practice. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Goleman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. New York:, NY Bantam.

Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Greenleaf, R.K. (2008). The servant as leader. Newton Center, MA: Greenleaf Center.

Gunnlaugson, O. , & Vokey, D. (2014). Evolving a public language of spirituality for transforming academic and campus life. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, *51* (4), 436–445.

Huber, M. T. , & Hutchings, P. (2004). Integrative learning: Mapping the terrain. The academy in transition. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Kuh, G. (2008). High impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Lowe, P. D. (2021). Speaking from our hearts volume 7: Managing change. New York, NY: Paragon Publishing.

Manning, K. (2001). Infusing soul into student affairs. In M. A. Jablonski (Ed.), The implications of student spirituality for student affairs practice (New Directions for Student Services, No. 95, pp. 27–35). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mather, P. C. (2010). Positive psychology and student affairs practice: A framework of possibility. Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, *47* (2), 157–173.

Morgan, A. (2001). Danah Zohar and Ian Marshall: SQ—Spiritual intelligence, the ultimate intelligence. Unpublished paper.

Oliveira, A. (2004). The place of spirituality in organizational theory. Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies, *9* (2), 17–21.

Ospina, S. M. , Foldy, E. G. , Fairhurst, G. T. , & Jackson, B. (2020) Collective dimensions of leadership: Connecting theory and method. Human Relations, *73* (4): 442–443.

Peppers, C. , & Briskin, A. (2000). Bringing your soul to work: An everyday practice. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Quatro, S. A. (2004). New age or age old: Classical management theory and traditional organized religion as underpinnings of the contemporary organizational spirituality movement. Human Resource Development Review, *3* (3), 228–249.

Rendón, L. I. (2009). Sentipensante (sensing/thinking) pedagogy: Educating for wholeness, social justice and liberation. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Rogers, J. (2003). Preparing spiritual leaders. About Campus, *8* (5), 19–26.

Rogers, J. , & Dantley, M. (2001). Invoking the spiritual in campus life and leadership. Journal of College Student Development, *42* (6), 589–603.

Strange, C. C. (2001). Spiritual dimensions of graduate preparation in student affairs. In M. A. Jablonski (Ed.), Implications of student spirituality for student affairs (New Directions for Student Services, No. 95, pp. 57–67). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Teasdale, W. (1999). The mystic heart: Discovering a universal spirituality in the world's religions. Novato, CA: New World Library.

Tirri, K. , & Nokelainen, P. (2008). Identification of multiple intelligences with the multiple intelligence profiling questionnaire III. Psychology Science Quarterly, *50* (2), 206–221.

Tirri, K. , Nokelainen, P. , & Ubani, M. (2006). Conceptual definition and empirical validation of the spiritual sensitivity scale. Journal of Empirical Theology, *19* (1), 37–62.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. Race Ethnicity and Education, *8* (1), 69–91.

Zajonc, A. (2013). Contemplative pedagogy: A quiet revolution in higher education. In L. A. Sanders (Ed.), Contemplative studies in higher education (New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 134, pp. 83–94). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Zohar, D. (1997). ReWiring the corporate brain: Using the new science to rethink how we structure and lead organizations. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Zohar, D. (2010). Exploring spiritual capital: An interview with Danah Zohar. Spirituality in Higher Education Newsletter, *5* (5), 1–8.

Zohar, D. (2016). The quantum leader: A revolution in business thinking and practice. Amherst, NY: Prometheus.

Zohar, D. , & Marshall, I. (2000). SQ: Connecting with your spiritual intelligence. New York, NY: Bloomsbury.

Zohar, D. , & Marshall, I. (2004). Spiritual capital: Wealth we can live by. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Conclusions

Birnbaum, R. (1991). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.