Summer 7-2023

Analysis of the Appointment, Experiences, and Job Satisfaction of Leaders in Large Schools of Music

Claire Murphy
Stephen F Austin State University, clairecmurphy@live.com

Analysis of the Appointment, Experiences, and Job Satisfaction of Leaders in Large Schools of Music

Creative Commons License

ANALYSIS OF THE APPOINTMENT, EXPERIENCES, AND JOB

SATISFACTION OF LEADERS IN LARGE SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

By

CLAIRE CHESSON MURPHY, B.M., M.M.Ed.

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

Stephen F. Austin State University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Doctor of Education

STEPHEN F. AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY

August 2023

ANALYSIS OF THE APPOINTMENT, EXPERIENCES, AND JOB

SATISFACTION OF LEADERS IN LARGE SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

By

CLAIRE CHESSON MURPHY, B.M., M.M.Ed.

APPROVED:

_____
Barbara Qualls, Ph.D., Dissertation Chair

_____
Ali Hachem, Ph.D., Committee Member

_____
Jerry Williams, Ph.D., Committee Member

_____
Deborah Buswell, Ph.D., Committee Member

_____
Sheryll Jerez, Ph.D.
Interim Dean of Research and Graduate Studies

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my husband and best friend, Michael Murphy, and our sons, William and Colin. Throughout my career, Michael has cheered me on and encouraged me to pursue my dreams. In every semester of the Ed.D. program (summer 2020 until now), he did all he could to ensure I could work on homework and writing after my work responsibilities. Michael, William, and Colin were there when I needed words of affirmation, a cup of coffee, a hug, time to think, or a sounding board. I could not have made it without them, and sincerely appreciate the sacrifices they have made over these past three years. I also dedicate this study to my parents, who have never left my side and are always there with a hug and support. Thank you for teaching me that hard work pays off. I am so excited to be the next Dr. Murphy in the family!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Trust the journey. What an amazing journey it has been! I am grateful to for being a part of my journey in this program and helping me complete this dissertation.

To my family, thank you for being so understanding when I needed to write, read, or study and loving me through it all. To my husband, Dr. Michael Murphy, thank you for being so supportive. Whatever I needed, you were there. Thank you to my parents, Shelton and Margaret Chesson, for taking what you could off my plate so I could focus on school. To my amazing sons, William and Colin, you will never know how much hearing you say, "Mom, I am proud of you" mattered. Without all of you cheering me on and sacrificing, I would not be making this dream a reality.

To Cohort 24, I am so glad we were on this journey together. Thank you for all the laughs, talks, and opportunities to learn from one another. I am grateful to call you my friends and proud to be part of this special cohort. Jennifer, thank you for being "my person" and always lending an ear.

I do not know where I would be without my amazing dissertation chair and professor, Dr. Barbara Qualls. There are not enough diet Dr. Peppers and Hershey bars to thank you for all the time, patience, encouragement, and guidance you gave as my chair. I am deeply grateful for all the opportunities you provided me over the last three years in the Ed.D. program, and I have learned so much working with you. Thank you for investing in me and helping me find my passion for research.

Thank you to my dissertation committee members, Dr. Deborah Buswell, Dr. Ali Hachem, and Dr. Jerry Williams, for their guidance through this process. Each of you gave much of your time helping me improve this study and answering my questions, and I appreciate you sharing your expertise with me. Thank you to Dr. Michael Walker for your willingness to help me as well.

Dr. Stacy Hendricks, thank you for always listening, always having time (even when you probably didn't), and always offering support. You have modeled servant leadership, and I learned so much from you. Belinda Davis, thank you for your kindness and support on my most challenging day.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge all of my professors in the Ed.D. program for helping me grow and learn. You make this program great, and I appreciate your investment in me as a student. I am blessed that my journey led me to such a great village of people!

ABSTRACT

Little is known about how male and female middle-level leaders in schools of music come into their leadership roles, how they distribute their time among responsibilities, and how the distribution of time or other factors impact their professional identities, creative activities, and job satisfaction. Quantitative, self-reported survey data collected on music leaders in large schools of music and qualitative data collected from a panel discussion with representative leaders were used to analyze the five research questions in this explanatory sequential mixed-methods study. An analysis of the relationship between the two variables, gender and method of entry, showed a weak association. Analyses of the method of entry and the groups within the distribution of time variable showed a negative correlation between those appointed by administration and time spent on teaching, research/creative activities, and service. A positive correlation with fundraising and administrative duties was found. However, correlations with administrative duties and service were negligible. Responsibilities and how leaders spend their time may vary based on their title, organizational structure, and job expectations. Music leaders value continued opportunities to engage in research and creative activities. These findings will benefit future music leaders and current music administrators in higher education. Future recommendations are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

Introduction to the Study

Middle-level leaders in higher education play a critical role in the institution's success (Gmelch et al., 2017). Middle-level leaders may hold titles such as chair, department chair, director, department head, assistant dean, and dean. Numerous factors, including qualifications, interest, gender, experiences, and applicant pool size, impact how middle-level leaders move into their leadership positions in higher education. Once in the role, middle-level leaders may face challenges in high workloads, distribution of time, role ambiguity, preparation, and uncertainty of stakeholders on the role expectations. Middle-level leaders need managerial and leadership skills that will help them succeed in their complex roles.

Additionally, middle-level leaders in higher education may be expected to hold responsibilities in teaching and research/creative activities while serving as an administrator. Feelings of success and making a difference have been linked to job satisfaction and retention among middle-level leaders. While these factors have been considered among middle-level leaders in higher education, less is known about how these factors impact middle-level leaders in schools of music.

Background

Academic middle-level leadership in higher education has played a significant role in the capacity of departments and schools to adapt to change and redefine

1

themselves for productivity and relevance (English & Kramer, 2017). Middle-level leaders in higher education served in leadership roles between faculty and upper administration. Influential middle-level leaders helped faculty move through change while moving internal organizations toward an institution's goals and mission. While leadership was challenging to define due to its complex nature (Northouse, 2019), leadership functions center around fostering change (Kotter, 1990), adapting (Northouse), and focusing on people within an organization (Bennis, 2009). Bennis also noted that leaders should possess the managerial skills of productivity, efficiency, order, and administration. While many noted that leadership and management are significantly different, they overlapped. Both were necessary for leadership success (Bailey, 2022; Kotter, 1990).

Challenges Within Middle-Level Leadership

Middle-level leaders have faced the challenge of being placed between the upper administration's managerial and the faculty's advocacy expectations (Armstrong & Woloshyn, 2017; Caza et al., 2018; Gonaim, 2016). In addition, higher education was challenged with finding and selecting new administrators amidst an increasingly thin applicant pool and with less qualified applicants than in the past (Zahneis, 2022). Skinner (2023) added that department chair searches have proliferated, internal investigations for the positions were failing, and departments, programs, and students were being impacted.

Zahneis (2022) noted a possible connection between administrative positions seen as less enticing than in years past and lowered expectations of experiences and

qualifications of interested applicants. Moreover, the middle-level leadership role was often ambiguous, with stakeholders and the leader unclear on the expectations (Armstrong & Woloshyn, 2017; Cleverly-Thompson, 2016; Gonaim, 2016). Skinner (2023) noted that expectations of what the middle-level leader can do often exceeded the resources provided. Stakeholders and potential candidates needed a clear understanding of what is expected of middle-level leaders and what support and time were allotted to assist in that success (Armstrong & Woloshyn, 2017). A clear understanding of expectations, support from stakeholders, and time considerations were vital as middle-level leaders attempted to balance their dual roles as managers and leaders while helping faculty and departments reach goals.

Academia generally offered little formal training and preparation in the skills needed for middle-level leaders to be successful in their multi-faceted roles (Gmelch et al., 2017). Some middle-level leaders were hired with little to no experience or not having demonstrated the needed skills for their multi-faceted role. However, management, administrative tasks, and leadership skills were necessary (Kruse, 2022). It was common for a faculty member to enter the middle-level leadership role as a tenured expert with an academic mission for the department as the focus of their energy, only to realize the majority of their time was spent on administrative matters (Hinson-Hasty, 2019). With the time spent on administrative matters and serving and representing the department, middle-level leaders needed administrative and managerial skill sets (Armstrong & Woloshyn, 2017; Cleverley-Thompson, 2016; Gonaim, 2016; Hinson-

Hasty, 2019). Earlier training and preparation through leadership experiences helped

faculty be more informed on the necessary skills for leadership should they decide to

pursue or accept a middle-level leadership role.

Middle-level leaders often came from faculty ranks and from within the

institution. The appointment route varied, including elected by faculty, selected by

faculty or upper administration, appointed by upper administration, or a combination of

these routes. While gender gaps had narrowed for some areas in middle-level leadership

(Flaherty, 2016; Gmelch et al., 2017), gender gaps still existed in areas of middle-level

administration and faculty hires, despite the higher number of master and doctoral

degrees earned by women than men (Johnson, 2017). Careful consideration of the

institution's appointment structures and faculty selection critically impacted the quality

and diversity of middle-level leader appointments.

Because structures and systems within higher education had changed at a rapid

pace as institutions and faculty continued to adapt, there had been changes in the roles

and responsibilities of middle-level leaders. Interpersonal skills such as conflict

resolution or management, motivating others, and communicating effectively required

more time than many middle-level leaders anticipated (Wolverton et al., 2005), and

studies by Goleman (2011) found that emotional intelligence traits were necessary for

helping others move through change and uncertainty (Carnicer et al., 2015). More recent

studies by Cipriano and Riccardi (2018), Gmelch and Buller (2016), and Thornton et al.

(2018) added to the findings of the seminal works of Wolverton and Goleman. Feelings

of competence in the role, effectiveness in carrying out the responsibilities, and having the skills and preparation needed for effective leadership impacted the retention of middle-level leaders in their leadership roles.

Influential Factors on Retention

Most middle-level leaders in higher education spent a 3-5 year term of appointment in their leadership positions (Boyko & Jones, 2010), and reappointment was often possible after the term. However, experiences held by leaders during their term of appointment contributed to their decision to remain in their middle-level leadership position or return to their previous roles. One major factor influencing a decision to return to faculty ranks was too little time allotted for research and creative activity (Weaver et al., 2019). Other factors influencing middle-level leaders to return to faculty ranks were an overwhelming workload (Henk et al., 2021) and the amount of time needed to deal with personnel issues, particularly with non-collegial faculty (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2017; 2018).

Some factors were ongoing issues for middle-level leaders. Wolverton et al. (2005), well-known for research on middle-level leadership in leadership effectiveness, gender issues and leadership, and leadership challenges with identity, noted several factors. These factors included struggles with role identity while trying to maintain dual roles played by middle-level leaders as they worked toward professional and personal goals, along with the multiple challenges in such a complex role with little formal training and preparation, negatively impacted leaders. These negative impacts were found

in the leaders' sense of job satisfaction, feelings of effectiveness, and retention (Wolverton et al., 2005).

The dual role played by many middle-level leaders in higher education, particularly at the department chair level, placed middle-level leaders in a unique academic leadership position. Role ambiguity in serving the department and upper administration has led to feelings of stress and uncertainty among middle-level leaders. It was common for most department chairs to continue teaching in some capacity along with their colleagues while managing and advocating for the department with upper administration (Armstrong & Woloshyn, 2017; Caza et al., 2018; Cleverley-Thompson, 2016; Gonaim, 2016). Many department chairs entered the role from faculty positions and did not anticipate the level of managerial skills needed. They felt unprepared (Hinson-Hasty, 2019) or pulled from their faculty role specialties into dealing with managerial tasks that left them feeling uncertain about their abilities (DeLander, 2017).

Despite the challenges of identity, little preparation, high workloads, and interpersonal issues, middle-level leaders chose to remain in their leadership positions because of the feeling that they made positive changes and impacts (Thornton et al., 2018). Middle-level leaders noted rewarding experiences, feeling confident and prepared, helping others, and feelings of making a difference as how they defined job satisfaction. Middle-level leaders were likely to remain in their position when they felt they positively impacted the faculty, department, and institution while growing as a leader (Dean et al., 2021).

In subsequent sections of this chapter, the following are discussed: the research problem, research questions, the significance of the study, any researcher assumptions, limitations and delimitations, and definitions of terms. This chapter concludes with a description of the organization of the study.

Research Problem

Middle-level leaders played a critical role in ensuring successful learning and teaching took place in higher education (Maddock, 2023). However, middle-level leaders came into their leadership roles through varied appointment paths and levels of preparation and understanding of this role's complex responsibilities and expectations (Weaver et al., 2019). Additionally, middle-level leadership roles were complex (Tomes, 2020). As middle-level leadership responsibilities and tasks have increased over time, the challenges and stressors of these leaders have increased (Cipriano, n.d.). Balancing time among expected job responsibilities, including administrative duties, teaching, research/creative activities, service, fundraising, and other tasks, left middle-level leaders to adapt rapidly and prioritize regularly. Some entered with prior leadership experience, but most have primarily served in a faculty role until their appointment. Many saw their middle-level leadership role as temporary and planned to return to their faculty responsibilities, including research and teaching. Multiple factors played a role in middle-level leaders deciding to remain in their position or return to their previous role if allowed. Longevity was impacted by high turnover rates and the challenges of recruiting and training new middle-level leaders (Appadurai, 2009; Bornstein, 2010; DeZure et al.,

2014; Luna, 2012; Mead-Fox, 2009; Reichert, 2016). Factors contributing to longevity in middle-level leadership included resilience, job demands, experiences, and job satisfaction (Henk et al., 2021).

Leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors may have had various leadership experiences before their middle-level leadership role as the head of a school or department of music. In higher education institutions with 401+ music majors, the distribution of how the music leader spent their time in their leadership role likely differed from their former experiences in a lesser leadership role. The distribution of time in the middle-level leadership role in music departments of this size may have contributed to their ability to reach personal and professional goals and impacted job satisfaction.

In music, performing, conducting, composing, adjudicating, and publishing are all considered research and creative activities for tenure and promotion (ASU, 2021; SFASU, 2023; UTRGV, 2017). Faculty in schools and music departments have a primary performance outlet, including playing an instrument, conducting music, or teaching music pedagogy-related courses. It is common for faculty in schools and music departments to begin their study on a primary instrument as adolescents in a middle school band, choral, or orchestral program and continue their studies in music through high school, college, and their careers. College-level music programs were generally "rigorous and competitive," and successful auditions based on early preparation and practice were vital to acceptance into a music program (Berlinsky-Schine, 2018, para.12).

The average time of study for undergraduate music majors requires eight semesters, meaning that music majors tend to audition during their senior year of high school for admittance into a music program and are expected to have specific musical skills and abilities before admittance.

Music faculty commonly obtain positions in higher education institutions after continued, advanced study in their primary instrument or music area and further teaching or performing experience after graduate school. After obtaining a faculty position, music professionals continue performing, practicing, teaching, and engaging in creative research as part of the expectations of the tenure and promotion policies of numerous institutions (ASU, 2021; SFASU, 2023; UTRGV, 2017). As middle-level leaders in music adjust their time spent from a faculty to a leadership role, it is assumed that this transition may be an additional challenge faced by leaders in music. Consideration and study of prior experiences, methods of entry among males and females into middle-level leadership roles, how middle-level music leaders distribute their time, how the distribution of time or other factors impact their artistic identities, job satisfaction, and retention among leaders in schools or departments of music, particularly large schools or departments of music, have not been researched before this study. Further study will allow future considerations of early middle-level leadership preparation, the possibility of distributed leadership, and deeper clarification on the roles and responsibilities of middle-level leaders in schools and departments of music to increase the longevity, preparation, and satisfaction of those in these roles.

Research Questions

In this study, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What is the relationship between gender and method of entry into their middle-level leadership positions of reporting leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors?

2. What is the relationship between the reported distribution of time and the method of entry into their middle-level leadership positions of reporting leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors?

3. Given the proportional form of the reported time use categories, which of these categories contributes or detracts from your job satisfaction?

4. How does the execution of your leadership responsibilities impact the progress of your professional agenda?

5. What other responsibilities other than those captured by the HEADS Music Data Survey might be identified as contributors to your job satisfaction?

Significance of the Research

No recent studies were found that focused explicitly on the experiences of middle-level leaders or middle-level leadership in large schools or departments of music in higher education. Studies in some areas of higher education, including business, education, and nursing, focused on the leadership role within those departments (AACSB, 2021; Sayler et al., 2017; Reichert, 2016). A study specific to middle-level leadership in music has allowed such a focus for music departments. Although most

decisions in higher education were made at the departmental level (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2017), more literature is needed on the responsibilities and expectations of middle-level leaders, especially as rapid changes have occurred. The role of today's middle-level leader is more complicated than a decade ago, and the skills these leaders need are very different from those required by a faculty member (Weaver et al., 2019). Training specific to the relevant needs of the department would be beneficial for middle-level leaders in higher education (Weaver et al., 2019).

This study offers a deeper understanding of how middle-level leaders in large schools of music come into their leadership roles, what factors or experiences lead to their appointment or election, what experiences and challenges leaders face in their role, and how these factors or other factors contribute or detract to their job satisfaction. Middle-level leaders often entered their roles with little preparation (Flaherty, 2016; Freeman et al., 2020) and clarity on what will occupy the majority of their time, the skills that will be needed compared with skills needed as a faculty member, and their new expected responsibilities in their leadership role was of critical importance (Armstrong & Woloshyn, 2017). People interested in a middle-level leadership role in music can use this study to understand the responsibilities and time spent on specific components of the middle-level leadership role and the potential impacts on their creative activities and identity - a common focal point when serving in a music faculty role. Creative activities and identity may remain a unique concern for middle-level leaders planning to return to faculty ranks after their term or who hold creative research or teaching responsibilities

while serving as an administrator. Institutions can consider factors that impact middle-level leadership and job satisfaction of those in music leadership roles in large schools or departments of music and develop leadership training to prepare middle-level music leaders and address longevity issues in middle-level institutional leadership.

Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations of Planning

One assumption was that data were accurate because the reported data used in the quantitative phase were generated from self-reported surveys. It was assumed that the self-reporting data on appointment, gender, and time spent were honest and truthful. A second assumption was that participants in the panel discussion would freely and honestly respond to questions asked by the researcher and other participants' comments in the panel discussion.

A potential limitation was that the sample size for the study was limited due to the number of NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors. Within the United States, there were only 49 NASM-affiliated public institutions with a reported enrollment of 401+ music majors in 2020-2021. However, since every institution had submitted the survey, the study used the total population or enumeration of this sub-section of NASM institutions. A second limitation was that the researcher was limited to only what was included in the 2020-2021 HEADS Music Data Survey and the unrefined data. Still, other demographic, descriptive information, including age, years in the position, and ethnicity, could have been interesting.

A delimitation was that this study was narrowed to HEADS Music Data Survey

from one annual year (2020-2021) due to time constraints. Broadening the scope of this study over ten years would have included additional statistical data before COVID-19 and allowed a wider comparative lens on the appointment process and how middle-level leaders spent their time in their roles. Since institutions report yearly, it would also have allowed for further study on gender balance in appointments, leaders' time distribution, and consideration of trends in how middle-level leaders adapted in spending their time as institutions changed.

Definition of Key Terms

- *HEADS*: Higher Education Arts Data Services provides data summaries of statistical data compiled from the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) annual self-reports (HEADS Data Surveys) (NASM, 2023). HEADS Project is a joint arts effort that also provides data summaries to the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), the National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST), and the National Association of Schools of Dance (NASD).

- *HEADS Data Summary*: statistical summaries from the annual HEADS Data Surveys, with data broken down by institution size (ex: number of music majors) and type (public or private). Summaries include the ethnicity of students, faculty, staff, and administration; faculty salaries; degrees offered; budgetary information; enrollment statistics; and gender of faculty and administration.

- *HEADS Data Survey:* required annual report of all NASM-accredited post-secondary institutions. The Survey requests statistical information on the music program's operations, enrollment, and achievements. Survey items include the ethnicity of students, faculty, staff, and administration; faculty salaries; degrees offered; budgetary information; enrollment statistics; and gender of faculty and administration.

- *Middle-level Leaders:* refers to titles including the chair, department chair, director, department head, assistant dean, and dean unless specified otherwise.

- *Music Executive:* refers to the title assigned by NASM in the HEADS Data Survey and Summary for the music department or school leader. For the survey, NASM defines the music executive as the chief academic administrator of the music school or department. The music executive may include leaders serving as chairs, department chairs, directors, department heads, etc.

- *Music Major:* defined by NASM (2023) as
  - A full-time student who has declared music as their major, or
  - A currently enrolled part-time student who has declared music as their major, or
  - A currently enrolled student enrolled in prerequisite music and academic courses for eligibility to declare music as their major

- *NASM*: National Association of Schools of Music is an accrediting agency of

approximately 633 schools, conservatories, colleges, and universities (NASM, 2023). Accreditation is awarded to the institution, not the music department or school**.**

Summary

The appointment and selection process of middle-level leaders in higher education differs among institutions and departments. Amidst rapid changes in higher education, the role of middle-level leaders has grown in complexity. Leaders in these positions face multiple responsibilities and need skills, traits, and experiences in middle-level leadership and management. Middle-level leaders have challenges unique to their work between faculty leadership needs and upper administration managerial needs. They are in positions that entail the majority of decision-making within institutions. This chapter provided a brief background on the role of a middle-level leader, the challenges leaders face, and concerns in appointment and retention. While much research exists on leadership experiences, appointment processes, and preparation of upper-level administration in higher education, there is a need for more research on the experiences of departmental and middle-level leaders in higher education. Furthermore, studies are needed on the appointment and experiences of middle-level leaders in schools of music or music departments and the challenges and factors that impact their job satisfaction.

Chapter 1 provided a background for the critical role of middle-level leaders in higher education institutions, their appointment process, challenges in how they spent their time, and applied theoretical perspectives. This chapter also included a statement of

the problem, the research significance in higher education, its assumptions, limitations, delimitations, and relevant study definitions.

Chapter 2 includes a literature review on the function of middle-level leaders, including appointment routes or methods of entry into middle-level leadership positions, roles, responsibilities, skills, and tasks of those serving in these positions. The second section of the chapter examines the experiences of middle-level leaders in higher education institutions. Chapter 2 concludes with gaps in existing literature and considerations for future research.

Chapter 3 focuses on using an explanatory sequential mixed methods research design to explore the phenomenon of how male and female leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors came into their roles, how they distributed their time, and what factors impacted their job satisfaction and professional agenda. The research problem, questions, design, method, instrument, sample, analysis methods, ethical considerations, and research procedures are explained. A summary offers an overview of the methodology of the study.

In Chapter 4, the analysis of the quantitative data from the first phase of the study is presented. Analysis of the qualitative data collected from the study's second phase will also be presented, followed by integrated data analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data. Chapter 5 includes a summary of the study; a discussion of the findings from the data analyses; limitations and delimitations; implications; recommendations for further research; and concluding remarks.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

This chapter summarizes the literature related to administrators in higher education, specifically those serving in middle-level administrative roles. The first section covers the function of middle-level leaders, the selection and appointment process, considerations for candidacy, and the roles, responsibilities, skills, and tasks of a middle-level leader in higher education. Unless specified otherwise, leaders and middle-level leaders refer to titles that include the chair, department chair, director, department head, assistant dean, and dean. The second section examines the experiences of those in middle-level leadership positions, including challenges and stressors, time spent, preparation, development and support, prior experiences, and motivation. The third section includes gaps in existing literature and considerations for future research.

Leadership Considerations

Across the years, education was vital to the health and strength of any country (Adamu, 2019), and higher education was the most important frontrunner in national development (Kohoutek et al., 2017). The COVID-19 global pandemic provided a reason for institutions to seek visionary leaders to guide departments and schools in redefining themselves and adapting to change (Freeman, 2020). Academic middle-level leaders were critical in moving a college successfully through transformative change (English &

Kramer, 2017). Effective middle-level leaders built relationships with faculty to support

transformative change and balance advocacy for faculty and administrative goals

(Williams-June, 2014).

Leadership is complex and thus difficult to define; however, Northouse (2019)

considered the concept of leadership to have four key components. The first component

was that leadership was an action-based process due to interactions between followers (s)

and leaders. In *Leadership* (1978), political sociologist James MacGregor Burns was

among the first to write about the relationship and exchanges between leaders and

followers. Burns considered these exchanges through two types of leadership:

transformational and transactional. In transformational leadership, according to

Northouse, the leader built connections with followers to help increase their motivation to

reach goals, which then motivated the leader to work toward goals. Northouse noted

transactional leadership as the exchange of something between the leader and followers,

which was the essence of the action. These two leadership types or ways of interacting

led to the next component defined by Northouse. The second component, and the crux of

leadership according to Northouse, concerned influence and how the leader impacted

followers. This impact included how leaders motivated, guided, or supported followers in

reaching professional and strategic goals (Laker, 2021). Northouse wrote that in

transformational leadership, the leader worked to meet the needs of followers and help

them reach their potential. In transactional leadership, the leader used influence by

offering rewards for those who met their goals. However, Notgrass (2014) noted that

this type did not foster trust among followers, and the preferred transformational leadership among followers helped foster collaborative creativity, trust, and visioning.

According to Northouse (2019), the third component of leadership was that it was set among a group with a shared purpose and goal(s). Joly (2021) referred to shared purpose as a "corporate why" and helped groups move through change, increased employee satisfaction and performance, and helped drive decisions made by leaders and followers (para.4). In Northouse's fourth key component of leadership, leaders moved groups toward meeting the goals and purpose shared by the leader and the group. In a (2015) study on music and the concept of leadership, Carnicer et al. examined the leadership/followership relationship between music conductors and ensemble members. Based on the fourth key component of leadership, the interrelationship in working toward common goals and shared purpose, Carnicer et al. suggested that music leaders combined their use of initiative, influence, problem-solving skills, group advocacy, and skills in building community and organization within groups to be effective in their role.

Leadership and management have often been used synonymously but are very different (Gavin, 2019). Management was similar to leadership in that it was process-oriented and involved influence, working with groups, and working to reach goals (Northouse, 2019). However, the functions of management and leadership were different. Management as a conceptual item emerged during the rise of industrialization and the concomitant need for efficiency and productivity. In a seminal work, Kotter (1990) noted that management functions were order and consistency, and leadership functions were

creating change. Northouse added that order and stability were important to management, while leadership involved adaptability. Bennis (2009) wrote that managers administered, maintained, and focused on working within the system; leaders created, developed, and focused on the people in the system. While leadership and management have distinct functions, both have been found necessary for success (Bailey, 2022; Kotter, 1990). Over the past 15 years, Bailey interviewed executives on the differences between leaders and managers and found organizations needed to hire individuals capable of both and knew when to lead and when to manage to reach the goals.

Middle-level leaders in higher education needed to meet the managerial expectations placed upon them by upper administration and provided leadership that nurtured and developed faculty (Berdrow, 2010; Bryman, 2007; Smith et al., 2012). Middle-level leaders were evaluated differently by upper administration and faculty on their role effectiveness. For example, Meek et al. (2010) found that upper administration considered how the middle-level leader managed resources, built programs, initiated needed change, and moved the program toward university goals. In a 1991 study by Gordon et al., specifically on teaching faculty perceptions of middle-level leaders in schools of education across higher education institutions in the United States, findings showed that faculty stressed the need for improved interpersonal skills, communication skills, the ability to motivate individuals and groups, and relatability from middle-level leaders. These middle-level leaders were placed in the middle of the managerial expectations from those in upper administration and the leadership expectations of the

faculty they led (Bryman & Lilley, 2009). Meeting these expectations may have been impacted by how the middle-level leader distributed their time among administrative, fundraising, and service duties as a manager and supported faculty, students, and programs as a leader.

Selection and Appointment

Academic leaders' selection and appointment process in higher education institutions varied between and within institutions (Adamu, 2019) and between chair and dean positions (Boyko & Jones, 2010). Some were appointed fixed-term, allowing leaders to return to their academic jobs following middle-level leadership tenure (Shepherd, 2017). Some candidates came from the faculty and were appointed from within the department or area, known as internal candidates. While these candidates may have known internal concerns, issues, and operations, this did not ensure they were effective or good-fit leaders (Wolverton et al., 2005). Wolverton et al. posited that external candidates offered opportunities for considerable change within the unit but lacked the institutional or departmental context and understanding of its culture in making decisions.

In a study on middle-level leaders in Canadian universities, Boyko and Jones (2010) looked at the appointment process, terms, roles, and responsibilities of chairs and deans for potential functional shifts due to institutional change. For chairs, they found the appointment process varied in three ways: direct appointment elected by faculty, appointment from a committee elected by the faculty, or appointment by the dean after

faculty consultation. The majority were appointed by a committee. Based on the HEADS Music Data Summary findings for 2020-2021, leaders in NASM-affiliated institutions were appointed by the administration/Board of Trustees or elected by faculty to their position. Gunsalus (2006) and Schloss and Cragg (2013) also found that department chairs came into their middle-level leadership roles through a variety of ways, and according to Kruse (2022), the majority were internal candidates chosen or appointed from faculty within the department in which they served. Like the 2010 Boyko and Jones study, Kruse found that the chair appointment process has stemmed from faculty votes, dean appointments, or a combination of the two.

In Sayler et al. (2017), a national study of middle-level leaders in colleges of arts and sciences, business, and education at research-extensive and-intensive universities in the United States, the appointment route was a majority internal appointment and vertical movement through faculty rank. Seventy-eight percent of those appointments came from within the college or school, with the appointment most likely coming from the dean. Around 7% were external search appointments, and 4% were internal search appointments from within the university but outside of the school or college. The study also found that the participants felt the appointment process often left little time to prepare for this role (Sayler et al., 2017).

Boyko and Jones (2010) found that the appointment process for deans differed from other middle-level leaders and often included more involvement from upper administration, a more diversified search committee (with elected and nominated

members), a committee chair from upper administration or from outside of the deanship area, and a lengthier process. Harvey et al. (2013) referred to the selection process of deans as often "convoluted" and, at times, "dysfunctional" (p. 25). Boyko and Jones found that while dean positions were open to internal and external candidates, the amount of information and policies on internal hires indicated that internal recruitment may have taken priority. For deans, they found the appointment process varied in four ways: a search committee made up of elected and appointed members based on faculty input; a search committee made up of elected and appointed members based on faculty input *plus* faculty evaluations on the candidates; direct vote by faculty with tenure and full-time administrators; and direct appointment by the president with input from the faculty. The majority of deans in their study were appointed by a search committee (Boyko & Jones, 2010).

Harvey et al. (2013) suggested three considerations for the selection process of finding an academic leader. First, it was necessary to have a strong pool of candidates. However, Zahneis (2022) found that 84% of 720 respondents in a survey on college leaders indicated that filling administrative jobs had been more challenging post-pandemic due to fewer applications in general and fewer applications from qualified candidates. Furthermore, 77% of the respondents indicated that working in higher education was not as enticing as it was even a year ago, which may have resulted in lowered expectations of experiences or qualifications (Zahneis, 2022). Second, according to Harvey et al., there was a need for clearly defined criteria for screening candidates.

Third, to address the ambiguous nature of the role, clear expectations among internal and external stakeholders on what role the middle-level leader played, what was expected of the leader, what resources were made available to help the leader achieve those expectations, and how much time was allotted for the leader to achieve those expectations needed to be outlined (Harvey et al., 2013).

Historically, position descriptors for middle-level leadership roles in higher education tended to be broad, covering leadership and managerial domains. For example, Boyko and Jones's (2010) study on roles and responsibilities of those in middle-level leadership positions found common position descriptors among the 30 institutions in the study. The most common words included "demonstrating leadership," "academic leadership," "research," "initiative," "serving as the voice for the department," and "scholar" (p. 14). Kruse (2022) identified "responsibility for department, college, and university governance," "internal and external communication," "instructional leadership," "faculty matters, issues, and concerns," "student matters, issues, and concerns," and "budget" (p.741). Terms specific to the description of the deanship position specifically were "leadership," "academic," "administrative," "visionary," "collaborative," and "dynamic" (p.18). Halonen and Dunn (2017) also found that it was essential that middle-level leaders had a vision and ideas on how to attain that vision. In response to the multitude of impacts on higher education caused by the global pandemic, Freeman (2020) suggested that visionary leadership was critical in helping schools redefine themselves. Focused specifically on schools of music, Freeman argued that

when selecting middle-level leaders, the role and responsibilities connected to the vision should center on ensuring music studies remain relevant through forward-thinking planning. This included suggestions for new curriculum design for modern-day musicians, shifting from single-field concentrations to double-field concentrations for undergraduate programs as jobs in performance fields have lessened, how to find new sources of funding to help alleviate budgetary concerns, and how to find opportunities for growth and visibility (Freeman, 2020). Regarding the idea of relevance in the current and future life of the department, Gardner and Ward (2018) described middle-level leadership as an "often precarious line… between the present and the future" (p. 59). Ultimately, middle-level leaders balanced the managerial and leadership aspects of the role while they helped others reach their goals and vision of the organization.

The summary job descriptions for middle-level leadership among the institutions studied centered around an experienced leader who administered the department's financial and human resources aspects, promoted and supported research and teaching, and represented and advocated for the department across the institution, but with less focus on scholarship activity as a factor for the deanship position (Boyko & Jones, 2010). While middle-level leadership roles were multi-faceted, one description did not fit every position but required leaders with expertise in management, administrative, and leadership skills (Kruse, 2022). Gmelch et al. (2017) pointed out the lack of training middle-level leaders received to be successful in the job description. Kelly Ward, the co-lead of the 2016 University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) study on

department chairs, shared with Flaherty (2016) that if institutions wanted to increase the strength and diversity of their candidate pool and attract interest in middle-level leadership positions, they had to demonstrate their commitment to helping them succeed. Ward posited that good department chairs impacted faculty retention and satisfaction, and chair positions were one passageway to upper-level administrative positions. Therefore, according to Ward, institutions interested in drawing impactful middle- and upper-level leaders with diverse backgrounds should have invested in helping them succeed in their beginning leadership roles and opportunities (Flaherty, 2016). Improving the selection process and increasing the candidacy pool began by investing earlier in faculty through leadership skill development as they moved up in rank.

Appointment Concerns

In the Sayler et al. (2017) national study on middle-level leaders, 33% of participants felt their knowledge of the college's programs and vision in sustaining them led to their selection. Twenty-two percent felt they were selected to facilitate change. In contrast, 7% felt they were chosen based on their abilities in crisis management, and 4% felt they were selected because they were willing to take on the role (Sayler et al., 2017). Some middle-level leaders were selected or appointed into their leadership roles "because of being in the right place at the right time" but were without prior preparation (Pepper & Giles, 2015, p. 51). While middle-level leadership positions, including department or school heads in universities, were critical to the institution's success (Gonaim, 2016; Whitchurch & Gordon, 2017), not all academics saw these as positions to celebrate

(Thornton et al., 2018). It was common practice to select middle-level leaders from their academic area (Branson et al., 2015; Degn, 2015; Floyd, 2016; Whitchurch & Gordon, 2017) based on their academic abilities, not on their leadership skills or experiences (Bryman, 2007; Floyd & Dimmock, 2011; Parrish, 2015). Of concern was that many middle-level leaders were appointed due to a lack of potential candidates and not because the person was well suited for the position (Thornton et al., 2018).

Gender and Leadership

The "pipeline myth" was that fewer women are qualified for higher-education leadership positions, yet since 2006 women have earned half or more of all doctoral and master's degrees since 1987 (Johnson, 2017, p. 2). Johnson found that males continued to make the associate and full professor ranks and rose to leadership roles more than women, especially women of color, because women remained in lower-ranking positions. Johnson also found that 32% of full professor positions in degree-granting institutions were held by women in 2015. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2015) published data on degrees awarded by gender between 1970-(projected) 2024, females were projected to earn 107,000 doctoral degrees compared to 97,000 for males. Dating back to 2004, females earned a nearly equal number of doctoral degrees as males, with 62,000 for females and 64,000 for males. By 2014, females had risen to 92,000, and males lagged with 86,000. However, data on rank and gender published in 2016 showed that over twice the number of males than females were full professors (U.S. Department of Education, 2016).

In Silbert et al. (2022), a study on women's power gap at elite universities published by The Eos Foundation's Women's Power Gap Initiative and the American Association of University Women (AAUW), findings showed a persistent gender gap in upper administration positions in U.S. research universities. For example, wide gender gaps were found in upper-level and middle-level leadership positions in academic medical institutions in the United States (Paturel, 2019). Academic medical institutions had a wide gender gap in middle-level leadership based on the 2018 Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) data reports that showed women served as 16% of deans, 18% of chairs, and 25% of full professors (Paturel, 2019). Even though the majority of PhDs earned in the United States over the past ten years were by women, only 22% of the 130 private and public R1 institutions had women in the top position (Nietzel, 2022). Sixty of those institutions had never had a woman in a top administrative leadership position. The gap for women of color was even more comprehensive, and only 5% of the reporting institutions had women who served in the top administrative leadership position. Pathways to these top leadership positions were not parallel for men and women. While 26% of men bypassed a provost or dean position or came in as a new leader in the top position, only 7% of women had similar paths (Nietzel, 2022).

In contrast to the findings on women in upper-level leadership roles, a comparative analysis of results from a 1991 University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) study on department chairs by Gmelch et al. and a 2016 UCEA Center for the Study of Academic Leadership study on department chairs showed that

gender profiles of chairs had shifted from a 90% male majority in 1991 to a 55% female majority in 2016 (Flaherty, 2016; Gmelch et al., 2017), marking a significant change in this level of leadership over the 25 years. Similar gender balances were seen in other titles categorized as middle-level leaders. Demographic information from Sayler et al.'s (2017) national study on associate deans showed that among their 527 respondents, 44% were women and 49% were men, and 7% chose not to respond to the question on gender identity. Sayler et al. found that significant change existed when comparing the numbers of female associate deans over the past three decades, and Applegate and Book (1989) noted that only 28% of associate deans in colleges or schools of education were women; in the 2017 Sayler et al. study, nearly half of the associate deans were women. In the HEADS Music Data Summary Report for 2020-2021, demographic data showed that the highest percentages of females serving as music executives were in public (33.1%) and private (33.3%) institutions with the lowest music major populations. For public NASM-affiliated institutions with 401+ music majors, which are the largest schools of music based on the number of music majors, only 18% of music executives were female.

Considering gender and deanship, the top end of middle-level leadership in academia, demographic information offered deeper gender balance issues in this role. Institutions of the 354 participants in the 2020-2021 Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) Deans Survey Report were divided into accredited and non-accredited categories. Participants were able to identify as female, male, or non-reported gender. Out of the 265 accredited institutions in the survey, 177 participants

were male deans, and 66 were female deans. Two participants did not report their gender. Out of the 89 non-accredited institutions in the survey, 63 participants were male deans, and 20 were female deans. Data also showed that in North American accredited institutions, 122 participants were male deans, 51 were female, and two were non-reporting gender. In the North American non-accredited institutions, 10 participants were male deans, and 10 were female deans (AACSB, 2021).

Implications for Appointment and Gender

Shepherd's (2017) study on the appointment of middle- and upper-level leaders in pre-1992, research-focused English universities challenged the idea that women lacked confidence or ambition in applying for these leadership positions as reasons for continual underrepresentation. Instead, concerns over factors that impacted the hiring and selection process were noted by Shepherd and included mobility and external factors, conservatism, and homosociality. Homosociality is the tendency to relate with people of the same sex, particularly regarding mentorship, friendship, or other social bonds, especially among men (Merriam-Webster, n.d.). While some chose not to go into middle- and upper-level leadership positions because of the demands of the position or a lack of desire to serve in that role, Shepherd's study on the appointment of middle- and upper-level leaders in higher education found that females were equally interested in leadership roles as their male colleagues. This implied the need for more systemic and procedural changes and awareness of cultural assumptions and politics, including homosociality, as considerations in institutions' recruitment and selection practices (Shepherd, 2017).

Gmelch's (2002) education dean study findings of gender and ethnic minority gaps implied a call to action for the retention and recruitment of women and people of color. Nevertheless, it was found that men still outnumbered women in deanships (Coll et al., 2018). Coll et al. argued that this supported the need to further recruit women and marginalized people for middle-level leadership positions.

A second implication from the study was that structural changes in the selection and appointment process were likely more impactful for gender equality in middle-level leadership than leadership programs developed specifically for females (Shepherd, 2017). The Women's Power Gap (WPG) at the Eos Foundation collects data and research gender and power gaps among women from diverse backgrounds. In 2021 and 2022, they released their first partnered research project series with the American Association of University Women (AAUW) on Executive Compensation and Leadership in Higher Education. Findings from the second study in the WPG series with the AAUW showed that gender divides were much wider at upper levels and in governing boards, and appointments to top positions were unequal for men and women (Silbert et al., 2022). For example, men had access to traditional (74%) and nontraditional (26%) routes to the presidency. However, women tended to take the traditional academic route only (93%), rising in rank from dean to provost to president. Men in the nontraditional route were appointed to their positions without having to climb the academic leadership ranks in the traditional route (Silbert et al., 2022). When asked about the implications of the findings, Silbert noted evidence of systemic bias that prevented women from leadership roles and

suggested that "universities need to focus their efforts on fixing the system, not the women. This starts with boards of trustees examining their biases and putting procedures in place to make selection more equitable" (Nietzel, 2022, para.7).

Rank and Experience

Faculty rank played a role in determining the chair (Freeman et al., 2020), and prior experience in a faculty role was beneficial when taking on a middle-level leadership role (Abele, 2013). Participating chairs in the Freeman et al. study noted that going through the ranks to full professor and having knowledge of the campus structures, protocols, and hierarchies was beneficial in middle-level leadership. In 1991, 92.5% of chairs surveyed in the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) study on department chairs had tenure, with over 80% ranked as full professors. By 2016, those numbers dropped to 80% with tenure rank, with only 59% ranked as full professors (Gmelch et al., 2017). More untenured, lower-ranked faculty were moving into middle-level leadership positions while they juggled the tenure and promotion process (Gmelch et al., 2017). Cipriano and Riccardi (2017) researched department chairs between 2007 and 2017, and among the 2,013 respondents, most ranked as full professors. Regarding experiences as middle-level leaders, respondents mostly had no formal training in administration, were satisfied serving as chair, saw communication skills as most needed, were most challenged by non-collegial faculty, and thought more attention should be given to collegiality in the tenure process (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2017).

Middle-level leaders who served as deans tended to have prior leadership

experience in other middle-level leadership positions within the institution. According to

data from the 364 deans in the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business

2020-2021 survey, around 25% served as associate deans; nearly 20% served as

department chairs; about 16% served as interim deans; and 10% served as a faculty

member immediately before their deanship appointment (AACSB, 2021). Coll et al.

(2018) found similar prior leadership experiences of deans in their survey on the

challenges of education deans in higher education, with 58 of the 130 affiliated members

of the Council of Academic Deans from Research Education Institutions (CADREI) who

participated. Twenty-six percent indicated previous experience as a dean, 58% had served

as an associate dean, and 69% had previously served as department chairs. While most

participants felt the associate dean position prepared them for the dean position, only

25% felt the department chair position prepared them for the dean position (Coll et al.,

2018).

Skills and Traits

Effective and strong middle-level leadership was noted as essential to the success

of higher education institutions (Braun et al., 2009; Hofmeyer et al., 2015). Leaders in

higher education needed to balance their knowledge, vision, political challenges, and

philosophies (Portugal, 2006). Communication, problem-solving, mentorship, transition,

conflict resolution, and cultural management skills were necessary for those serving as

academic chairs or leaders (Bowman, 2002). Similar to Bowman's findings, Cipriano and

Riccardi (2018) found from their studies that a middle-level leader in higher

education needed effective communication skills, conflict-resolution skills, was able to relate with others, made decisions when needed, and had leadership skills and integrity.

Tucker (1981) was one of the first scholars who examined department chairs' complex tasks, roles, and responsibilities. At the time, he defined 54 tasks and 28 possible roles, with the potential for the chair to serve in multiple roles and tasks at one time, and by Tucker's subsequent book publication (1992), the number of possible roles swelled to 41 (Weaver et al., 2019). As higher education has undergone massive change, department chairs' tasks, roles, and responsibilities have also changed. Jones (2011) examined these systemic changes and leadership changes for impacts on future middle-level leaders. Jones's study showed that middle-level leaders needed to multitask and possess a high level of leadership skills over managerial skills. Leadership skills included administration, teaching, mediating, communicating, motivating, developing, evaluating, problem-solving, and leading (Jones, 2011). Gmelch and Buller (2016) noted that the skills needed for middle-level leadership positions differed from those needed in faculty roles. Skills in communicating, problem-solving, dealing with conflict, and thinking critically were commonly cited as necessary in studies on middle-level leaders (Weaver et al., 2019).

In a 2003 study on academic deans, deans were asked what skills middle-level leaders should have. One comment was that they should "be able to successfully stand their ground with both deans and faculty without irritating either group to the point of insurrection" (Wolverton et al., 2005, p. 230). Thornton et al. (2018) found that middle-

level leaders identified interpersonal skills, integrity, transparency, organizational skills, leadership skills, collegial behavior, communication skills, and strategic visioning as necessary for effective leadership. Senior middle-level leaders emphasized accepting challenges and being willing to make hard decisions while balancing relationships (Thornton et al., 2018). Reliability and academic competence were included as traits under leadership, along with the ability to motivate and inspire others (Thornton et al., 2018). Danilowicz and McCartan, authors of *Organizing Academic Colleges: A Guide for Deans* (2017), added that delegating responsibilities and setting deadlines were necessary for successful middle-level leadership (Monaghan, 2018).

Accountability was an expectation of leaders, and data showed the high-quality work of faculty, programs, students, and tasks associated with effective middle-level leadership (Halonen & Dunn, 2017). With little formal training, middle-level leaders needed to consider working with data and metrics experts such as IT departments or statistics specialists (Halonen & Dunn, 2017). Educators and administrators needed to be aware of the needs of students and work to meet them (Freedman, 2011). Data collection and research were two methods of determining these needs and sharing the information with stakeholders. For fine arts administrators, sharing this information with stakeholders was necessary for effective middle-level leadership to ensure the arts were protected and supported in higher education and the community (Filippelli & Clements, 2019).

In Morris and Laipple's (2015) study on U.S. public research institution middle-level leaders (including deans, chairs, department heads, associate deans, and directors),

1,515 participants from 145 institutions were surveyed. The majority (1,041) were men, and 474 were women. When women and men self-evaluated themselves on leadership skills and preparedness for the role, women had higher scores for leadership and men had higher scores for preparedness. Based on the findings, women (more than men) felt they inspired others, used meeting time efficiently, were more comfortable leading change, were fairer and objective, and followed through in their leadership. Men evaluated themselves higher than women in how they dealt with grievances, managed money and budgetary issues, and avoided making decisions.

New middle-level leaders were sometimes unprepared for how much time they spent motivating and nurturing some faculty (Wolverton et al., 2005). Emotional intelligence traits, including empathy and social skills, were beneficial for middle-level leaders who worked to manage personnel issues (Parrish, 2011, 2015). Goleman (2011) noted that emotional intelligence was a critical trait for middle-level leadership roles and was necessary for a great leader who moved people through difficult times and uncertainty (Carnicer et al., 2015).

Roles and Tasks

The role of leaders on college campuses has changed since the rise of public institutions of higher education in the early 1900s and events that forced institutional change. From 1900-1944, colleges became more complex, and boards sought administrators with strong managerial skills (Selingo et al., 2017). Following World War II, higher education snowballed in size, federal funding was made available for science

research, and student enrollment grew with the passing of the GI Bill, which resulted in the need for more middle-level leaders to help with the building and growth (Selingo et al., 2017). From 1976-2008, federal student loans replaced grants, and states gravitated to direct appropriations, forcing institutional leaders to become fiscally focused on new opportunities for revenue, including fundraising and partnerships in cost-sharing (Selingo et al., 2017). The role of the middle-level academic leader changed to a more complex role over time, and that complexity continued to be a challenge.

Over the past decade, leaders in higher education faced multiple challenges in retention, technology, fiscal revenue and government constraints, and their work in institutions with numerous academic disciplines and needs (Selingo et al., 2017). Additionally, the student population was more diverse; they needed more support, and public funding had decreased (Harvey et al., 2013). Based on data from the 2016 UCEA study, Kelly Ward suggested that middle-level leaders work more than in years past because departments were more extensive, and chair positions often paralleled that of a dean position (Flaherty, 2016). The role of the department chair was complex and not always clearly defined (Weaver et al., 2019), which left new leaders uncertain of their role, expectations, identities, and how the role impacted their personal and professional lives (Armstrong & Woloshyn, 2017). Middle-level leaders in academic departments held titles ranging from the chair, department head, director, associate dean, or dean. They often carried out some of their faculty responsibilities while they held administrative roles (Jenkins, 2016). These administrative roles varied significantly among universities

(Cipriano & Riccardi, 2017).

The role of department chairs and middle-level leaders was critical to the success of higher education institutions (Gmelch et al., 2017). These leaders were vital in moving departments and faculty through change (Seagren et al., 1993; Tucker, 1992) and functioned as liaisons between faculty and upper administration, served as a voice for the department, were managers, and implemented all policies and missions (Hecht et al., 1999). Interestingly, Hammersley-Fletcher and Kirkham (2005) brought the idea of expected collegiality, professionalism, and authority to describe the role of middle-level leaders, centered more around interpersonal and relational aspects of the role than managerial-based aspects.

Middle-level leaders faced balancing task-related expectations and timelines as they built relationships, maintained research, taught (Dean et al., 2021), and dealt with immediate issues (Buller, 2012). High-quality outcomes in practical and academic (research and teaching) areas were expected of middle-level leaders (Golosinski, 2008) while they balanced the goals of those above, below, and outside of the institution. It became necessary for middle-level leaders to clearly understand their expectations in their role and what tasks were most critical to their success (Wilkerson, 1999; Gmelch, 2000).

In a study on academic leaders at the University of Nevada Las Vegas (UNLV), middle-level leaders shared tasks critical to their leadership role. Responses included attending and facilitating meetings, developing and managing budgets, recruiting,

planning, conflict-resolution, setting the unit's culture, mentoring and evaluating faculty

and staff, serving the faculty and outside the unit, and working to ensure fairness

(Wolverton et al., 2005). Duties were less student-focused (programs and curriculum) and

were more accountability-focused on internal and external relations (Gallos, 2002;

Kaplan, 2004; Khurana, 2007; Webster et al., 2006).

Department chairs or leaders also needed to manage relationships within and

beyond their departments, according to Gmelch and Miskin (2011). Leaders at this

leadership level in higher education needed to support the staff and faculty while they

worked to demonstrate successful performance within specific periods (Bossmann et al.,

2016). Successful performance demonstrations connected to findings for more

accountability (Gallos, 2002; Kaplan, 2004; Khurana, 2007; Webster et al., 2006). Data

from the Freeman et al. (2020) study on department chairs supported Gmelch and

Miskin's premise that good relationships with the department and those outside the

department were critical to the chair accomplishing their goals (Freeman et al., 2020).

Their role was an in-between role (Cervino, 2018; Freeman et al., 2020; Gmelch &

Miskin, 2011; Rhodes & Lees, 2016) and of a double identity or "double-consciousness,"

originally coined by W. E. B. Du Bois in 1903 (Freeman et al., 2020). Freeman et al. used

the term to describe the identities chairs try to maintain while developing new role

identities. Gmelch and Buller (2015) described the challenge leaders faced while they

simultaneously worked with faculty and administration. Creaton and Heard-Laureote

(2019) added that this was a struggle, and Taggart (2015) added that middle-level leaders

felt very alone without support and training.

There was an increase in studies on middle-level leadership in higher education internationally (Degn, 2015; Floyd, 2016; Gonaim, 2016). This leadership position was defined as ambiguous (Gigliotti, 2021), multifaceted (Gonaim, 2016), lacked clarity (Branson et al., 2015), and was especially important during times of change (Floyd, 2016). Rapid advancements and changes in technology and communication in the 21st century forced chairs to adapt and implement these changes in technology and how they communicated in their leadership role (Weaver et al., 2019). Modern chairs adapted to change rapidly as higher education forced them to adapt to economic and enrollment issues (Gmelch & Buller, 2016; Jones, 2011). It was found that modern-day chairs needed be innovative and creative as they navigated challenges regarding reform, accountability, and maximizing limited financial resources while they worked to address enrollment issues (Armstrong & Woloshyn, 2017).

Responsibilities

Middle-level leaders hold one of several titles, which include department chair, department head, director, associate or assistant dean, or dean. The responsibilities of department chairs have remained similar between 1991 and 2016 (Flaherty, 2016). Responsibilities generally fell under two areas: departmental business and department goals and missions related to academics (Kruse, 2022). The top ten responsibilities centered around academic and administrative areas, and included representing the department to administration; maintaining a positive work climate; creating long-range

goals for the unit; recruiting and selecting faculty; improving teaching quality; managing resources; seeking ways to improve the department; faculty evaluations; communication between faculty and administration; and teaching and advising students (Flaherty, 2016). While middle-level leaders were not as responsible as upper-level leaders in creating strategic plans, they were often responsible for communicating and carrying them out within their departments (Manning, 2018; Mintzberg, 2009; Weick, 2009). Taggart (2015) added that middle-level leaders made decisions that affected faculty's curriculum, budgets, and future career opportunities.

Dating back to the 2010 Boyko and Jones study and looking at the responsibilities of middle-level leaders serving as deans, institutions expected higher levels of administrative and managerial duties with the management of staff, support for scholarly activity, budgetary planning, reporting to upper administration, strategic planning following university policy; and curriculum responsibilities with program development and curriculum-related work. The prioritization of responsibilities varied among institutions and was sometimes more specific to the department area the dean served (Boyko & Jones, 2010). Middle-level leaders in Sayler et al.'s (2017) study noted that their dominant focus areas of assigned responsibilities were academics (60%), administrative duties (51%), and curriculum (50%). One of the least assigned responsibilities was external affairs (15%). Participants in the 2019 Weaver et al. study strongly agreed that the number of meetings outside the department had increased and became more of a priority. Forty-four percent of Sayler et al. participants indicated their

role was an equal balance between an administrator and a faculty member. Thirty-one percent indicated their role was primarily administrative, and 13% indicated their primary role was as a faculty member. Participants' job titles reflected their academic and administrative roles (Sayler et al., 2017).

In Thornton et al. (2018), study participants categorized middle-level leader responsibilities by leadership, management, and administrative tasks. In the leadership category, according to Thornton, heads of schools acted as advocates for the school, upheld academic integrity, worked with external stakeholders, and guided the school's strategic vision. For fine arts administrators in higher education, advocating for the arts among stakeholders and working to adapt programs to meet the needs of students and support their learning experiences was important (Filippelli & Clements, 2019). Fine arts leaders needed to be prepared to collect and present data to affirm that students and programs aligned with the university, state, national, professional, and field-specific expectations (Filippelli & Clements, 2019). As managers and administrators, heads of schools hired and managed staff, which included professional development, workloads, and evaluations; oversaw financial budgeting and planning; oversaw program evaluations and student learning experiences; and fostered and modeled the community culture within the school as a role model (Thornton et al., 2018).

Longevity and Terms

Those going into middle-level leadership positions often saw this as a brief service away from their faculty position (Carroll & Wolverton, 2004). Academic deans

were vital to the success of their academic units but rarely served a term of more than five years (Butin, 2016; Greicar, 2009). The majority (74%) of the 354 respondents in the 2020-2021 AACSB Deans Survey reported that their deanship did not have a fixed term, and for the 26% that indicated a term length, the average length of that time was 4.6 years (p. 9). In the Sayler et al. (2017) study, 74% reported service in the role five years or less; 17% served 6-10 years; 5% served 11-15 years; 2% served 16-20 years, and 2% for 21 years or longer. Many middle-level leaders who served less than six years were still developing the needed skills needed for their role and developing as leaders (Wolverton et al., 2001).

The average time spent as a department leader was four years (Gmelch et al., 2017). Faculty were allowed seven years to gain expertise, leading to tenure, yet less time was often allowed to gain expertise in middle-level leadership roles. Forty percent of middle-level leaders surveyed in the 2016 UCEA study did not feel competent until after the first or second year. Nearly 20% of those surveyed took longer to develop a sense of competence (Gmelch et al., 2017).

Boyko and Jones's (2010) study on Canadian middle-level leaders examined appointment terms for chairs and deans. Three to five years was the average term for chair positions at 23 out of 25 universities that defined term limits. One university had a two-year term, and one had a seven-year term maximum. Five to six years was the average term for dean positions at 19 out of 21 universities that defined term limits. One university had a five to seven-year term, and one had a seven-year maximum. Over 75%

of the universities permit the chair to apply for a second term. Deans can be re-appointed, but Boyko and Jones found that deans' details for the re-appointment process were not as straightforward or consistent across institutions.

With thinning candidate pools and challenges in recruiting, high turnover rates, and issues of minor to no formal preparation and training, institutions needed to consider how to increase the longevity of those in academic middle-level leadership positions (Henk et al., 2021). It became questionable when institutions considered ten hours or less of training to prepare new middle-level leaders to be competent in their new roles (Gmelch et al., 2017). According to some researchers, competence in one's field took ten thousand hours of deliberate practice (Colvin, 2008; Coyle, 2009; Gladwell, 2008).

Challenges and Stressors of Middle-Level Leaders

Researchers who studied challenges and stressors faced by chairs (Gmelch & Burns, 1993; Wolverton et al., 2005) have encouraged higher education institutions to provide more training and preparation for those entering the role of the chair (Dean et al., 2021). Nevertheless, institutions still have not prioritized training (Armstrong & Woloshyn, 2017). Some middle-level administrators acknowledged their lack of understanding about the position, the time needed to motivate and nurture faculty, and the time and skill needed to deal with conflict (Wolverton et al., 2005). Based on the prior research of Gmelch and Burns (1993), Wolverton et al. (2005), and Armstrong and Woloshyn (2017), the challenges and preparation for middle-level leadership remained relatively consistent within the span of their research (Dean et al., 2021).

Balance of Time and Responsibilities

Gmelch et al. (2017) compared the 1991 and 2016 University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) studies on middle-level leadership in higher education. They found ten parallel excessive job stressors for both groups, but rankings differed. Gmelch et al. found that the top stressors in the 1991 study included a heavy workload, keeping up with current issues and research in the field, balancing work-life demands, and maintaining personal time. The top stressors in the 2016 study included balancing administrative and scholarly demands, scholarship productivity, work-life demands, and keeping up with email. When evaluating the level of the stressors from 1991 to 2016, nine out of the 10 top stressors were identified as excessive in 2016 compared to 1991, which indicated increased stress levels (Gmelch et al., 2017). According to Ward, co-leader of the 2016 UCEA study, the increased stressors possibly suggested that chairs were doing more work than in the past, likely due to increased department size and combined disciplines within one department (Flaherty, 2016). Ward offered another possible explanation to Flaherty for stress levels: the responsibilities and expectations of a chair were similar to those formerly expected of a dean.

Chairs experienced stress from challenges with meeting deadlines, personnel issues and conflicts, and meeting expectations (Gmelch & Burns,1993). Dean et al. (2021) found that these challenges were duplicated by over half of the participants in a 2010 study on chairs by Cipriano and Riccardi. In a follow-up survey from 2017, the top challenges chairs faced included limited resources, personnel issues, overwhelming

emails, limited time for research, and high workloads (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2018).

Research by Weaver et al. (2019) centered on how the role and needs of the department

chair changed over time. The challenges of limited research time, bureaucracy issues,

job-related stressors, high workloads, and difficult faculty found by Cipriano and

Riccardi (2010) were duplicated in Weaver et al.'s (2019) study.

The amount of time middle-level academic leaders spent on administrative duties,

research and creative activities, teaching, fundraising, and service varied from unit to unit

and among institutions. Middle-level leaders who divided their time between all or

several of these areas may have spent more time on faculty and budget issues and

struggled to fulfill their research or teaching responsibilities (Wolverton et al., 2005).

Middle-level leaders were often expected to deal with management tasks, personnel

leadership issues, and balancing research and teaching time (Wolverton et al., 2005).

According to data from the 2020-2021 AACSB Deans Survey Participant Report, deans

reported spending the majority (19%) of their time working with the administration,

strategic planning (13%), academic and program development (11%), accreditation

(10%), fundraising (10%), and community engagement (10%). The remaining amount of

their time was divided between faculty development (6%), communications (5%),

budgetary planning (5%), faculty retention and recruitment (5%), student retention and

recruitment (5%), and crisis management (2%), as reported by the 354 participants in the

survey. While middle-level leaders in NASM-affiliated institutions were asked to self-

report the percentage of time they spent on teaching, research/creative activities,

administrative duties, service, and fundraising, little was known about the challenges of time distribution or other challenging factors for leaders in schools of music.

Dealing with personnel issues has been a challenge for chairs (Bryman & Lilley, 2009; Scott et al., 2008), but dealing with "uncivil" faculty has been identified by chairs as a more significant challenge than workload since 2010 (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2017, p. 11). Faculty behavior was connected with collegiality in academia. The concept of collegiality became a part of Cipriano and Riccardi's continued research on chairs based on participant feedback between 2010 and 2017 studies. From those studies, 69% of participants (90% of female chairs and 85% of male chairs) felt collegiality should be a fourth criterion for faculty tenure and promotion. Every respondent who planned to leave higher education after their chair term or was unsatisfied serving as chair supported the addition of the collegiality criterion (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2017).

Education deanships shifted dramatically over the past 20 years (Williams-June, 2014). Education deans were challenged with working with faculty to update and evaluate curricula and programs to meet the needed change (CADREI, 2015). Deans in higher education faced multiple challenges, including revisioning programs, resistance to curricular change, pressure to fundraise, and diminishing resources (Coll et al., 2018). Nationwide, as higher education enrollment numbers moved toward health science and engineering fields and away from education and humanities, those deans who lost students were more likely to face challenges with budgetary cuts (English & Kramer, 2017; Hearn, 2003).

Gmelch and Burns (1994) identified that movement from a faculty role to a chair role was a challenge as they became more of a mediator, leader, and administrator while they held some faculty responsibilities (Weaver et al., 2019). Middle-level leaders in higher education faced many challenges and duties (Wolverton et al., 2005). One challenge of many middle-level administrators was balancing time and roles as an administrator, remaining as faculty, and continuing research and scholarship (Wolverton et al., 2001). In the field of music in higher education, research and scholarship often included creating, composing, and performing, which required consistent time and attention. Degn (2015) suggested three strategies for leaders who struggled to balance middle-level leadership roles and research. Strategies included focusing only on the leadership role, trying to manage both, and looking at the leadership role as temporary. It was harder for middle-level leaders who tried to manage them both (Thornton et al., 2018). However, setting time aside each week for research was a practice of successful chairs (Halonen & Dunn, 2017).

As middle-level administrators, budgetary issues and inadequate resources to support the needs and opportunities of the department, faculty, and students were concerns (Wolverton et al., 2005). This often forced these administrators to meet the needs of some faculty but not all. The 2017 Sayler et al. study asked participants to prioritize challenges they currently faced and expected to continue to face within the next five years. An immense challenge centered around budgetary concerns with less state support, fewer resources, and expectations to increase funding from fundraising efforts to

support faculty research and department revenue. The second most significant area of

challenges included faculty development (recruitment and retention), personal career

goals (including research, work-life balance, and returning to faculty), program

improvement, institutional growth, and relationships within and outside the department.

The challenges least mentioned were accreditation, student concerns, strategic planning,

and assessment (Sayler et al., 2017).

Research and Scholarship

The limited time middle-level leaders have allotted for research was a concern for

many serving in leadership roles. Participant responses from the 2018 Thornton et al.

study on middle-level academic leaders identified overwhelming workload, personnel

issues, and job role ambiguity as negative impacts on their scholarship (Freeman et al.,

2020). Maintaining prior research agendas while serving as a middle-level leader was a

challenge that required discipline from the leader in dedicating specific time for research

(Halonen & Dunn, 2017).

Professional scholarship was identified as a challenge for those who served as

associate deans (Sayler et al., 2017). Sixty-one percent of participants in the national

study on associate deans noted a decline in scholarly productivity since they took on the

role of associate dean, and nearly 20% indicated output had sharply declined. While 19%

expressed satisfaction with their amount of scholarly activity, 40% expressed

dissatisfaction to great dissatisfaction. Nearly half shifted their research agendas and

scholarly activities from their discipline area toward administration and higher education;

however, most associate deans indicated they had little time for research or professional development. This was concerning considering nearly 25% planned to return to their faculty position at the end of their term, partially so they could continue their research agenda (Sayler et al., 2017). Also concerning was that half of Sayler et al.'s respondents had not yet been promoted to full professor and perhaps needed extensive time to reestablish their careers, suggested Sayler et al.. Weaver et al. (2019) found similar frustrations in middle-level leaders in that over half of the participants in their study were dissatisfied with how much time they were allotted for research while in their leadership role, and 94% would not be interested in their current leadership role if no time were allocated for research.

Management of Position, People, and Self

Armstrong and Woloshyn (2017) considered the challenges chairs faced to fall under three main categories of management: position, people, and self. The three categories emerged from their qualitative study on department chairs' experiences and perspectives in the middle-level leadership role. Findings under the position category showed that chairs felt high levels of responsibility and workload and low levels of power and autonomy. Challenges under the people category included the multiple ways they communicated with people, interactions with colleagues, and how they dealt with conflicts and non-collegial faculty. Chairs also struggled in the self category with how they balanced when to express their opinion rather than that of the chair as they moved from the identity of faculty to chair (Armstrong & Woloshyn, 2017). Freeman et al.

(2020) categorized the challenges of middle-level leaders into two main areas: *people* work and *paper* work. People work related to faculty and student issues, while paper work related to the administrative aspects of the job. The challenge identified by chairs was the amount of time needed to give faculty the support they needed to fulfill their responsibilities while they still had enough time to attend to administrative duties and their personal lives (Freeman et al., 2020).

Similar to Armstrong and Woloshyn's (2017) findings about challenges of high workload, communication, relationships, and identity, findings from the nine-year study by Cipriano and Riccardi (2016) showed that the most notable challenges middle-level leaders faced were dealing with faculty issues. Armstrong and Woloshyn labeled the overwhelming amount of information received from many levels within the institution and leaders who worked to balance it all as a source of cognitive dissonance, as mentioned in Freeman et al. (2020). Additional challenges in balancing involved trying to find ways to meet the needs and interests of upper administration and faculty and learning how to prioritize those needs and interests (Wolverton et al., 2005). Those with middle-level leadership roles also faced the challenge of how they explained the decisions made by upper administration, sometimes with little context, and managed budgets with little training on how to do so, which added to stress levels (Dean et al., 2021). Furthermore, their work to maintain personal and professional growth while they managed the multiple roles middle-level leaders played led to struggles with professional identity. These challenges negatively impacted job satisfaction and feelings of effectiveness in the role

(Wolverton et al., 2005).

Chairs experienced stress from challenges with deadlines, personnel issues and conflicts, and if they met expectations (Gmelch & Burns,1993). These challenges were duplicated again by over half of the participants in a 2010 study on chairs by Cipriano and Riccardi (Dean et al., 2021). In the seven years following the 2010 chair study, the top challenges chairs faced included limited resources, personnel issues, overwhelming emails, limited time for research, and high workloads (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2018). Dealing with issues of difficult faculty (Bryman & Lilley, 2009; Scott et al., 2008) or "uncivil" faculty was identified as more significant a challenge than workload by chairs since 2010 (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2017, p. 11). The concept of collegiality was part of Cipriano and Riccardi's research on chairs since 2010, based on 2010 feedback that it was considered a fourth criterion for faculty tenure and promotion process. Between 2010 and 2017, 69% of respondents felt collegiality should be a factor. Ninety percent of female chairs and 85% of male chairs agreed collegiality should be a fourth component of the tenure and promotion process, and every respondent who planned to leave higher education after their chair term or was unsatisfied serving as chair supported the addition of the collegiality criterion (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2017). "Dealing with people" was the biggest challenge referenced by participants in the Dean et al. (2021) study on academic chairs (p. 104). Participants also noted having to deal with "aggressive" personal attacks and requests for preferential treatment from faculty and that "the emotional investment makes the job hard" (Dean et al., 2021, p. 105).

Expectations and Strategies

The ambiguity of the role of a middle-level leader in higher education, such as a department or school head, resulted in differing expectations of duties and leadership of the leader from the stakeholders (Thornton et al., 2018). Thornton et al. added that there was additional pressure to continue academic and research agendas while taking on leadership responsibilities that some middle-level leaders felt. Collegiality within their area of discipline felt conflicting regarding the managerial side of the middle-level leadership role, which was particularly challenging for those who returned to the rank of academic faculty after the leadership term expired (Branson et al., 2015; Degn, 2015; Floyd, 2016; Whitchurch & Gordon, 2017). Challenges referenced by participants in the Thornton et al. study included working with difficult people, heavy workloads, and unclear expectations within the role. Middle-level leaders expressed frustrations that more of their time was spent on people with problems and that many of their former peers had no idea how much work went into being the head of a department or school (Thornton et al., 2018).

It was worthwhile to examine how the challenges have been addressed within their purpose and role in the job (Sanaghan, 2016). Sanaghan suggested that those in college administrative roles who dealt with challenges, internal and external issues, and change should have considered two strategies. The first was to accept reality, and the second was to develop a clear sense of purpose. While middle-level leaders needed to be realistic, Sanaghan stressed that it was essential to believe things will improve. This

belief led to confidence that built resilience and effective leadership strategies in a developed sense of purpose in the leader's work and the organization's mission.

Preparation of Middle-Level Leaders

Despite the required university tenure process of an average of seven years for faculty to have moved up in rank and be seen as an expert, followed by several more years for a movement to the rank of full professor, little has been done to prepare experts for middle-level leadership positions (Gmelch et al., 1999). The health of an academic department or area was generally associated with the effectiveness of the department leader (Armstrong & Woloshyn, 2017), yet most entered this leadership position with little formal training (Dean et al., 2021; Morris & Laipple, 2015) or preparation for the needs of current leadership (Weaver et al., 2019). Department chairs commonly entered their positions without training, leadership experience, an understanding of the multiple dimensions of their role, an understanding of adapting from serving as an academic to a leader in academia, and an understanding of the impacts the position would have on their professional and personal lives (Gmelch et al., 2017).

Individuals who entered middle-level leadership roles often had insufficient preparation and relied upon mentors and learn-as-you-go experiences (Merrion, 2009). The academic department level was where most work on college campuses occurs. However, the preparation and succession process of those in academic department leadership roles was not a key consideration (Sessa & Taylor, 2000). Academics were given little preparation for the middle-level leadership role of the dean and tended to

focus less on the primary purpose of the job – to facilitate learning - when faced with pressure from lower and upper administration (Gallos, 2002).

One significant gap in leadership literature was the limited research on middle-level leader development and training (Gmelch & Buller, 2015; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Morris & Laipple, 2015). Existing literature supported that few administrators received training before their leadership positions (Carroll & Wolverton, 2004; Hecht, 2004; Wolverton et al., 2001), unlike the U.S. business sector, which spent an estimated $166 billion annually in leadership development (Westfall, 2019). Morris and Laipple (2015) mirrored earlier research of Wolverton and Poch (2000), and found parallels in responsibilities and skills needed for CEOs and academic administrators; therefore, they posited that leadership preparation in higher education needed further investment. While the business sector invested in leadership training and identified those with leadership potential (Conger & Fulmer, 2003), the academic setting offered very little regarding middle-level leadership preparation. It frequently pulled candidates from the faculty and inserted them into critical middle-level leadership positions (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993). Despite needing more leadership preparation and training, department chairs received minimal support from institutions (Weaver et al., 2019). For those surveyed in the UCEA 2016 survey, over 72 percent of those who received training had ten or fewer hours of training (Gmelch et al., 2017). Very few deans received prior training and had limited administrative experience before entering the academic role of deanship (Harvey et al., 2013; Morris & Laipple, 2015).

An earlier study from 1990 to 2000 on over 2,000 academic middle-level leaders surveyed in the United States found that only 3% received leadership training and preparation (Gmelch, 2000). This lack of training and preparation was found in the majority of those appointed to chair or associate dean positions from faculty or chair positions (Flaherty, 2016; Palm, 2006). Sayler et al. (2017) found that many faculty took on middle-level leadership roles with the desire to help their colleges succeed while they placed their personal growth in their field aside and with little experience and training. Additionally, of those taking on the role of associate dean, most lacked experience in areas deemed critical to the job description: fundraising, budget management, and external relations (Sayler et al., 2017).

The results of chair surveys from the 1991 UCEA study by Gmelch et al. showed the reported need for more training in managing funds, budgeting and preparing budgets, long-range planning, faculty evaluations, managing staff, and ensuring a conducive work environment (Gmelch et al., 2017). Results of chair surveys from the 2016 UCEA study showed the need for more training in conflict resolution, budget and finance, time management, and institutional policy and procedures (Gmelch et al., 2017). Kelly Ward, the co-leader of the 2016 UCEA study, shared with Flaherty (2016) that much of the training centered around hard skills that were not relevant to all leaders rather than interpersonal skills deemed critical for the departmental climate. Ward stressed the need for middle-level leaders to be trained on how they reduced or cut a budget rather than how they made a budget sheet, or they needed more on how they dealt with

underperforming faculty rather than how they completed annual reviews (Flaherty, 2016).

In a nine-year longitudinal study on department leaders' experiences, roles, and responsibilities, Cipriano and Riccardi (2016) found that 83% of participants received no formal training. Additionally, only 3.3% of department chairs had leadership coursework, and 9.1% had management training before they took on the chair role. Morris and Laipple (2015) surveyed 1,515 academic middle-level leaders from 145 U.S. public research institutions about their job satisfaction, preparation, and leadership skills. Results showed that leaders lacked knowledge in dealing with grievances, creating assessments to show progress, and creating new revenue. Those who participated in development courses on behavioral and organizational psychology, leadership and relationship-building, and business administration tended to be more prepared to take on middle-level leadership roles. The resources these participants referenced as helping them learn how to do their job once appointed were senior leadership, leadership books and articles, and professional seminars (Morris & Laipple, 2015).

Preston and Floyd (2016) surveyed 172 associate deans in England, Scotland, and Wales to determine the preparation and support levels provided to help them perform their roles and responsibilities. Like the Morris and Laipple (2015) study, most (60%) received little to no preparation before they took on the associate dean position and referenced the importance of senior leadership and learning from others in the same role. The Thornton et al. (2018) study showed that participants acknowledged that previous leadership experiences, mentoring from the previous middle-level leader, and

professional support they received impacted their preparation and success in their middle-level leadership role. When asked to share challenges regarding preparation, those involved in the study acknowledged a lack of preparation for the wide variety of job responsibilities within the role, along with difficult transitions into and out of the middle-level leadership position as issues (Thornton et al., 2018).

Participants in the 2020-2021 Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) Deans Survey were asked to evaluate how prepared they felt for specific job-related activities upon entering the role of deanship. The top three areas deans indicated they were highly prepared for included academic and program development (57%), strategic planning (54%), and faculty retention and recruitment (52%). Deans felt somewhat unprepared for fundraising (31%), risk/crisis management (29%), and communications (20%). While upper-level leaders in higher education had more opportunities for leadership training, this was often not the case for those in middle and lower-level leadership roles (MacFarlane, 2014). Departmental-level leaders had unique roles and required skills; therefore, training and preparation should have been individualized to the area in which the individual served (Trowler, 2008), deemed more relevant and meaningful by those who received this type of support from the institution (Floyd, 2016).

Academic leaders were highly influential in the success of the departments, schools, colleges, and institutions they led. The combined forces of resource constraints, changes in student demographics and needs, technology needs and changes, and increases

in accountability, paired with middle-level leaders who lacked preparation in leadership, have negatively impacted the success and effectiveness of the unit (Wolverton et al., 2005). The tasks and skills middle-level leaders needed were areas they identified as unprepared for. These included knowledge of unit and institutional policies and procedures, legalities, personnel management, working with higher-level administration, delegating, fostering trust, problem-solving, and conflict resolution (Wolverton et al., 2005). Weaver et al. (2019) utilized data from the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) survey of new department chairs in 2016 and found that 67% received no formal training upon appointment. This lack of preparation contributed to stress and lack of confidence experienced by chairs (Weaver et al., 2019).

Recognizing the lack of training or preparation leaders received before entering their leadership roles, it was critical for administrators in fine arts to have prior leadership experience (Filippelli & Clements, 2019). However, Yungclas' (2007) study on fine arts deans in the United States found that fine arts deans with prior experiences as department heads still felt unprepared for the deanship role. This study also found that it was essential for fine arts deans to have a background in fine arts. Floyd (2016) offered a similar suggestion regarding individualized preparation. Floyd posited that while more preparation was needed for department-level leaders, the purpose should not be a blanketed approach focused on increasing productivity, a current focus within institutions, at the expense of academic and faculty challenges the leader may have dealt with within the department (2016). Instead, preparation and training needed to be more

individualized to meet the needs of the middle-level leader in the context in which they served as much as possible, in addition to considering the institution's needs (Floyd, 2016).

There was an assumption that good faculty members were good academic middle-level leaders (Wolverton et al., 2005). However, the skills needed for effective middle-level leadership differed from those practiced over several years as good faculty members. Another consideration for future preparation was for current chairs to delegate leadership responsibilities and tasks to faculty members to look for future middle-level leaders (Halonen & Dunn, 2017). Faculty were able to make decisions at a slower pace with less concern over how their decisions impacted others. At the same time, middle-level leaders needed to be prepared for numerous interruptions, respond quickly when needed, interact with people from various levels across campus, make decisions while considering the impact on many people, and have strong interpersonal skills (Wolverton et al., 2005). Therefore, Halonen and Dunn suggested that delegating leadership opportunities to faculty allowed future middle-level leaders to gain experience and better understand their responsibilities before they stepped into the role of the department chair.

Professional Development and Support of Current Leaders

It was essential that while middle-level leaders were serving, they received practical training and mentorship to help them prepare for and navigate change (Coll et al., 2018). Findings in Gmelch and Burn's (1994) research and results from the Freeman et al. (2020) study showed that leaders experienced stress managing the multiple roles

middle-level leaders held at once and that mentoring programs alleviated some of these stressors. Mentorship, opportunities to work with others in leadership, and middle-level leadership development workshops helped bridge the gap in experience and preparation (Halonen & Dunn, 2017). Senior administrators supported middle-level administrators when they supported them to create a work culture that included work-life parameters and modeled communication practices that helped avoid leadership burnout (Freeman et al., 2020)

Associate deans reported on the importance of remaining current in their areas of responsibilities, strategies, and resources most beneficial to them. Most referenced were personal interactions with other associate deans (73%); their dean (64%); and mentors (30%) (Sayler et al., 2017). Additionally, reading journal articles and books about leadership, collecting data on their effectiveness, attending workshops geared explicitly toward new associate deans, and networking were referenced as beneficial for development by associate deans (Sayler et al., 2017).

The majority of the participants in the survey on education deans' challenges indicated that their associate deanships helped prepare them for their role as dean, which may have been because the offices of the associate and dean were usually close in proximity. There were more interactions between the two leadership roles (Coll et al., 2018). For that reason, it was beneficial to provide associate deans with preparatory training for deanship in higher education and opportunities to be mentored by deans (Coll et al., 2018).

Similar to findings in Gmelch and Burn's (1994) and Freeman et al. (2020) studies, mentorship was referenced in Thornton et al.'s (2018) study. Participants in the New Zealand study suggested mentorship, entering the position with an awareness of the job expectations, and choosing to safeguard research time or be willing to put research on hold were beneficial for those entering the middle-level leadership role. Gmelch et al. (2017) recommended that those interested in such leadership roles wait until they received full professorship due to administrative roles' limitations on research agendas. This would have negatively impacted the number of prospective candidates for chair positions; therefore, institutions needed to adjust the workload of chair positions to allow new chairs to continue moving forward in their professional advancement and scholarly work (Dean et al., 2021).

Chairs also stressed the value of having group discussions with other chairs, where they shared ideas and experiences and offered one another support (Dean et al., 2021; Weaver et al., 2019). Group discussions and support were a focus of English and Kramer (2017) in addressing the management, budgetary, and personnel issues that deans face. They implemented a dean leadership program at the University of North Carolina School of the Arts, where deans complained of feeling overworked, overwhelmed, and underprepared. Through the program, strategies the deans felt were helpful were bimonthly meetings on relevant issues, group training on campus-related issues, individual goal setting for each dean with strategies to meet the goal(s), and consistent feedback from upper administration, peers, and faculty (English & Kramer, 2017). As a

result of the group discussions and support in the program, participants felt they most benefitted from mentorship and were more equipped in how they dealt with conflict resolution, related with other people, and made decisions (English & Kramer, 2017).

According to Cipriano and Riccardi (2017), recent studies on challenges department chairs in higher education faced found that personnel issues or dealing with difficult faculty were a top challenge. Results from Aziz et al.'s (2005) chair study showed that dealing with personnel issues was very challenging and necessary for the job, and there was a need for professional development in this area. Brinkley-Etzkorn and Lane's (2019) and Dean et al.'s (2021) studies further confirmed this critical need for developing interpersonal skills to help middle-level leaders navigate personnel issues.

Based on findings from the 2021 Dean et al. chair study, there were suggestions for individuals and institutions from chairs to help middle-level leaders be successful. One suggestion was that leaders should set realistic and attainable goals for their leadership term. A second suggestion for middle-level leaders was to learn to delegate responsibilities to others to increase their leadership skills. Leaders should also consider finding support systems within and outside of the work environment. Dean et al. (2021) study participants also stressed the need for Institutions should offer training for leadership roles before and during the leaders' administrative experience.

Motivation to Pursue a Middle-Level Leadership Role

Many factors contributed to why faculty were interested in a middle-level leadership position. Some faculty personally decided to pursue a middle-level leadership

role, while others were asked to consider or step into the role (Perlmutter, 2023). Incentives like full or partial compensation in course reductions, increases in salary, administrative monetary stipends, and a better office attracted some, and others sought middle-level leadership opportunities because they thought they knew how to make improvements within the department (Halonen & Dunn, 2017). Some faculty interested in pursuing a middle-level leadership role have seen the success of their department and wanted to play a role in seeing that success continue, while others opted to serve out of a sense of obligation and duty (Preston & Price, 2012). Findings from Pepper and Giles' (2015) study duplicated results from Inman's (2011), Preston and Price's (2012), and Scott et al. (2008) studies and showed that those interested in middle-level leadership positions wanted to be challenged and grow and make a difference to their department and others. Finally, knowing that people serving as new leaders were supported by upper-level administration and the faculty and staff the new leaders would work with was another motivator for pursuing a middle-level leadership role in higher education (Halonen & Dunn, 2017).

Participants in the Coll et al. (2018) survey on the challenges of education deans affiliated with CADREI were asked to indicate reasons for becoming a dean, associate dean, or department chair. Responses from the participants duplicated the findings in the studies conducted by Inman (2011), Pepper and Giles (2015), Preston and Price (2012), and Scott et al. (2008). Coll et al. found the most common responses for deanship were 'to assume a leadership role,' 'to promote positive change,' and 'to serve' (p. 8). The

most common responses for associate deanship were 'I was asked' and 'to promote positive change' (p. 8). Responses from associate deans in the Sayler et al. (2017) study on what motivated them to remain in the position centered around improvement to the college, the authority and power that came with the position, personal growth, and serving as a positive influence. Most responses for department chairs were 'I was asked' (Coll et al., 2018, p. 8). Responses leaned toward a sense of obligation as the level of leadership decreased. Thornton et al. (2018) also found that middle-level leaders served out of a sense of duty, wanted to take on a challenge, or it kept another individual from taking the role. For those asked to serve by their dean or because the position needed to be filled, the external impact of feeling pressure impacted their decision to serve (Gmelch et al., 2017). Recent studies by Coll et al. (2018) and Thornton (2018) reflected that some were motivated to pursue a middle-level leadership role because they were asked or felt pressure to take on the role. Agreeing to the role without understanding the position or out of a sense of obligation presented challenges in leadership.

Data from the 1991 and 2016 UCEA studies showed one consistent internal reason over 15 years that faculty chose to serve as middle-level leaders: to advance themselves or their departments (Gmelch et al., 2017). Data from Freeman et al. (2020), UCEA (Gmelch et al., 2017), and Cervino (2018) studies supported personal career goals, advancement for self, and out-of-service to the department as factors that continued to motivate faculty to pursue leadership roles.

It was questioned whether some faculty opted to pursue middle-level leadership

positions to avoid faculty responsibilities or because of concerns over research and scholarship productivity in their quest for tenure (Backes-Gellner et al., 2018). The empirical analysis of a dataset of deans in Austria and Germany examined the research productivity rates of deans before they served to see if low publication rates motivated some to pursue leadership roles. The study concluded that lower publication rates were not a factor for younger or older deans when they entered their leadership roles (Backes-Gellner et al., 2018).

Concerns Over Leadership

Halonen and Dunn (2017) noted multiple factors that may have negatively impacted a faculty member's interest in middle-level leadership, which included low monetary compensation for the job, a lack of clarity on what the position entailed, the expectations of the person in the leadership role, and some felt unprepared for the role, especially if they had no prior leadership opportunities. According to Weaver et al.'s (2019) study on department chairs, participants expressed concern over the negative impact serving in a middle-level leadership role had on their research activity. Half of the participants were not satisfied with the amount of time allocated for continuing their research while they served as chair, and 94% indicated they were very unlikely or unlikely to pursue the department chair position if there were no time permitted for research activity (Weaver et al., 2019, p. 180). Studies by Bryman and Lilly (2009) and Scott et al. (2008) found that some faculty did not consider middle-level leadership roles because they did not want to deal with noncollegial behavior, and that according to

Pepper and Giles (2015), many in middle-level leadership cited this as their biggest challenge. Finally, concerns over the amount of time spent dealing with bureaucratic issues may also have decreased pursuits of middle-level leadership positions (Halonen & Dunn, 2017).

Retention of Middle-Level Leaders

Two factors that contributed to leaving the middle-level leadership role were high stress and low satisfaction (Gmelch & Burns, 1994; Wolverton et al., 1999). Out of the 1,515 participants in the Morris and Laipple (2015a) study, approximately 75% of participants had lost some level of interest in their job since they took on the position, and some cited high job demands and interference with family and health as factors. Most of the chairs in Freeman et al.'s (2020) study planned to return to their faculty role after they served as chairs. These roles, where individuals continued to serve as faculty in some capacity while they served in leadership or where faculty moved to leadership and transitioned back to faculty, have caused challenges in role identity where individuals did not see themselves as belonging to faculty or administrators (Freeman et al., 2020).

In the 2018 Thornton et al. study, participants found the job very satisfying (12%) or satisfying (56%) because they felt they had helped others reach their goals and had positively impacted the work environment. The overwhelming reasons for those leaders who remained in their middle-level leadership position were because they felt they were making a difference and helped the department move in a good direction (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2018). Middle-level administrators often equated their satisfaction in their

leadership role with their ability to help others and feeling like they made a difference (Pepper & Giles, 2015). Scott et al. (2008) surveyed middle-level leaders and found that helping faculty reach their goals, managing resources, and improving teaching and learning contributed to the leaders' satisfaction (Pepper & Giles, 2015). However, those interested in remaining in the position stated that dealing with difficult faculty was their biggest challenge (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2018).

Like findings from the Armstrong and Woloshyn (2017) study, Dean et al. (2021) found that chairs identified specific rewarding experiences from their leadership role. These included personal growth and development, making a difference in the department, and building community across the institution. Despite the challenges in the position, most participants in the Gmelch et al. (2017) study and the Dean et al. (2021) study indicated they would take on the role again if asked.

Current Gaps in the Literature

Much literature exists on the role and definition of the academic dean as a middle-level leadership role with numerous challenges. Despite the majority of decisions in higher education are made at the department level, much less literature existed on the role and expectations of departmental leaders (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2017). Concerns over the lack of preparation of middle-level leaders before entering their roles were abundant and noted as an area needing more attention in the research on middle-level leaders. These leaders were generally untrained (Flaherty, 2016), and most did not receive any formal preparation to prepare them for their roles (Freeman et al., 2020). Continued focus on

middle-level leader preparation and their experiences is needed since most decisions are made at this level. Weaver et al. (2019) suggested that one area to improve in the research was to look at current department chairs and examine the specific areas they felt under-prepared and needed more training and knowledge. This would allow individual departments to examine departmental and leadership needs and offer meaningful and relevant training and development for future chairs.

In addition, higher education has undergone rapid change in recent years, and studies on department chairs have not kept up with the experiences of these leaders (Weaver et al., 2019). Riley and Russell (2013) posited that those currently serving as department chairs were in a much more complicated role than their peers from ten years ago (Weaver et al., 2019). Chairs needed different skills and held different responsibilities and expectations than those used primarily in their faculty role, and their leadership responsibilities varied from prior leaders (Weaver et al., 2019).

Productivity among departments and within institutions continued to be a high priority in higher education and an expected focus for middle-level leaders (Floyd, 2016). There was a need for research on best leadership practices for fine arts middle-level leaders, especially when higher administration is focused on making each program productive (Filippelli & Clements, 2019). While more study is needed on the preparation and experiences of middle-level leaders and how those impact productivity and job satisfaction, very little literature exists on the experiences, challenges, and other factors that impact the job satisfaction of middle-level leaders in large schools of music.

Additionally, little literature exists on the specific needs and experiences of middle-level leaders in music, the challenges they face in moving from faculty to administrative ranks, unique challenges in placing their research and creative activity (which is often performance-based) on hold while serving in the leadership role, adapting from the role of performer/musician to administrator, and how these impact job satisfaction and retention. While music conductors are often referenced as examples of leaders, few studies have been done on the leadership of conductors (Carnicer et al., 2015). The conductor played the dual role of teacher/director/leader and mediator, dependent upon the setting of rehearsal or concert performance (Carnicer et al., 2015). Studies existed on middle-level academic leaders in education, nursing, and business (Sayler et al., 2017) and issues of selection and appointment routes, challenges, distributions of time, and impacts on personal and professional agendas. More information is needed on the leadership experiences of those in the fine arts, and the research questions in this study have not yet been asked. With performance as a common medium for research and scholarship, time spent in collaborative activities (ensembles) before taking on the leadership role, and the role differentiation between performing as a musician and serving as a leader, how do middle-level leaders in fine arts experiences compare with middle-level leaders in other fields?

Theoretical Considerations

Middle-level leadership is a complex and ambiguous role in higher education. An examination of the appointment, selection, roles, and experiences of middle-level leaders

in NASM (National Association of Schools of Music) affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors will be conducted in this study. NASM is an accrediting agency of approximately 633 schools, conservatories, colleges, and universities (NASM, 2023). Reference point theory (RPT) may offer an understanding of the selection and appointment of middle-level leaders in higher education when looking at gender and the method of entry of reporting leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions. RPT is rooted in the premise that when people made difficult choices, they pulled from their prior experiences and observations of others and formed reference points in making those decisions (Harvey et al., 2013). Charles (1989) added that the political nature of the decision-making process among organizations in hiring leaders often involved a selected committee making difficult decisions in narrowing down applicant pools by eliminating those less qualified on paper and retaining those most qualified.

Harvey et al. noted that when considering RPT and candidate selection through a strategic management lens, individuals serving on hiring committees for the first time and making complex decisions of narrowing down an applicant pool or choosing the best candidate will lack reference points compared to those with more experience in serving on such committees and having more experience with the process itself or the roles of the position being filled. Lee Bolman and Terry Deal, researchers in the field of leadership and authors of the four-frame leadership model as described in their book *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership (1991),* stated that leaders needed to consider organizational issues through four perspectives or frames. Bolman and Deal's

frames were similar to Harvey et al.'s reference points. Leaders who chose only to use one repeated frame, a habitual frame, or a frame of reference were less effective than those who chose to use all four frames or lenses to see the broad picture and determine if one or more lenses would be best for that issue. Bolman and Deal (1997) voiced concerns over the vacillation in academic leadership and leader responsibilities in higher education and a lack of decision-making experiences and reference points for those deciding to appoint new leadership.

The theory of liminality and the theory of double-consciousness may be applied to the experiences, including roles, time spent, challenges, and job satisfaction of middle-level leaders. Liminality, authored by Arnold van Gennep (1960), is applied in studying people's transitions in life and their communities. Van Gennep's theory marked the change process through separation, liminality or margin, and incorporation phases. Turner (1969) built upon the second phase, liminality, and described this phase as being between two assigned positions or roles. Findings from recent studies (Cervino, 2018; Freeman et al., 2020; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Rhodes & Lees, 2016) supported that middle-level leaders navigated "in-between" roles (Freeman et al., 2020, p. 896). DuBois (1903) first applied the term double consciousness to individuals living in the United States who identified as American and African and held their identity within both cultures. Double identity or double consciousness may be applied to middle-level leaders serving as administrators and continuing to hold faculty responsibilities.

Based on considering the theory of liminality and theory of double consciousness

in the present study, we might expect the findings from participant responses to Research Questions 3-5 in the qualitative portion of the study to support leaders' distribution of time, continued responsibilities in teaching and research/creative activities, or identity as influential factors on job satisfaction.

Summary

Chapter 2 offered an extensive literature overview on middle-level leadership in higher education. The literature was examined in two broad categories of the middle-level leadership role and the experiences of those serving as middle-level leaders. Challenges, including a lack of preparation, gender gaps, unclear expectations of leaders among stakeholders, stressors of distribution of time and impacts on research and leader effectiveness, and personal issues in dealing with non-collegial faculty and issues with identity emerged as common factors on job satisfaction and retention. Additionally, gaps in the existing literature were noted, particularly in middle-level leadership in fine arts.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

This study focused on relationships between genders, methods of entry into leadership positions, and reports of time distribution, along with other factors that impacted the creative activities, music identity, and job satisfaction of middle-level leaders serving in NASM (National Associate Schools of Music) affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors. Methods of entry included appointment by administration and elected by faculty. Categories for reported time distribution included teaching, research/creative activities, administrative matters, service, and fundraising. NASM is an accrediting agency of approximately 633 schools, conservatories, colleges, and universities (NASM, 2023). Accreditation is awarded to the institution, not the music department or school. Public institutions of interest for this study were those with 401+ music majors.

This chapter includes the research procedures and methods used in the mixed methods study. Chapter 3 is organized in the following order: research problem, research questions, research design, research method, research instrument, research sample, research analysis, research procedures, and a summary.

Research Problem

Middle-level leaders in academia played a key role in the productivity and success of departments and the institution (English & Kramer, 2017) and navigated complex

challenges unique to this leadership level. Challenges have included a lack of preparation and training for the job (Gmelch et al., 2017), functioning in a role that often holds unclear expectations, and having the necessary managerial and administrative skills to be effective (Armstrong & Woloshyn, 2017; Cleverly-Thompson, 2016; Gonaim, 2016; Kruse, 2022). Other challenges have included awareness of changes in time distribution in a middle-level leadership role (Hinson-Hasty, 2019), time-consuming interpersonal issues (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2017; Wolverton et al., 2005), overwhelming workloads (Henk et al., 2021), too little time allotted for research and creative activity (Weaver et al., 2019), and identity issues (Armstrong & Wolverton, 2017; Freeman et al., 2020; Wolverton et al., 2005). Wolverton et al. (2005) added that middle-level leaders struggled with identity as they maintained dual roles as managers and leaders, met faculty and administrative responsibilities, and worked toward personal and professional goals. As many middle-level leaders have come directly from faculty ranks into these complex middle-leadership roles, it was worth further study on why and how leaders came into those roles. Consideration of their experiences, the contrast of time distribution from a faculty to an administrative role, and how these played a role in their job satisfaction and professional agendas may be essential factors in the retention of effective middle-level leaders and the productivity of departments.

Research Questions

In this study, the following research questions were addressed:

1. Research Question 1 (RQ1): What is the relationship between gender and method

of entry into their middle-level leadership positions of reporting leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors?

2. Research Question 2 (RQ2): What is the relationship between the reported distribution of time and the method of entry into their middle-level leadership positions of reporting leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors?

3. Research Question 3 (RQ3): Given the proportional form of the reported time use categories, how do these categories contribute or detract from job satisfaction?

4. Research Question 4 (RQ4): How does the execution of your leadership responsibilities impact the progress of your professional agenda?

5. Research Question 5 (RQ5): What responsibilities other than those captured by the HEADS Music Data Survey might be identified as contributors to job satisfaction?

Research Questions 1 and 2 were addressed in the quantitative analysis portion of this study. Research Questions 3-5 served more as triggers for discussion rather than questions that could be interpreted as an oral survey. Research Questions 3-5 were addressed with the responses generated in a panel discussion based on Rajoo's (2022) model (see Appendix C) among representative middle-level leaders from NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors.

Research Design

The research design was an explanatory sequential mixed methods study.

Through an explanatory sequential mixed methods design, an analysis of the quantitative data was conducted first. Further explanation through qualitative methodology built upon the findings of the quantitative data. Creswell and Creswell (2018) added that this method is explanatory because the quantitative first phase is explained further by the qualitative second phase. The method was sequential because the qualitative phase followed the quantitative phase. The advantage of this design was that the qualitative analysis offered further detail to the quantitative results and depth of understanding of the research problem.

The first part of the design for this study entailed a non-experimental quantitative phase to answer the first two research questions using SPSS/Laerd's statistics software to gain information on the relationships between methods of entry among leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors in 2020-2021. Data from the 2020-2021 Survey, Section V: Music Administrative Personnel and Procedures, items 1-2, 5, and 9, were analyzed to address the first two research questions (see Appendix B).

The second part of the design for this study entailed a qualitative phase to answer the last three research questions and offered further context to the first two research questions using research participant responses. Open-ended questions were used in a panel discussion with four participants who serve as leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors. The panel discussion was based on Rajoo's (2022) model with specific questions generated from the HEADS Music Data Survey results, Section V: Music Administrative Personnel and Procedures analyses of items 1-2, 5, and

9 (see Appendix C). One example of a question generated from the Survey analysis asked panel participants how their distribution of time toward teaching related to that of their peers. The purpose of the panel discussion was to gather viewpoints and opinions from participants to explain the quantitative survey data further and offer a deeper understanding of the research problem.

The explanatory sequential mixed methods design examined the experiences of middle-level leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors for relationships between a leader's method of entry into their middle-level leadership positions and method of entry and reported distribution of time within their role; how time distribution and other factors impacted their job satisfaction; and how leaders' professional agendas were impacted by their middle-level leadership responsibilities. Quantitative analyses of relationships between gender and method of entry were conducted, followed by quantitative analyses of relationships between the reported distribution of time and the method of entry. Findings from the analyses of data collected to answer Research Questions 1 and 2 were shared with selected study participants in the qualitative phase. Participants were asked to respond to the findings from the quantitative analyses and offer further perspective and insight on their experiences related to Research Questions 3-5.

Variables

Variables included in this study were categorical and were treated as independent. Categorical variables may be nominal, ordinal, or dichotomous (Laerd, 2012).

Respondents have self-assigned themselves to each of the groups. One variable was gender. The gender variable included two categorical, independent male and female groups. The other variables were the method of entry and time distribution. The method of entry variable included four non-discrete categories:

- Appointed by administration

- Not appointed by administration

- Elected by faculty

- Not elected by faculty

The time spent variable included five categories:

- Teaching

- Research/creative activities

- Administrative matters

- Service

- Fundraising

Respondents self-reported the percentage of their time spent on each of the five categories, with total percentages expected to equal 100%. The gender and method of entry variables applied to RQ1. The method of entry and time spent variables applied to RQ2.

Research Method

Research methods included a two-phase study of collecting quantitative data from the self-reported HEADS Music Data Survey 2020-2021 (Survey) of the 49 public

institutions with 401+ music majors and then conducting a panel discussion with selected

participants serving as middle-level leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with

401+ music majors. Quantitative data from the Survey are unpublished to the general

public and only available to the general public in summary form on the NASM website.

The quantitative data needed from the Survey were the responses to items 1-2, 5, and 9 in

Section V.A. on Music Executives (Appendix B). This data was obtained by contacting

the HEADS data manager. All 49 Survey responses for Section V.A. were requested due

to the small total population size. The data requested were individual responses from

middle-level leaders of the 49 institutions to items from Section V.A. in the study. Items

1-2, 5, and 9 from Section V.A. related to the research questions in this study. The

Survey is completed annually by music leaders in private and public

NASM-affiliated institutions with music majors. It can be completed between November

1 and January 31 of each year.

In the qualitative phase, respondents were invited to participate in a panel

discussion conducted via Zoom. A selection of four participants comprised the

representative panel. A smaller group size allowed the researcher to use a naturalistic

method of inquiry to understand the real-world issues and meanings participants have

with events and whatever emerges from the qualitative setting and interaction (Roberts &

Hyatt, 2019). Open-ended research questions allowed participants to respond using their

own words rather than predetermined responses (Albudaiwi, 2017). Rajoo's (2022)

interview model was used (Appendix C). Qualitative research questions focused on how

leaders from NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors in 2020-2021 came into their middle-level leadership roles, how they spent their time, and how their experiences compared with the collected data. Composite data from gender, method of entry, and time spent categories were shared with participants. They were asked to comment on that data and how the reality of their time expenditure aligned with their job satisfaction. Additional questions focused on experiences that have impacted their success as middle-level leaders and the perceived impacts of their leadership role on their research/creative activities and music identity. Analyzing the quantitative and qualitative phases offered a rich understanding of the perspectives and experiences of middle-level music leaders from NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors.

Role and Reflexivity of the Researcher

Qualitative research entails interpretative research, often with the researcher interacting with the participants (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Strategic, ethical, and personal considerations must be considered when conducting qualitative research (Locke et al., 2013), and biases, values, and personal backgrounds that impact the researcher's interpretations made during the study should be identified (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). In this study, the researcher acknowledged their professional background as a current faculty member in a NASM-affiliated public institution with 401+ music majors and former faculty member in NASM-affiliated public institutions with smaller sizes in other parts of the United States. One of the study's institutions is the researcher's place of employment. To avoid backyard research (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992) of studying the

researcher's work setting (Creswell & Creswell, 2018), the researcher disclosed her place of employment with the participants and informed participants that identifying information would not be disclosed in the publication of the study.

Research Instrument

The quantitative research instrument was the HEADS Music Data Survey 2020-2021, administered to middle-level leaders of NASM-affiliated institutions. The producing organization of the data used in this study was the HEADS Project. This organization served over 1,249 institutions in 2019-2020, with 625 coming from schools of music (NASM). HEADS serves the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), the National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST), and the National Association of Schools of Dance (NASD). The Project began in 1982, and accredited institutional members of NASM, NASAD, NAST, and NASD must participate each year by submitting an annual self-study survey document. This annual survey is referred to as the HEADS Music Data Survey.

The HEADS Project is a system that collects and reports annual self-reported data from Surveys. It compiles them into HEADS Music Data Summaries, released every spring. The HEADS Music Data Summary is available to all institutional members of NASM as a resource for comparison and analysis among institutions. The HEADS Music Data Summary for 2020-2021 included the compiled data from all Surveys completed by music leaders in public and private NASM-affiliated institutions. Data for the HEADS

Music Data Summary is shared in charts and organized in the same order as in the

Survey. The Summary data are disaggregated by public and private institutions and

divided by the institution's size based on the number of music majors. Size categories for

public institutions include 1-100 music majors; 101-20 music majors; 201-400 music

majors; and 401+ music majors. The size category with 401+ music majors is the largest

music major population. Unlike the other size categories with concrete numbers on both

ends, it is unknown what the top number of music majors in this category or sub-section

is. Size categories for private institutions include 1-50 music majors; 51-100 music

majors; 101-200 music majors; and 201+ music majors. Each of these categories is a sub-

section of the NASM-affiliated institutions.

Only the Surveys administered to the middle-level leaders of the sub-section of 49

NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors were used in this study.

Every school of music in this sub-section of the NASM-affiliated public institutions

submitted the Survey. The collection of all 49 Survey data on music executives or leaders

allowed for a total enumeration count of this sub-section of the NASM-affiliated

institutions. The comprehensive information collected by the Surveys included self-

reported statistical information on multiple areas, including the appointment route of

middle-level leaders, ethnicity of faculty and students, faculty salaries, degrees offered,

operational budgets, administrative process, student enrollment, degrees offered, and

gender of faculty. The Survey was divided into seven sections, including Section I:

General Institutional Information; Section II: Music Enrollment; Section III: Instructional

Service; Section IV: Music Faculty and Instructional Staff; Section V: Music

Administrative Personnel and Procedures; Section VI: Direct or Allocated Expenditures

and Income; and Appendix: Demographic Survey of Doctoral Degree Students.

Additionally, the Survey requested general information and actual instructional,

operational, and performance expenses for each academic year. Section V.A. was the

only section specific to music executives. Section V.A. included a total of 10 items. Items

in this section of the Survey asked about the executive's method of appointment,

evaluation term, distribution of time, title, salary, number of months for the salary base,

gender, and teaching load. The Surveys are to be completed between November 1 and

January 31 by the leader of the music school or department (termed *music executive* in

the Survey). Institutional leaders are notified via email each year when the Survey

becomes available. Leaders of each HEADS area (music, art/design, theatre, dance) in

affiliated institutions are given a username and password or may use the username and

password from a previous year. Once logged in, leaders of each HEADS area select the

annual Survey to complete.

For this study, data collected from items 1-2, 5, and 9 of Section V.A. in the self-

reported Survey were used to answer Research Questions 1 and 2. Question 1 asked the

music executive (leader) if they were appointed by administration/Board of Trustees.

Responses included Y and N. Question 2 asked the music executive if they were elected

by faculty. Responses included Y and N. Question 5 asked music executives to indicate

the percentage of time spent on teaching, research/creative activities, administrative

matters, service, and fundraising. Percentages must have equaled 100%. Question 9 asked

music executives about their gender. Responses included male and female.

A total enumeration of the population was used, and data from Section V.A. of all

49 Surveys were requested. While the annual HEADS Music Data Summaries and

updated lists of NASM-affiliated public and private institutions in each size category are

publicly available on the NASM webpage, including the 2020-2021 HEADS Music Data

Summary, the Survey instrument and individual data from the Surveys are not. Following

IRB approval, a request for this data was made to the data manager of the HEADS

Project. Identifying information on the 49 public institutions was not requested to protect

the identity of each institution with the data, and institutions were labeled 1-49. The

individual data collected from items 1-2, 5, and 9 (see Appendix B) from the 49 Surveys

in Section V.A: Music Executives answered Research Questions 1 and 2.

Self-Reported Surveys

Self-reports may be valuable in descriptive studies when the intent is to describe

demographic variables or experiences or identify differences between groups (Lodico et

al., 2010). Salters-Pedneault (2022) noted several advantages of self-reported data,

including cost-efficiency and time-efficiency on behalf of the researcher as opposed to

observing individuals over time. Warner et al. (2011) added that self-reports may hold

more truthful responses when participants know their information will remain

anonymous. Salters-Pedneault mentioned the limitations of self-reports for the

participants' roles and the survey's structure. For participants, responses may include

individual biases; they may desire to report what is socially preferred rather than what is most truthful and have difficulty or inability to accurately self-assess. For the Survey, how the participants interpret or understand the items, the restrictive nature of how participants may be asked to respond (Y or N only, for example), and if the researcher selected a representative sample of the population of research interest will all impact the veracity of the self-reported survey (Salters-Pedneault, 2022).

The data collection method for the qualitative second phase of this study was a semi-structured panel discussion with participants who serve as leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors. Semi-structured interviews in the form of a panel discussion were beneficial in addressing the research questions created before the discussion. The structure of Research Questions 3-5 was open-ended, allowing participants to respond and offer a variety of responses. Data were obtained from participants' responses to Research Questions 3-5 in a synchronous video and audio-recorded panel discussion. The panel discussion involved a group of four participants selected from the music leaders of the 49 institutions in the study and the facilitator. The researcher acted as the facilitator. Each music leader of the 49 institutions was emailed and invited to participate in the panel discussion. If more than 8 leaders responded, a proportional group would be identified by the results of a https://randomizer.org run. Five leaders expressed interest and availability; therefore, convenience sampling was used rather than random sampling. The Zoom online platform was used. Participants could interact, and the discussion was recorded for transcription and coding.

Validity and Reliability

The validity criterion of a quantitative instrument determines if the instrument measures what it is designed to measure and, thus, if the instrument is of value (Lodico et al., 2010). For this study, results from a self-reported survey were used as the quantitative instrument. Self-reported surveys depended on face validity, which according to Lodico et al., meant the instrument appeared to be measuring what it was designed to measure. This meant that when examining the data from the HEADS Music Data Summary Report, it appeared that the questions asked were designed to fit the purpose of the Survey, which was to gain descriptive information on individual institutions affiliated with NASM. The Survey researchers did not manipulate the data. The researchers only collected data from the self-reported Surveys.

Panel discussions, like focus groups, allowed the researcher to observe and record participant interactions and responses to questions. A semi-structured interview protocol allowed three research questions to be asked, and probing questions were used to elicit participant responses. The discussion was recorded and transcribed verbatim to ensure the reliability of the process of collecting quantitative data. Field notes were taken on body language, expression, vocal tone, and other behavioral observations.

Sampling, the Sample, Units of Observation and Analysis

There are approximately 633 schools, conservatories, colleges, and universities currently accredited by NASM. In 2020-2021, there were 343 public institutions accredited by NASM, and these public institutions were broken into four sub-sections: 1-

100 music majors; 101-200 music majors; 201-400 music majors; and 401+ music majors. The 401+ sub-section was made up of 49 institutions. The total population or total enumeration was used for the quantitative phase of the study rather than sampling. This purposeful technique allowed the researcher to examine the entire population of a group with a specific set of characteristics (Laerd, 2012). The units were self-reported Surveys from middle-level leaders of NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors. The instrument used was the Surveys, specifically Section V.A., from leaders of the 49 NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors in 2020-2021. The shared experience was individuals serving as middle-level leaders in a NASM-affiliated public institution with 401+ music majors. Their different experiences and characteristics included appointment route, gender, and reported distribution of time. According to Laerd (2012), total population or enumeration is beneficial when examining relatively small populations, as found in this size of 49. The institutions included in the total enumeration are listed (see Appendix A).

Participants for the qualitative second phase of the study were middle-level leaders who serve as music executives in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors. A multistage design was used for the qualitative phase of the study. In the first stage of the qualitative phase of this study, the HEADS Music Data Summary 2020-2021 was used to identify the 49 public institutions with 401+ music majors (see Appendix A). The researcher obtained the names and email addresses of the leaders of the schools of music in the 49 institutions following IRB approval. The researcher

searched for each institution's music director/executive online by looking at each institution's school of music/department webpage (see Appendix A). This was the second stage of the design. Each of these individuals was contacted via email about the study and invited to participate in a panel discussion via Zoom. They were informed that their names would not be published in the study. The Zoom platform assisted in the ease of bringing participants together despite distance issues among institutions. For the third stage, a panel discussion included four individuals. If more than 8 leaders responded, a proportional group would have been identified by the results of a https://randomizer.org run.

Focus groups or panel discussions allowed for unstructured and open-ended questions in that participants can share their perspectives and experiences (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Sharing the same role as a leader of a large school of music and participating in a panel discussion facilitated by a researcher working in a school of music may have put participants at ease. Each participant was allowed to describe or compare their appointment route, role, and time spent in responsibilities of their current position to help build connections between participants and offer context of the data for the researcher. Panel participants were also invited to share how they distributed their time and other factors that contributed to or detracted from their job satisfaction. Probing questions such as "Tell me more about.." and "Did anyone have a similar or different experience?" were beneficial to elicit further perspectives and responses. In this study, all participants were currently serving as the leader of a school of music, and their

experiences and attitudes related to their jobs and the findings from the quantitative

analysis offered a richer understanding of the research problem.

Using interviews as a qualitative data collection type offers several options,

including focus groups or panel discussions. In a panel discussion, the researcher can ask

questions to the entire group of participants. One advantage of panel discussions is the

researcher's control over the questioning and setting (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). For

this study, Zoom was the chosen platform for the panel discussions, offering another

advantage when distance was a concern for face-to-face interaction with participants.

Limitations of the Zoom panel discussion included differences in how participants

articulated and perceived information, the potential that the researcher's presence would

bias how participants responded to questions and one another, and the online platform

was not a natural, face-to-face, traditional setting.

Methods of Analysis of Findings

The quantitative data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 27)

predictive analysis software. A Cramér's V was used to analyze data related to Research

Question 1. The Cramér's V, a chi-square based test, is used to examine the association

between two categorical variables (Bhatt, 2022). The test determined any association

between the categorical variables of gender and method of entry among middle-level

leaders of NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors, measured at the

nominal level. An assumption for Cramér's V is that the two variables, gender, and

method of entry, are categorical (IBM, 2023).

One independent variable, gender, was measured at the dichotomous level, with female and male as the two categories. There was another independent variable, method of entry, and two categorical groups. These categorical groups included those appointed by administration and not appointed by administration (elected by faculty).

A Pearson's product-moment correlation (Pearson's *r*) was used to analyze data related to Research Question 2. One purpose of Pearson's *r* test was to determine the strength and direction of a linear relationship between continuous variables (Laerd Statistics, 2023). In this study, Pearson's *r* was used to determine the strength of association between the distribution of time categories and the method of entry of middle-level leaders of NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors.

Assumptions defined by Laerd (2016) for the Pearson's *r* test were two variables measured on a continuous scale (at the ratio or interval level). For RQ2, one variable, reported distribution of time (with five categorical groups: teaching, research/creative activities, service, fundraising, and administrative matters), and a second variable, method of entry (with two categorical groups: appointed by administration, not appointed by administration) were measured on a continuous scale. A second assumption was that each respondent had a value for each continuous variable. Assumptions 3, 4, and 5 were the presence of a linear relationship between the two continuous variables; there were no significant outliers; and there should be bivariate normality (Laerd, 2016).

Data collected from the Surveys and used for the analysis of Research Questions 1 and 2 came from self-reported surveys completed by each middle-level leader of the 49

NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors. Data collected from the panel discussion with middle-level leaders who represented the leaders of the 49 NASM-affiliated public institutions were used for the analysis of Research Questions 3-5.

Data analysis of the qualitative phase of the study included five steps outlined by Creswell and Creswell (2018). First, the panel discussion via the Zoom platform was recorded and transcribed, two essential components of narrative analysis (Riessman, 1993). Based on Riessman's 1993 model, a first draft transcription included words and other "striking features" of the discussion; a second draft re-transcribed isolated sections for detailed analysis (p. 56). Participants' responses, researcher notes, and questions were separated using the online software www.delvetool.com. Next, data were analyzed for themes, general ideas, and usefulness.

In the third step, the coding process involved organizing the data into chunks or segments and then writing one word to represent the segments (Rossman & Rallis, 2012). A mix of deductive and inductive methods was beneficial in coding responses to Research Questions 3-5 and data collected from the panel discussion. Coding was then used to describe the people, the setting, and the events, and themes helped describe the experiences or problems (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Emergent themes and broad categories were identified, and connections were made between the codes. A narrative analysis communicated the findings of the qualitative data analysis. According to Huberman (1984), narrative analysis is the most common method of communicating qualitative research findings. Finally, findings from the quantitative analyses phase and

participants' responses and findings from the qualitative phase were integrated into narrative form. Qualitative data analysis and coding software such as Delvetool helped ensure accuracy in coding the transcriptions of the panel discussion. The validity of the analysis and conclusions was shared.

Validation of the narrative analysis and interpretation was provided by Riessman's (1993) suggestions of "(a) describing how the interpretations were produced, (b) making visible what we did, (c) specifying how we accomplished successive transformations, and (d) making primary data available to other researchers" (p. 68). Excerpts and coded representations were included in the study. The narrative analysis approach was useful for studies with small numbers which the researcher can observe (Riessman, 1993). Based on Riessman's model, discussions with the panel participants provided diverse representations and variations for comparison with theories. Using narrative analysis allowed the study of participants' experiences and meanings.

Ethical Safeguards, Issues, and Considerations

Ethical safeguards were put in place to help protect the identity of participants. Institutions among the 49 in the study were assigned a random number (1-49) before the researcher received the data, and the names of institutions were not connected with specific data. Leaders of the 49 institutions were individually emailed, informed of the study, and invited to participate. Those participating were expected to engage in the panel discussion via Zoom with their camera on. While participants were able to introduce themselves in the panel discussion, the names of participants and their institutions were

not used in the printed study. Instead, pseudonyms were used.

Efforts to establish and maintain trust with the panel participants were made. Guidelines and expectations outlined by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) were reviewed and followed to ensure that the researcher's actions were ethical. The IRB-required approval was obtained before collecting and analyzing data related to the research questions and interacting with individuals via email or Zoom.

Research Procedures

Multiple methods were used to examine the methods of entry, time distribution, and job satisfaction among male and female middle-level leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors in 2020-2021. An explanatory sequential mixed methods design was used in this study. This design involved two phases of collecting data.

In the quantitative phase, data from the 49 Surveys from 2020-2021, Section V.A., items 1, 2, 5, and 9 were extracted and analyzed to address Research Questions 1 and 2. The 49 Surveys were the self-reported surveys of the 49 NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors. First, IRB approval for using human subjects for the panel discussion was sought through the institution's IRB process. Following IRB approval, a request for the 49 public institutions with 401+ music majors' individual Survey responses to Section V.A., items 1, 2, 5, and 9 was made to the data manager of the HEADS Project. The researcher used the public data available on the HEADS Music Data Summary report for 2020-2021 to determine Survey items of interest. Identifying

information on the 49 public institutions was not requested to protect the identity of each

institution with the data, and institutions were labeled 1-49. Responses to Survey item 9

(gender) included two options, male and female. Responses to Survey item 1 (appointed

by administration/Board of Trustees) included two options, Y and N. Responses to

Survey item 2 (elected by faculty) included two options, Y and N. Data collected from

the self-reported responses to Section V.A., items 9, 1, and 2 were analyzed for any

statistically significant relationship between gender and method of entry through a

Cramér's $\mathcal{V}$. This related to RQ 1.

Responses to Survey item 5 (percentage of time spent on teaching,

research/creative activities, administrative matters, service, and fundraising) included

percentages of time spent on each of the five categories listed in the Survey. Percentages

per individual totaled 100%. Data collected from the responses to Survey items 5, 1, and

2 were analyzed for the relationship and strength of association between the reported

distribution of time and method of entry through a Pearson's r test. This related to RQ2.

Next, the names of the music executives (leaders) in each of the 49 NASM-

affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors in 2020-2021 and their email

addresses were collected through an internet search by the researcher. All 49 music

executives (leaders) were emailed to inform them of the study and invite them to

participate in a panel discussion via Zoom. From those interested in participating, a

representative panel of four leaders participated in a semi-structured discussion.

Participants were notified and sent a Zoom link for the panel discussion. At the start of

the Zoom discussion, Rajoo's (2022) five preamble suggestions were used. Zoom video

and audio recording and Zoom transcription began. Research questions 3-5 were asked to

panel participants. Table information was shared with panelists because, as participants in

the original HEADS Music Data Survey, they only had access to the summary data

published by the organization. Panelists were asked to review the table information and

react to what it revealed. The table information included summary data only from

participants from NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors.

Participants described and shared their perspectives and experiences in comparison with

the data collected from RQs 1 and 2 and with one another.

The qualitative phase of data collection and analysis involved multiple steps

involving manual and coding software. First, the panel discussion was recorded via Zoom

and transcribed through Cockatoo auto-transcription software purchased by the

researcher. Manual, verbatim transcription was conducted by the researcher by listening

to the video recording. The first draft of transcription included the words and other

features of the discussion; a second draft re-transcribed isolated sections for detailed

analysis. Participants' responses, researcher notes, and questions were separated. These

steps were done manually.

Additionally, the manual transcription of text was uploaded into Delvetool

qualitative analysis and coding software. Delvetool software helped ensure accuracy in

coding the transcriptions of the panel discussion. Next, data were analyzed for themes,

general ideas, and usefulness. Data were coded by dividing them into categories and one-

word themes or codes. Consideration of inductive and deductive methods was made based on participant responses. Combining deductive and inductive methods allowed the researcher to begin deductively with a set of codes and then inductively create new codes when going through the data. A narrative analysis communicated the findings of the qualitative data analysis. Finally, findings from the quantitative analyses phase and participants' responses, and findings from the qualitative phase narrative were integrated into a narrative form. The validity of the analysis and conclusions was shared. Data collected and analyzed from the panel discussion were used to provide more depth and understanding of the quantitative results and the research problem.

Summary

An explanatory sequential mixed methods design was a valuable means of exploring how middle-level leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors came into their roles, their experiences in their roles, and what factors impacted their job satisfaction and retention. Chapter 3 described how a quantitative analysis of data on appointment route and time spent, followed by a qualitative analysis of data obtained from participant's responses to open-ended questions on their perspectives of the data and personal experiences, were interpreted together to offer a deeper understanding of the appointment, experiences, and job satisfaction of middle-level leaders in higher education serving in schools of music. In Chapter 4, the analysis of data collected from the quantitative phase and the qualitative phase will be presented. Integrated data from both phases will also be presented. Chapter 5 includes a summary of

the study; a discussion of the findings from the data analyses; limitations and

delimitations, implications for practice and future research, limitations of

implementation, recommendations for future research, and concluding remarks.

CHAPTER IV

Findings

The current study aimed to understand how middle-level leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors come into their leadership roles. Their method of entry was examined by gender and reported time distribution (teaching, research/creative activities, service, fundraising, and administrative matters). The study used two data sources to address the five research questions and sub-questions. The first data source was the 2020-2021 Higher Education Arts Data Services (HEADS) Music Data Survey, Section V: Music Administrative Personnel and Procedures, items 1-2, 5, and 9. The second data source was responses from a panel discussion, including topics from RQs 1-2 and topics associated with RQs 3-5. Participant responses served as triggers for additional sub-questions. Chapter 4 reports the quantitative results of the statistical analyses utilizing the self-reported data collected from the Survey, and the qualitative results of the data collected from participant responses in the panel discussion.

Quantitative Analysis

The Survey data from the music leaders in the 49 NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors were analyzed. The setting was all 49 public institutions with 401+ music majors in 2020-2021. Statistical tests were parametric because there was no sampling in the data set. Quantitative, non-experimental data were

analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 27) predictive analysis software. The

method of entry variable was collapsed into two groups: appointed by

administration/Board of Trustees and elected by faculty, resulting in 39 respondents. A

Cramér's $\mathcal{V}$ was used to analyze data collected for Research Question 1. The Cramér's $\mathcal{V}$,

an effect size measurement (IBM, 2023) determined the strength of association between

the categorical variables of gender and method of entry among middle-level leaders of

NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors, measured at the nominal

level. Data collected for RQ1 related to items 1, 2, and 9 in the HEADS Music Data

Survey.

      A Pearson's product-moment correlation (Pearson's *r)* was used to analyze data

collected from the 39 respondents who were appointed by administration/Board of

Trustees or elected by faculty for Research Question 2. RQ2 was treated as an

exploratory question to better understand the relationship between how leaders

distributed their time and their method of entry. In this study, Pearson's *r* determined the

strength and direction of a linear relationship between the two variables (Kumar, 2023).

The two variables were reported distribution of time, measured in percentages, and the

method of entry of middle-level leaders of NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+

music majors. The method of entry variable was coded as appointed by administration

and a dummy variable, not appointed by administration. The dummy variable allowed the

researcher to use a numeric stand-in for a nominal variable (Garavaglia et al., 1998). Data

were extracted from items 1, 2, and 5 in the HEADS Music Data Survey (see Appendix

B). The method of entry variable was collapsed to appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or not appointed by administration/Board of Trustees, resulting in 39 respondents. The minimum enumeration size of 30 was still met.

For RQ2, five Pearson's *r* were run. Test 1 was on the 39 respondents' time distribution percentages in teaching and their method of entry. Test 2 was on the time distribution percentages in research/creative activities (RCA) and their method of entry. Test 3 was on the time distribution percentages in service and their method of entry. Test 4 was on the time distribution percentages in fundraising and their method of entry. Test 5 was on the time distribution percentages in administrative matters and their method of entry.

Research Question 1 (RQ1)

Research Question 1 (RQ1): What is the relationship between gender and method of entry into their middle-level leadership positions of reporting leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors?

Thirty-nine music executives' self-reported Survey responses to items 1, 2, and 9 were used in the quantitative portion of this study. The HEADS Music Data Survey instrument asked for a Y/N response to these Survey items:

1. Is the music executive appointed by the administration/Board of Trustees?

2. Is the music executive elected by faculty?

A total of 49 responses to Survey items 1, 2, 5, and 9 were collected for analysis. However, the results from Survey items 1 and 2 included ten responses with ambiguous

answers of Y/Y or N/N to these Survey items. A Y/Y response meant they were

appointed by the administration/Board of Trustees and elected by faculty. These

responses are included in "both", Table 1. A N/N response meant they were not

appointed by the administration/Board of Trustees nor elected by faculty. These

responses are included in "neither", Table 1. Responses of the 49 participants to Survey

items 1 and 2 are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Method of Entry Into Leadership Role of All 49 Music Leaders

	Method of Entry							
Gender	Appt. by Admin		Elected by Faculty		Both		Neither	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Male	24	58.5	7	17.1	4	9.8	6	14.6
Female	7	87.5	1	12.5	0	0	0	0

Note. Reflects the number and percentage of participants answering "yes" to Survey

items 1 and 2.

Results for Research Question 1 (RQ1)

The researcher anticipated a less wide distribution in gender among leaders of

NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors. Leaders who identified as

female represented 16.3% of the total population of leaders. Most male and female

leaders self-reported that they were appointed by administration/Board of Trustees. Only

male leaders reported that they were both appointed by administration/Board of Trustees

and elected by faculty or not appointed by administration/Board of Trustees nor elected by faculty.

The researcher opted to use a Cramér's $\mathcal{V}$ test and collapsed the method of entry variable to two groups: appointed by administration and elected by faculty. The 10 ambiguous responses in the both and neither category were not included (see Table 2).

Table 2

Crosstabulation of Collapsed Method of Entry and Gender

		Method of Entry		
		Administration	Faculty	Total
Gender	Male	24	7	31
	Female	7	1	8
Total		31	8	39

Table 3 shows the symmetric results of the Cramér's $\mathcal{V}$ test. There was a weak association between gender and method of entry of middle-level leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors (Cramér's $\mathcal{V} \neq .00$).

Table 3

Symmetric Measures for Collapsed Method of Entry and Gender (N=39)

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.101	.529
	Cramér's V	.101	.529
N of Valid Cases		39	

The second question in the quantitative phase of this study considered the method of entry variable and how middle-level leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors distributed their time. Research Question 2 was treated as an exploratory question to examine the variation in time spent on the five categories (teaching, research/creative activities, service, fundraising, and administrative matters) based on the method of entry.

Research Question 2 (RQ2)

What is the relationship between the reported distribution of time and the method of entry into their middle-level leadership positions of reporting leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors?

Responses to Survey item 5 (percentage of time spent on teaching, research/creative activities, administrative matters, service, and fundraising) included percentages of time spent on each of the five categories listed in the Survey. The Survey instructions indicated that the totaled percentages should equal 100%. Percentages per individual totaled 100% for 46 of the 49 responses. One participant's total time was 70%. A second participant's total time was 80%. A third participant's total time was 90%.

Participants were asked in items 1 and 2 of the Survey, respectively, to respond "yes" or "no" if they were appointed by administration/Board of Trustees to their leadership position and "yes" or "no" if they were elected by faculty to their leadership position. Table 4 represents the method of entry of leaders indicating they were appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or elected by faculty, and the average percentage for

each time distribution category of the NASM-affiliated leaders in public institutions with

401+ music majors (*N*=39). The data were retrieved from leaders' responses to items 1,

2, and 5 in the Survey (Section V.A.).

Table 4

Leaders' Collapsed Method of Entry and Mean Time Distribution Percentages (N=39)

Method of Entry	*n*	Teaching $\overline{x}_t$	RCA $\overline{x}_{rca}$	Service $\overline{x}_{sv}$	Fundraising $\overline{x}_{fr}$	Admin. Matters $\overline{x}_{adm}$
Admin.=Y	31	4.19	5.71	6.29	16.97	64.90
Faculty=Y	8	13.13	14.38	6.88	10.00	55.63

Note. Admin. Matters = Administrative Matters. RCA = Research/Creative

Activities.

Out of the 31 respondents that were appointed by administration/Board of

Trustees, 16 self-reported that they spent 0% of time teaching. None of the appointed

leaders reported that more than 18% of their time was spent on teaching. The elected by

faculty group had 1 self-report that they spent 0% of time teaching. None of the elected

by faculty leaders reported more than 25% of their time was spent on teaching. Based on

mean percentages for each time distribution category and method of entry category,

leaders spend the majority of their time on administrative matters and those elected by

faculty spend more time on teaching and research/creative activities (see Table 4).

While 10 of the method of entry responses were ambiguous and removed from

statistical testing, the researcher chose to include them when examining descriptive data

for each of the time distribution categories. One reason to include them was the

uncertainty of the panel participants' method of entry and the structure of RQ3, where

panelists were asked to look at the data analyzed for the quantitative phase and compare

it with their experiences. Table 5 shows the time percentages collapsed into categories for

the 39 leaders appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or elected by faculty and

time spent on teaching. Collapsing percentages into categories allowed for categorical

comparison between those appointed or elected by faculty and teaching. Over half of

those appointed by administration spent 0% of their time on teaching.

Table 5

Time % and Assigned Category for Teaching and Collapsed Method of Entry (N=39)

Time % and Assigned Category	Method of Entry	
	Administration $n = 31$	Faculty $n = 8$
0%	16	2
1-9%	8	0
10-19%	7	3
20-29%	0	3

Table 6 shows the assigned time percentage category for research/creative

activities and those either appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or elected by

faculty. Only leaders who reported they were elected by faculty spent 20% or more of

their time on research/creative activities. Nearly 30% of those appointed by

administration spent 0% of their time on research/creative activities.

Table 6

Time % and Assigned Category for RCA and Collapsed Method of Entry (N=39)

Time % and Assigned Category	Method of Entry	
	Administration $n = 31$	Faculty $n = 8$
0 %	9	1
1-9%	10	2
10-19%	12	1
20-29%	0	5
30-39%	0	1

Table 7 shows the assigned time percentage category for service and those either appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or elected by faculty. Most appointed by administration/Board of Trustees and elected by faculty leaders spent between 1% and 19% on service. Only one of the participants spent 20%-29% of their time on service.

Table 7

Time % and Assigned Category for Service and Method of Entry (N=39)

Time % and Assigned Category	Method of Entry	
	Administration $n = 31$	Faculty $n = 8$
0%	5	1
1-9%	16	3
10-19%	9	4
20-29%	1	0

Table 8 shows the assigned time percentage category for fundraising and those either appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or elected by faculty. Only leaders in the appointed by administration/Board of Trustees group spent more than 40% of their time on fundraising. Thirty-eight percent of those elected by faculty spent 0% of their time on fundraising.

Table 8

Time % and Assigned Category for Fundraising and Method of Entry (N=39)

Time % and Assigned Category	Method of Entry	
	Administration *n* = 31	Faculty *n* = 8
0%	4	3
1-9%	6	0
10-19%	6	3
20-29%	9	1
30-39%	3	1
40-49%	1	0
50-59%	2	0

Table 9 shows the assigned time percentage category for administrative matters and those either appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or elected by faculty. More leaders who reported appointed by administration/Board of Trustees as their method of entry spent at least 60% of their time on administrative matters. Most leaders in both groups reported spending at least 50% of their time on administrative matters.

Table 9

Time % and Assigned Category for Administrative Matters and Method of Entry (N=39)

Time % and Assigned Category	Method of Entry	
	Admin. $n = 31$	Faculty $n = 8$
20-29%	1	0
30-39%	0	1
40-49%	3	0
50-59%	5	3
60-69%	9	2
70-79%	5	2
80-89%	6	0
90-99%	1	0
100%	1	0

Table 10 shows the assigned time percentage category and the five time distribution categories for the 39 appointed or elected leaders. Twenty-six leaders reported spending 9% or less time on teaching, and the majority reported spending 9% or less time on research/creative activities and service. Two leaders reported spending 100% of time on administrative matters; the only category other than administrative matters that leaders reported spending at least 50% of time on was fundraising.

Table 10

Time % and Assigned Category for Time Categories for Leaders (N=39)

Time % and Assigned Category	Total Number of Leaders for each Time Category				
	Teaching	RCA	Service	Fundraising	Admin. Matters
0%	18	10	6	7	-
1-9%	8	10	19	6	-
10-19%	10	12	13	9	-
20-29%	3	-	1	10	1
30-39%	-	-	-	4	1
40-49%	-	-	-	1	3
50-59%	-	-	-	2	8
60-69%	-	-	-	-	11
70-79%	-	-	-	-	7
80-89%	-	-	-	-	6
90-99%	-	-	-	-	1
100%	-	-	-	-	2

Note. RCA = Research/Creative Activities. Admin. Matters = Administrative Matters. Cells with - represent no reported time percentages by participants.

Results for Research Question 2 (RQ2)

The variable for distribution of time has five categories: teaching, research/creative activities, service, fundraising, and administrative matters. A Pearson's r test was used for each of the categories for the strength of association between the percentage of time leaders spent for each category and their method of entry. Only the 39

responses from those appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or elected by faculty were used.

A Pearson's *r* was performed to evaluate the relationship between the 39 leaders who were appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or elected by faculty and the amount of reported time spent on teaching. There was a negative moderate relationship between the amount of reported time spent on teaching and those who were appointed by administration/Board of Trustees, *r* = (-.482).

A Pearson's *r* on the relationship between the 39 leaders who were appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or elected by faculty and the amount of reported time spent on research/creative activities showed a negative moderate relationship between the amount of reported time spent on research/creative activities and those who were appointed by administration/Board of Trustees, *r* = (-.498).

A Pearson's *r* on the relationship between the 39 leaders who were appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or elected by faculty and the amount of reported time spent on service showed a negative weak relationship between the amount of reported time spent on service and those who were appointed by administration/Board of Trustees, *r* = (-.053).

A Pearson's *r* on the relationship between the 39 leaders who were appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or elected by faculty and the amount of reported time spent on fundraising showed a positive weak relationship between the amount of reported time spent on fundraising and those who were appointed by administration/Board of

Trustees, $r = (.211)$.

A Pearson's *r* on the relationship between the 39 leaders who were appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or elected by faculty and the amount of reported time spent on administrative matters showed a positive weak relationship between the amount of reported time spent on administrative duties and those who were appointed by administration/Board of Trustees, $r = (.237)$.

Table 11

Correlation Matrix for RQ2

		MOE	Teach	RCA	Service	Fund.	Admin.
MOE	Pearson Correlation	1	-.482	-.498	-.053	.211	.237
	N	39	39	39	39	39	39
Teach	Pearson Correlation	-.482	1	.459	-.122	-.499	-.216
	N	39	39	39	39	39	39
RCA	Pearson Correlation	-.498	.459	1	.082	-.323	-.401
	N	39	39	39	39	39	39
Service	Pearson Correlation	-.053	-.122	.082	1	.289	-.565
	N	39	39	39	39	39	39
Fund.	Pearson Correlation	.211	-.499	-.323	.289	1	-.519
	N	39	39	39	39	39	39
Admin.	Pearson Correlation	.237	-.216	-.401	-.565	-.519	1
	N	39	39	39	39	39	39

Note. MOE = Method of Entry. Teach = Teaching. RCA = Research/creative activities.

Fund. = Fundraising. Admin. = Administrative matters.

Table 11 shows the correlation matrix for all five Pearson's *r* tests and includes the correlation coefficient for each of the time distribution categories and those appointed

by administration/Board of Trustees. Not appointed by administration/Board of Trustees was treated as a dummy variable. Based on the five Pearson's *r* tests, negative and positive relationships existed between leaders' method of entry and how they distributed their time.

Qualitative Analysis

Findings from the qualitative second phase of the study offered further context to the first two quantitative research questions using research participant responses during a panel discussion. Panel participants were representative middle-level leaders from NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors. The list of NASM-affiliated public institutions was found in the 2020-2021 HEADS Music Data Summary, which is available to the public. The researcher did an online search of each of the institutions' School of Music to obtain the name of the music leader and their email address. Following Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, each music leader of the 49 institutions was emailed and invited to participate in the panel discussion (see Appendix E). The researcher received a total of 11 responses (22%). Out of the 11 responses, five leaders indicated they would like to participate. Therefore, convenience sampling was used rather than random sampling. There was no need to run a https://randomizer.org to determine a proportional group with only five responses.

Work telephone numbers were obtained for the interested leaders by visiting their school of music websites. The researcher telephoned each of the five leaders to inform them they had been selected for the study. The researcher was able to speak with four of

the five interested leaders. A voicemail was left for the fifth leader. All five interested

leaders were sent the email with the consent form and Zoom link (see Appendix F and

G). Four leaders returned the consent form and participated in the Zoom panel discussion.

The fifth leader did not respond before the panel discussion but did contact the researcher

following the discussion.

Rajoo's (2022) model (see Appendix C) was used as a guide for the beginning of

the panel discussion and possible probing questions. The four participants were asked to

respond to the findings included in tables from the quantitative analyses and offer further

perspective and insight on their experiences related to Research Questions 3-5. Tables

information was viewed through a share screen option with participants during the panel

discussion. Due to the high level of conversation during the discussion, some portions of

the table information were discussed more than others.

The panel discussion took place through Zoom and was audio and video recorded

through the Zoom platform. The audio recording was uploaded into transcription

software from www.cockatoo.com. The researcher paid a service fee to use the software

to obtain the verbatim transcriptions, which were made available through a link emailed

to the researcher's Cockatoo account. The researcher then validated transcription text and

participant voice accuracy by playing the Zoom video recording while reading the

transcript. Participants' names were changed to pseudonyms (P1, P2, P3, P4) on the

transcript. A second viewing of the video recording was done to include participant

gestures, including head nods to indicate yes to others' verbal responses, smiles, and

laughs. These gestures were then included as they occurred in the researcher's printed transcript.

Deductive and inductive methods were beneficial in coding responses to Research Questions 3-5. The researcher paid for a month of service from www.delvetool.com. The transcript, including participant pseudonyms, was uploaded to the researcher's Delvetool account. The researcher used the Delvetool coding software to create and organize codes for excerpts and segments. A descriptive coding method involved the researcher coding passages according to the topic in the form of a noun (Sage Ocean, 2020.). A set of predetermined codes based on the research questions was developed. One option for researchers is to use predetermined codes based on what is being examined (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Participant responses were analyzed and collated by code words (see Table 12). Following the initial deductive coding process, a second inductive coding round was conducted. New code words were derived based on participants' responses within the transcript (see Table 12). The code words connected with the research questions and findings from studies in the literature review.

Table 12

Code Words and Occurrences

Deductive Code Words	Occurrences n	Inductive Code Words	Occurrences n
Appointed/ administration	12/18	Title	28
Elected/faculty	8/18	Organizational structure	17
Neither	5	Survey	7
Both	5	Leadership	2

Table 12 Continued

Deductive Code Words	Occurrences n	Inductive Code Words	Occurrences n
Teaching	23	Choice	25
RCA	19	Tenure/rank	9
Service	1	Strength	4
Fundraising	6	Identity	15
Administrative	22	Connection	6
Gender	1	COVID	5
Responsibilities	22	Retention	11
Satisfaction	25	Synthesize	4
Professional agendas/goals	16	Challenge	20
Other factors	15	Rewarding	3
Experiences	60		

Note. RCA = research/creative activities. Org. structure = organizational structure

Categories were identified based on the code words and research questions. Categories included method of entry, gender, distribution of time, responsibilities, survey, experiences, identity, and satisfaction (see Table 13).

Table 13

Categories and Distribution of Code Words

Category	Code Words
Method of Entry	Faculty, Administration, Neither, Both, Appointed, Elected
Gender	Gender
Responsibilities	Synthesize, Tenure/Rank, Title of Position, Organizational Structure
Survey	Survey
Experiences	Strength, Choice, Challenge, COVID
Identity	Leadership, Connection
Satisfaction	Other Factors, Retention, Professional Agendas/Goals, Rewarding
Distribution of Time	Administrative, Service, Fundraising, RCA, Teaching

Note. RCA = Research/Creative Activities

Findings related to each research question were adapted into a narrative form.

Research Question 3 (RQ3)

Given the proportional form of the reported time use categories, how do these categories contribute or detract from job satisfaction?

Panel participants viewed table information to answer RQ3. Table information from participants from NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors was shared with panelists because, as participants in the Survey, they only had access to the summary data published by the organization. They were asked to review the tables on leaders' method of entry (appointed by administration/Board of Trustees, elected by faculty, both, and neither) and their distribution of time categorical percentages in

teaching, research/creative activities, service, fundraising, and administrative matters. The researcher allowed time for participants to consider the data and respond to how their personal distribution of time in each category impacted their job satisfaction. Following the panel discussion, all responses to RQ 3 were analyzed for code words and categories (see Table 14).

Results for Research Question 3 (RQ3)

Main ideas that emerged from responses to RQ3 and one another included:

- Leaders' ability to balance time impacts their ability to spend time in the areas they enjoy most.

- Having to spend time in some less satisfying areas takes leaders' time away from areas they enjoy.

- Panel participants worked to find time to do what they enjoy, particularly regarding their research/creative activities.

- Administrative matters were described as challenging, frustrating, and rewarding.

Table 14

Code Words, Categories, and Excerpts for RQ3

Code Words	Category	Excerpts
Teaching	Satisfaction	P1: my teaching has not suffered as much as it did the first time around. I just didn't know how to balance it. much more focused on the teaching now and able to compartmentalize a little bit more
		P2: last job I chose to keep four students. Here I wouldn't. I can't do that.

Table 14 Continued

Code Words	Categories	Excerpts
		P4: there is room if you want to teach some. It just depends on what you're willing to move around
RCA	Satisfaction	P3: I can find a couple of hours to do research, easier than I can teach a Monday, Friday, 8am class or something like that. P4: I make a point to try and still be involved … because I, I love doing it. I'm playing concerts here because I love it and because also that's kind of what we do in our school, the research and creative part.
Service	Satisfaction	
Fundraising	Satisfaction	P2: administrative matters often challenge the fundraising opportunities I'd actually like to raise money administrative matters often takes time away from the creativity and the freshness that's necessary for fundraising. much happier if a larger percentage of my work were just fundraising.
Admin. Matters	Satisfaction	P3: that [COVID]opened up a lot of space for other administrative matters… we had lots of new, exciting new administrative matters P1: only negative part…is accessing all the systems at school that don't run very well. red tape and the lack of clarity and the ease of use is quite staggering... I just didn't know how to balance it. P4: administrative matters, to me, I mean NAME, those challenges that you just mentioned are, yes, in fact, very frustrating. curricular matters and things like that of how we can self-evaluate and progress and those things I find to be incredibly rewarding.
Rewarding	Satisfaction	it can…reinforce…the great things that the program's already doing other times it calls into question, like…need to… restructuring a certain cohort of classes to better meet more contemporary needs... administrative matters in that can also be difficult because…people feel differently. And so bringing those kinds of conversations to the table I think are important to see kind of where we are. And so I like that part. P3: I would agree with that (responding to P4) administrative matters is just such a broad category on the one hand, yes, the administrative matters are the most important part. it's also signing the 42 check forms and answering 37 emails from people who…their office is two degrees warmer than they'd like or whatever. and so, you know, it's both the best and the worst part of the job for me.

Note. RCA = Research/Creative Activities. Admin. Matters = Administrative Matters. Service cells are blank due to no participant comments.

Participant 1, who serves as chair of the department, served a previous term as the interim chair. The participant shared, "my teaching has not suffered as much as it did the first time around. I just didn't know how to balance it." They went on to add that they were now able to do a better job teaching because they had learned to compartmentalize the job responsibilities more.

Participant 2, who serves as the dean of the school of music, introduced the idea of choosing if or what to teach during the discussion. While the participant shared they reported 100% of their time is distributed to administrative matters, they noted that in institutions with 401+ music majors, it can be "absolutely impossible" to teach a class that meets every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday while trying to maintain fundraising responsibilities and emergency meetings, or "whatever is happening." Participant 2 said, "In my last job, I chose to keep four students. Here I wouldn't. I can't do that." Participant 4 said, "There is room if you want to teach some. It just depends on what you are willing to move around."

Participants unanimously reported they make time to continue with their research and creative activities because they enjoy it. Depending on the leaders' area of expertise, research and creative activities within the arts may include research or performance activities. Participants eluded that rank plays a role in how much research/creative activities leaders are expected to do or can choose to do. Participant 1 shared that the

former chair "had to continue to do research" because they had not been fully promoted.

Participant 4, who has been fully promoted, said their job expectation is 100%

administrative duties, but they still continue with research/creative activities because "I

love doing it…and there's a connection."

While none of the panel participants spoke about the service category on their job

satisfaction, administrative matters were where panel participants indicated a variety of

challenges and rewarding experiences. Participant 1 identified challenges in

administrative duties, including "accessing all of the systems at school that don't run very

well, the red tape and the lack of clarity and the ease of use." All other participants

nodded in agreement.

Participant 2 responded:

Administrative matters often challenge the fundraising opportunities. I actually

like to raise money, but the minutiae of the administrative matters often takes time

away from the creativity and the freshness that is necessary for fundraising. So I

would say that's probably where I see the challenge. I would be much happier if a

larger percentage of my work were just fundraising.

Participant 4 noted that the challenges mentioned by Participant 2 are

"frustrating," but added, "A lot of curricular matters and things like that of how we can

self-evaluate and progress, I find to be incredibly rewarding." The participant noted

because people feel differently, administrative matters can also be difficult. However,

Participant 4 said, "Bringing those kinds of conversations to the table are important to see

where we are, and I like that part."

Participant 3 followed with:

Because on the one hand, yes, the administrative matters are the most important

part. That's the strategic planning, the budget planning, and the thinking about

curriculum redesign and all those sorts of things. But it's also signing the 42 check

forms and answering 37 emails from people who, you know, their office is two

degrees warmer than they'd like or whatever. You know, and so, it's both the best

and the worst part of the job for me.

Research Question 4 (RQ4)

How does the execution of your leadership responsibilities impact the progress of

your professional agenda?

Panel participants viewed table information on the method of entry for leaders in

NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors and their time percentages

spent on the five time distribution categories from the Survey. For those in music, a

professional agenda includes research and also creative activities such as performing,

conducting, and composing. The researcher allowed time for participants to consider the

data and respond to how the execution of their leadership responsibilities impacted the

progress of their professional agenda. One panelist asked for clarification on the term

"professional agenda." The researcher defined the term as accomplishing what you want

or set out to do, which may include continuing in their research/creative activities,

teaching, performing, or other professional goals. This is the second question utilizing the

data collection methodology of the panel discussion. Following the panel discussion, all responses to RQ 4 were analyzed for code words and categorized (see Table 15).

Results for Research Question 4 (RQ4)

As each participant responded to RQ4, other participants demonstrated a connection and agreement with what the others said with head nods and smiles. Main ideas that emerged from responses to RQ4 and one another included:

- Leaders have less time for research/creative activities, so doing as much toward research/creative activity goals before taking on a full-time administrative role is advised.

- Due to the numerous responsibilities in an administrative role, leaders had to adapt any research and creative activities to smaller projects.

- Leaders identify as musicians, still, and make time for research/creative activities beyond their job expectations because of the benefits to their other responsibilities and overall leadership.

Table 15

Code Words, Categories, and Excerpts for RQ4

Code Word	Category	Excerpt
Admin.	Dist. of Time	P2: tapped to be chair in my first job after 3 years.
Prof. agenda/goals	Satisfaction	moved into administration…didn't get time to establish the piano career I planned… pulled aside by administration and stayed
Admin. Challenge Choice	Dist. of Time Experiences	accomplish what you want to do in your research and creative activities and teaching before you step into the administrative role

Table 15 Continued

Code Word	Category	Excerpt

Prof. agenda/goals RCA	Satisfaction	hard to go back…with things like performing
		tell colleagues trying to decide about going into
		    leadership…accomplish what they kind of set, had in mind,
		    before…total administrative

Choice	Experiences	P3: I agree with that entirely. …adjusting own expectations for myself

Prof. agenda/goals
 	
RCA
 	
Identity
	Satisfaction
	
	Leadership
		still want to be active as a musicologist, but what does that look
		    like….in this different capacity?
		Instead of writing books…shifting over to editing…smaller scale
		    projects
		I'm also a pianist. It's about picking…small attainable projects
		    versus…big recital. I'll play one piece on this one thing.
		Still want to be active in those things and a core feature of who I
		    am…

Prof. agenda/goals
 	
Admin. Synthesize
	Satisfaction
	
	Dist. of Time
		P4: I still get to perform…and go out and do these things
		    …my professional interests have kind of evolved
		The more I was doing the admin. side…I saw ways I can
		    incorporate…bringing it all together. I've tried to synthesize
		    those things…using similar skills in different ways

Challenge
 	
Choice
Prof. agenda/goals
Leadership
	Satisfaction
	Experience
	
	Identity
		P2: That's interesting because I find myself getting foggy if I haven't
		    played in a while.
		    …becomes challenging to make a decision if I haven't…I choose
		    the project I want to do
		    …last year I played a recital…my leadership was much smoother
		    and more facile while I was playing.
		I sort of put it away and moved on to other things…it becomes
		    more matter-of fact and less artistically influenced.
		    …really effective when it can become artistically or scholarly
		    connection to what we originally came…to do.

Connection
 	
Rewarding
	Identity
	
	Satisfaction
		P4: It (RCA) helps, it maintains a firmer rooting in…faculty teaching
		    and student learning experiences…a meaningful experience
		    for me.

Choice
 	
Prof. agenda/goals
	Experiences
	
	Satisfaction
		P2: I just have to make the time every day.
		I just make it a priority every day.
		    …can't think about the admin. stuff while I'm doing it….Yeah, I
		    don't have that. Some people can switch on and off. I just
		    don't have those chops.

Note. Dist. of Time = Distribution of Time. RCA = Research/Creative Activities. Prof. agenda/goals = Professional agenda/goals

Participant 2 responded that they wanted to speak on this question because they were "tapped to be chair" after three years in higher education and has experienced the challenge of balancing responsibilities with identity and goals as a pianist and administrator. Comments from the participant included, "I really didn't get to establish the piano career that I had planned because I was pulled aside by administration and stayed there ever since." They advise other colleagues to "accomplish what you want to do in your creative and research activities and your teaching before you step into the administrative role that you're about to step into, because it's hard to go back in the other direction, especially with things like performing."

Participant 3 agreed with Participant 2 and added the importance of adjusting their expectations as an active musicologist, but also as an administrator. Ways they've worked to adjust included "editing and smaller scale projects rather than writing books", picking "attainable projects rather than big recitals", and playing "one piece on this one thing." The participant expressed interest in still being active in writing and performing, as it is a "core feature" of who they are as an administrator, but "it's just making things bite-sized." Participants 2 and 3 nodded at choosing smaller, attainable projects and "bite-sized."

Synthesizing skills and rewarding experiences emerged as ways to adapt within professional agendas. Participant 4 noted the feelings of fulfillment and reward felt when

teaching and performing (a component of research/creative activities) as a faculty member transferred into curricular discussions or advocacy in their administrative role.

I still get to perform and still get to go out and do these things. And so I think part of it for me is that my professional interests have kind of evolved over time. And so the more I was doing the admin side, the more I saw ways I can incorporate some of the things that I loved about being a full-time professor in that, and so bringing all that together. I've tried to really synthesize those things. So I don't see them so much as separate, but just using some similar skills in different ways.

Participant 2 added that when they have not played their instrument in a while that they feel "foggy" and find decision-making to be more challenging. "It's really effective when it can become artistically or scholarly connected to what we originally came into the field to do."

Participant 4 added, "It maintains a firmer rooting in like the faculty teaching and student learning experiences, you know, so it's a meaningful experience for me." Participant 1 said, "I just have to make the time every day…make it a priority every day." Participant 1 also expressed the need to focus on playing (their instrument) while not thinking about other administrative tasks.

Research Question 5 (RQ5)

What responsibilities other than those captured by the HEADS Music Data Survey might be identified as contributors to job satisfaction?

Panel participants were still able to see table information with the five categories

for distribution of time when asked to respond to RQ5. This is the third question utilizing

the data collection methodology of the panel discussion. Following the panel discussion,

all responses to RQ5 were analyzed for code words, and categorized (see Table 16).

Results for Research Question 5 (RQ5)

Participants engaged in the least amount of dialog for RQ5, however, they all

nodded in agreement with the response offered by Participant 4. Main ideas that emerged

from the response to RQ5 included:

- the amount of flexibility needed

- "other duties as assigned" – both challenging and rewarding

Table 16

Code Words, Categories, and Excerpts for RQ5

Code Word	Category	Excerpts
Other factors	Satisfaction	P4: certain amount of flexibility there that I'm sure we all have experienced…it's like other duties as assigned (others nod) a lot of kind of reprioritization of time that you have to be flexible with depending on the needs at that given moment (others nod)
Rewarding		that's rewarding, but it also can be frustrating Sometimes there's, like, a real opportunity…other times you're working on something else that needs to get done…that
Challenge		contributes and takes away from job satisfaction…but usually positive working in on one thing very intensely, and then all of a sudden you have to drop that and go on to something else, it just depends on the day or the week

The "other duties as assigned" phrase was linked with flexibility as contributors

and detractors of job satisfaction. Participant 4 shared that when new initiatives are

introduced by upper administration, leaders must reprioritize their time and be flexible with their time, "depending on the needs at that given moment." This was noted as challenging and frustrating when the leader is working intensely on one thing and is forced to drop that work and move on to something else, which can be more or less challenging depending on the day or week. Flexibility was seen by the participants as rewarding because there is a "real opportunity that you can proceed with immediately" and frustrating if you are working "intensely" on one thing and then need to attend to other duties (Participant 4). Again, all the other participants nodded.

Emergent Themes

Panelists had considerable crosstalk that stemmed from the shared tables, and the resulting conversation was not directly related to RQs 3-5. The following topical themes emerged:

- Title/rank

- Variation in institutional/organizational structure

- Turnover/COVID

- Role confusion

As panel participants examined the data analysis for leaders' distribution of time among the five categories (teaching, research/creative activities, service, fundraising, and administrative matters), they all posited that the title of the leader likely has an impact on how leaders distribute their time. Participants asked if the reporting 49 leaders were deans, chairs, or directors. The researcher was unable to answer the question because

Section V.A. of the HEADS Music Data Survey does not ask respondents to indicate their job title.

The researcher shared with participants that during her quest to obtain contact information for music leaders in the 49 institutions, she noted that many leaders were not serving as leaders in 2020-2021. One participant shared that at a recent meeting with North American Music Executives of State Universities Group, of the 38 schools represented, 16 or 17 of the leaders were new, and that "massive turnover and school of music directors and people who retired either during or immediately after COVID" was a major topic of the conference. Participants referenced similar trends for NASM, with many new faces and "generational changeover." As the participants continued on the topic, it was suggested that turnover rates in 401+ schools may not be as high, based on similar faces who attended NASM, and if organizational academic unit head terms could play a role.

When discussing job responsibilities and organizational structure, one participant added that the responsibilities of a dean may differ from school to school and the responsibilities of a chair, director, and dean may differ. Another participant shared that when they became an administrator they still identified as a musicology professor and attended musicology area meetings. The faculty were confused at their attendance and the participant noted the conversation felt guarded. The participant noted feeling in the "them" category and not the "us" category, for the most part.

Summary of Research Findings

In the quantitative phase of analysis, the relationship between the method of entry and gender of middle-level leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors was analyzed to answer RQ1. Findings show a weak relationship between gender and method of entry of middle-level leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors (Cramér's $\mathcal{V} \neq .00$). The relationship between leader's method of entry and how they distributed their time was analyzed to answer RQ2. Based on the five Pearson's r tests, negative and positive relationships existed between leaders' method of entry and how they distributed their time. Weak positive relationships were found between those appointed by administration/Board of Trustees and time spent on fundraising and administrative matters. Moderate negative relationships were found between those appointed by administration/Board of Trustees and time spent on teaching and research/creative activities.

In the qualitative phase of analysis, RQs 3-5 yielded significant qualitative data. For the most part, panel participants agreed with one another. Differences were generally based on specific, individual experiences. In addition, a number of other factors that were not included in the Survey question items emerged.

In Chapter 5, a summary of these conclusions is offered. Limitations of the study and the possible impacts of the limitations on the study are discussed. Additionally, implications of these results on future middle-level leaders in schools of music and recommendations for future research are shared.

CHAPTER V

Conclusions, Recommendations, and Implications

Middle-level leaders play a critical role in higher education (Maddock, 2023) and enter their administrative roles through varied appointment paths, levels of preparation, and understanding of their roles' complex responsibilities and expectations (Weaver et al., 2019). While gender gaps have narrowed for some areas in middle-level leadership (Flaherty, 2016; Gmelch et al., 2017), they still exist in areas of middle-level administration, despite the higher number of master's and doctoral degrees earned by women than men (Johnson, 2017).

Middle-level leadership roles are complex (Tomes, 2020), and the responsibilities, challenges, and stressors have increased for leaders at this level (Cipriano, n.d). Most middle-level leaders come directly from faculty positions, and some may continue to hold a faculty role while serving as an administrator. Wolverton et al. (2005) noted that middle-level leaders working to balance a faculty and administrative role and work toward personal and professional goals often struggle with role identity. Balancing time among expected job responsibilities, including administrative duties, teaching, research/creative activities, service, fundraising, and other tasks, left middle-level leaders to adapt rapidly and prioritize regularly.

One major factor influencing a decision to return to faculty ranks was too little

time allotted for research and creative activity (Weaver et al., 2019). Middle-level leaders reported a desire to return to faculty ranks due to an overwhelming workload (Henk et al., 2021). Resilience, job demands, experiences, and job satisfaction were further noted as factors contributing to retention in the role.

More literature on middle-level leaders' experiences, responsibilities, and expectations is needed, especially as rapid changes have occurred. The role of today's middle-level leader is more complicated than a decade ago, and the skills these leaders need are very different from those required by a faculty member (Weaver et al., 2019). Additionally, noted Weaver et al., departments would benefit by preparing middle-level leaders in higher education with training specific to the relevant needs of the department.

This study offers a deeper understanding of how middle-level leaders in large schools of music come into their leadership roles, what experiences and challenges leaders face in their roles, and how these factors or other factors contribute to or detract from their job satisfaction. Middle-level leaders often enter their roles with little preparation (Flaherty, 2016; Freeman et al., 2020) and clarity on what will occupy the majority of their time, the skills that will be needed compared with the required skills as a faculty member, and their new expected responsibilities in their leadership role are of critical importance (Armstrong & Woloshyn, 2017). Leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors may have had various leadership experiences before their middle-level leadership role as the head of a school or department of music. In higher education institutions with 401+ music majors, the distribution of how the music

leader spent their time in their leadership role differed from their former experiences in a lesser leadership role. The distribution of time in the middle-level leadership role in music departments of this size may have contributed to their ability to reach personal and professional goals and impacted job satisfaction.

This study is useful for music faculty interested in an administrative role in understanding the responsibilities and time spent on specific components of the middle-level leadership role and the potential impacts on their creative activities and identity - a common focal point when serving in a music faculty role. Creative activities and identity may remain a unique concern for middle-level leaders planning to return to faculty ranks after their term or who have creative research or teaching responsibilities while serving as an administrator.

This study is useful for administrators currently serving in middle-level leadership roles in music institutions in understanding how their own experiences in appointment, distribution of time, and balancing responsibilities with research/creative activities compares with others serving in an administrative role. Institutions can consider factors that impact middle-level leadership and job satisfaction of those in music leadership roles in large schools or departments of music and develop leadership training to prepare middle-level music leaders and address longevity issues in middle-level institutional leadership.

Summary of Findings and Interpretation

As discussed in the previous chapter, the results of this study's quantitative

analysis phase offer a deeper understanding of male and female leaders' methods of entry into their leadership roles and how they distribute their time. Most (49) male and female leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors reported administration/Board of Trustees appointed them. Ten of the 41 total male leaders reported ambiguous responses to their method of entry. Of the 39 respondents included in RQs 1 and 2, 77% of males and 88% of females reported that administration/Board of Trustees appointed them.

None of the 39 leaders included for RQs 1 and 2 reported that more than the 20%-29% category of their time was spent on teaching, and 18 reported 0% of their time on teaching. Ten of the 39 reported they spent 0% of their time on research/creative activities. Five of the 39 reported they spent 0% of the time on service and fundraising categories. The minimum percentage of time reported for administrative duties of the 39 respondents was in the 30%-39% category, and most of their time was spent on administrative matters.

Results from the qualitative phase suggest that middle-level leaders in large schools of music found administrative matters as challenging/frustrating, and rewarding. Flexibility to engage in research and creative activities and continue performing or conducting research in some capacity were seen as factors in job satisfaction. The size of the research or creative/performance projects seemed to be linked with the job title and responsibilities. Organizational structure may influence leaders' flexibility to engage in the time distribution categories and meet the institution's needs.

Research Question 1 (RQ1)

The researcher aimed to determine the relationship between the gender and method of entry of middle-level leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors. Due to small cell counts in 50% of the categories, the researcher chose to collapse the method of entry only to include the 39 Survey respondents appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or elected by faculty. A Cramér's $\mathcal{V}$ was used to test for the strength of association. While there was an association between gender and method of entry, the association was weak.

The sample used for this study was the total population of leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors. The limited size of 49, and the focus on the largest size category for public schools of music may have impacted the small cell counts, resulting in the need for the researcher to collapse the method of entry variable. When examining data collected from the Survey, four groups within the method of entry variable emerged, based on 10 respondents indicating they were appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or not appointed by administration/Board of Trustees nor elected by faculty. There were no female respondents who fell into either of these groups, so for schools of music of this size, there did seem to be more variation in how males' method of entry compared with females.

Out of the 49 leaders, only 8 (16%) were female. The gender distribution among leaders in this size category of NASM-affiliated schools of music was more comparable with the study results of wide gender gaps in middle-level leadership in academic

medical institutions (Paturel, 2019) and in accredited collegiate schools of business (AACSB, 2021). Demographics of this study did not parallel those found in the 2016 UCEA study (Flaherty, 2016; Gmelch et al., 2017), which showed a 55% female majority in middle-level leadership, and the Sayler et al. (2017) study results, which found significant changes over the past three decades in gender balance in leadership roles.

Research Question 2 (RQ2)

The researcher treated RQ2 as an exploratory question to examine the variation in time leaders spent on teaching, research/creative activities, service, fundraising, and administrative matters; based on how they entered their middle-level leadership roles (appointed by administration/Board of Trustees or elected by faculty). A Pearson's *r* was used to determine the strength of association between leaders' distribution of time and method of entry. The relationship between leaders' method of entry and how they distributed their time was analyzed to answer RQ2. Based on the five Pearson's *r* tests, negative and positive relationships existed between leaders' method of entry and how they distributed their time.

In this study, it was found that the time leaders spent on service had a weak negative association with those appointed by the administration/Board of Trustees. Time spent on fundraising had a weak positive association with being appointed by the administration/Board of Trustees. There was a moderate negative association between those appointed by administration/Board of Trustees and the amount of time spent on teaching.

A weak positive association between time spent on administrative matters and those appointed by administration/Board of Trustees suggests that leaders who come into their roles through this entry route spend more time on administrative matters than those not appointed by administration/Board of Trustees. There was a moderate negative association between time spent on research/creative activities and on teaching and those appointed by administration/Board of Trustees. This suggests that those leaders who come into their roles through this entry route spend less time on research/creative activities and teaching than those not appointed by administration/Board of Trustees.

The title held by the leader emerged from the panel discussion as a possible indicator of how leaders distributed their time and their method of entry, paralleling the findings from the Sayler et al. (2017) study on associate deans. The titles of the 39 respondents included in the analysis for RQ3 were unknown. However, panelists suggested that deans may have less time for teaching and research/creative activities than chairs.

Research Question 3 (RQ 3)

A panel discussion with four leaders in NASM-affiliate public institutions with 401+ music majors was conducted via Zoom. All leaders of the 49 large public schools of music were emailed and invited to participate. Five leaders responded that they were available on the day of the scheduled panel discussion. Four of the five leaders returned consent forms and participated. The panel discussion allowed leaders to respond to RQs 3, 4, and 5 and interact with one another and the researcher. For RQ3, the researcher

asked the four participants in the panel discussion to look at tables with self-reported proportional time distribution categories and methods of entry of the 49 leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors (2020-2021) and share how the categories of time (teaching, research/creative activities, service, fundraising, and administrative matters) contributed to their job satisfaction. Administrative matters were seen as challenging/frustrating, and rewarding. Flexibility to engage in research and creative activities and continue performing or conducting research in some capacity were seen as factors in job satisfaction. The size of the research or creative/performance projects seemed to be linked with the job title and responsibilities. Organizational structure may influence leaders' flexibility to engage in the time distribution categories and meet the institution's needs.

Research Question 4 (RQ 4)

Research question 4 was asked during the panel discussion. The researcher asked panelists to share how their execution of job responsibilities impacted the progress of their professional agenda. Responses indicated that the professional agenda of a music leader is related to their identity as a musician, and continuing in their research and creative activities is something they see as beneficial to their leadership and connection with faculty and students. Time limitations are an issue, so leaders find ways to adapt the size of their research/creative projects and put in extra time beyond the job responsibilities.

Time limitations were noted as concerns of middle-level leaders in the Cipriano

and Riccardi (2018) and Weaver et al. (2019) studies. Sayler et al. (2017) found that

personal career goals, including research, were notable challenges for this level of

leadership. The majority of participants in the Sayler et al. study indicated a decline in

their scholarly activities, and nearly half shifted their research agendas and activities from

their original area to administration and higher education. Weaver et al. (2019) study

results showed that 94% of the participants said they would not be interested in a

leadership role if there were no time allowed for research. The responses from panel

participants seem to corroborate the findings of these studies; that research and creative

activities are valued by middle-level leaders and they seek opportunities to continue in

their professional agendas. Decreases in research/creative activities and professional

agendas is likely limited due to time constraints rather than interest, and may be a source

of frustration and negatively impact job satisfaction among middle-level leaders in music.

However, leaders seem to find and create ways to remain active in their professional and

research agendas while balancing their responsibilities by finding attainable projects of

interest.

Research Question 5 (RQ5)

Research question 5 was asked during the panel discussion. In considering what

responsibilities other than the five distribution of time categories in the Survey may be

contributors to job satisfaction, two main ideas emerged. The first was that leaders often

have to be very flexible in prioritizing and reprioritizing their time based on new

initiatives from upper administration. Flexibility was seen as challenging and frustrating

when leaders had to drop a current project and attend to a new one, and rewarding because of new opportunities that are seen as beneficial.

These findings parallel those found by Dean et al. (2021), in that middle-level leaders must work to balance their task-related expectations and work-related deadlines with building relationships within and outside of their department and keeping up with research and teaching. Buller (2012) noted that these leaders also have to deal with immediate issues while balancing their responsibilities.

Panel participants, unlike findings from Cipriano and Riccardi's (2017) study, did not mention collegiality or dealing with difficult faculty as a factor or responsibility related with job satisfaction. While dealing with personnel issues has been a challenge for chairs (Bryman & Lilley, 2009; Scott et al., 2008), dealing with "uncivil" faculty has been identified as a more significant challenge than workload since 2010 (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2017, p. 11), yet these were not expressed as issues from the panel participants.

Limitations and Delimitations

As discussed in Chapter 1, the results of this study were based on assumptions that data were accurate because the reported data used in the quantitative phase were generated from self-reported surveys. It was assumed that the self-reporting data on appointment, gender, and time spent were honest and truthful. For the first two Survey items on leaders' method of entry into their leadership positions, leaders were to respond "Yes" or "No" if they were appointed by administration/Board of Trustees and "Yes" or "No" if they were elected by faculty. It was assumed by the researcher that all leaders'

responses to the method of entry would be a Y/N or a N/Y and that all leaders would be either appointed or elected. However, 10 of the 49 leaders gave ambiguous responses of Y/Y (4) or N/N (6). Additionally, the Survey stated that the total percentages of time distributed among the five categories of teaching, research/creative activities, service, fundraising, and administrative duties should total 100% of time; however, three leaders' responses did not total 100% of time distribution.

A second assumption was that participants in the panel discussion would freely and honestly respond to questions asked by the researcher and other participants' comments in the panel discussion. Steps were taken to put participants at ease, including a phone conversation with individual participants the day before the panel discussion and an initial conversation among the panel before the recording began. These steps may have led participants to speak honestly and freely.

A potential limitation noted previously was that the sample size for the study was limited due to the number of NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors. Within the United States, there were only 49 NASM-affiliated public institutions with a reported enrollment of 401+ music majors in 2020-2021. While the study used the total enumeration of this sub-section of NASM institutions (since every institution had submitted the Survey), there were limitations in the low number of females serving as leaders among the 49. The researcher anticipated a greater representation of females before beginning the study. Only seven of the 49 leaders identified as female. This presented challenges in examining the relationship between gender and method of entry

within this sub-section of NASM institutions.

A second limitation was the selection of only what was included in items 1, 2, 5, and 9 of Section V.A. in the 2020-2021 HEADS Music Data Survey and the unrefined data. Further descriptive information, including age, years in the position, and ethnicity, might offer a deeper understanding of leaders in schools of music. Other descriptive details that emerged as a gap included the title of the leaders (dean, director, chair, etc.) and the number of years the leader had served in this music leadership position.

A third limitation was that the unrefined data collected were based on the leaders' interpretation of each question. Because organizational structures vary among institutions, how leaders come into their leadership positions may vary, also. This could explain the ambiguous responses to the method of entry. Leaders may have also interpreted the distribution of time percentages to represent their job descriptions rather than how they actually distribute their time. One of the panelists shared that they never knew how to complete the distribution of time percentages in the Survey. The Survey does not give examples for the time distribution. Considering how leaders actually distribute their time among the time categories in the Survey could be challenging to measure.

A delimitation was that this study was narrowed to HEADS Music Data Survey from one annual year (2020-2021). Broadening the scope of this study over ten years would have included additional statistical data before COVID-19 and allowed a wider comparative lens on the appointment process and how middle-level leaders spent their

time in their roles. Since institutions report yearly, it would also have allowed for further study on gender balance in appointments, leaders' time distribution, and consideration of trends in how middle-level leaders adapted how they distributed their time as institutions changed. Furthermore, examining all leaders in public NASM-affiliated institutions might offer additional insight into the method of entry, distribution of time, and job satisfaction between institutions with 1-100, 101-200, 201-400, and 401+ music majors.

Recommendations for Future Study

The purpose of the HEADS Music Data Survey is to collect annual self-reported data and compile it into the HEADS Music Data Summary reports. These reports are valuable resources for examining many aspects of public and private institutions. Data from the Summary are shared in disaggregated charts by public and private institutions and divided by the institution's number of music majors. It is recommended that a similar study be conducted to include a comparison of all size categories of public NASM-affiliated institutions to discover if different quantitative results on gender and method of entry, and method of entry and distribution of time, based on the size category, are obtained. A second focus for the study could include a comparative analysis of leaders' job satisfaction and distribution of time between the size categories.

A second recommendation for future study is to examine the relationship between leaders' titles/ranks and their distribution of time in teaching, research/creative activities, service, fundraising, and administrative duties. Leaders' titles were identified as a gap in the current study, especially considering leaders' method of entry into their

administrative roles and how they distribute their time.

While this study looked only at the 49 NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors, further research is needed on leaders in all NASM categories, including public and private institutions with different size categories. At the time of this study, the researcher did not locate any available literature on middle-level leadership in schools or departments of music. There are existing studies on middle-level leadership in other academic units, but little is known about the gender and appointment routes of music leaders, the transition from music faculty to administrator, their experiences and job satisfaction as they relate to their job responsibilities, and other factors that impact retention.

More research is needed on leaders' music roles and experiences before their administrative role to gain a better understanding and more information about the history and culture of those serving as music leaders. It may be interesting to consider whether the relationship between the leaders' major instrument/area (i.e., applied trumpet, music education, musicology, conductor of ensembles) influences their entry into their administrative roles. Are ensemble directors more likely to pursue and serve as leaders in schools of music, for example? A second consideration could be whether the relationship between leaders' major instrument/area influences their job satisfaction. For example, do the experiences and skillsets of faculty in certain instruments/areas impact their preparation for an administrative role and their job satisfaction?

Areas of concern that emerged from the literature review and panel discussion

include the preparation, retention, and turnover of middle-level leaders. Further study on the prior leadership experiences (including associate chair and associate dean, for example) within leaders' current and former institutions, along with the number of years they have served in their current position, could offer deeper context on the preparation and retention of middle-level leaders.

The HEADS Music Data Summary offers a great deal of descriptive information on NASM-affiliated public and private institutions with various size categories of music majors. Examining current and past Summary reports could serve as a springboard for future research topics on middle-level music leaders.

Implications for Practice

Middle-level leaders in schools of music manage many responsibilities that often align with the department's and institution's mission. Leaders in large schools of music hold a variety of titles (chair, director, and dean), and the responsibilities may vary significantly between titles and within and among institutions. Because of the complexity of their job, finding time to progress in their professional agendas and creative activities may be limited. For those leaders who have not yet earned the rank of full professor, having designated time for research/creative activities can be of concern. Additionally, based on research findings from the qualitative phase of this study, as middle-level leaders try to balance their responsibilities, they also seek opportunities to continue in their research/creative activities because they enjoy performing and still identify as professional musicians. Considering these challenges by those interested in an

administrative role and institutional recognition and support may positively impact job satisfaction and retention.

Implications for Future Research

While the HEADS Music Data Survey collects comprehensive, self-reported information on multiple areas, including the appointment route of middle-level leaders, ethnicity of faculty and students, faculty salaries, degrees offered, operational budgets, administrative process, student enrollment, degrees offered, and gender of faculty, it does not include some data that would be beneficial in examining music leaders in NASM-affiliated institutions. An implication for future research is to include survey items such as leaders' years of service in their current position and their term length (if applicable). Other suggestions for survey items that emerged from this study include leaders' major instrument/area and prior administrative experiences. Adding these factors (title, rank, years in current administrative role, term length, instrument/area, and experiences) to future research on middle-level leaders in schools of music would add tremendous depth to the current study. These factors could also provide further insight into the preparation and retention of NASM-affiliated music leaders.

The researcher and the panelists identified a gap in knowing the title of the leader when examining respondents' method of entry, gender, and distribution of time. Data collected from the qualitative phase of the study showed that leaders expressed spending more than 8 hours per day on their responsibilities. More research is needed on the amount of time leaders actually spend on their duties compared with job expectations, if

the amount of time they actually spend contributes to job satisfaction, and if the leaders'

title plays a role in their method of entry and distribution of time.

Limitations of Implementation

One limitation of the study was the shortcomings revealed in the Survey

construction. The unrefined data collected were based on the leaders' interpretation of

each question. Because organizational structures vary among institutions, how leaders

come into their leadership positions may vary, also. This could explain the ambiguous

responses to the method of entry. When reading the first two Survey items on whether

administration/Board of Trustees appoints the music leader and whether the music leader

is elected by faculty, there are only two possible answers to the questions: yes and no. It

was assumed that all respondents would indicate a "yes" response for only one of the two

entry routes, based on Music Chart 22 in the 2020-2021 HEADS Music Data Summary,

accessible by the public. However, 10 of the 49 middle-level leaders in the 2020-2021

Survey gave ambiguous answers of Y/Y or N/N. While those 10 were not included in the

statistical tests of RQs 1 and 2, the researcher does presume these ambiguous answers

could tell their own story.

There is a need to clarify how leaders should determine their method of entry into

their leadership role when responding to the Survey. Missing or vague Survey

instructions likely impact responses. A description of the "yes or no" option of

"appointed by administration/Board of Trustees" and the "yes or no" option of "elected

by faculty" could provide researchers with a clearer understanding of how leaders

responded. If possible, responses are expected to include a "yes/yes" or "no/no" response, then including these responses in the Survey would offer additional options on how NASM-affiliated music leaders come into their positions.

A second limitation of implementation is that data obtained showed that only eight of the 49 middle-level respondents to the Survey identified as female. While this is interesting when considering gender balance among middle-level leaders, the low number of female leaders meant the researcher had to change the original statistical analysis test for RQ1 (due to small cell counts) from a chi-square to Cramér's $\mathcal{V}$.

Leaders may have also interpreted the distribution of time percentages to represent their job descriptions rather than how they actually distribute their time. Considering how leaders actually distribute their time among the time categories in the Survey could be challenging to measure. One implication from the panel discussion was that there might be a difference between how leaders actually distribute their time and their distribution of time in their job descriptions and that music leaders may choose additional projects or creative activities because they enjoy them.

Concluding Remarks

This study has offered a deeper understanding of factors that lead to the appointment or election of middle-level leaders in NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors, their experiences in how they distribute their time among specific categories, how time distribution and job expectations impact their professional agendas and research/creative activities, and factors that contribute to or detract from

their job satisfaction.

The responsibilities and time distribution for teaching, research/creative activities, service, fundraising, and administrative matters vary among middle-level leaders in large schools of music. This is likely dependent upon the leader's title, rank, and the organizational structure of the unit or institution. Music leaders continue to seek opportunities and make time to engage as musicians through their research and creative activities. They find this to be a component of their job satisfaction, leadership, connection with faculty, and identity. Administrative matters were identified as challenging and rewarding, and flexibility in time distribution daily can be challenging.

Differences are frequently greater than similarities when examining the roles and responsibilities of middle-level leaders in large schools of music. Further research into other aspects of the roles and responsibilities is warranted based on leaders' titles and complexity of the emergent themes.

REFERENCES

Abele, L. (2013, March 27). The associate professor as chair. *Inside Higher Ed.*

https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2013/03/27/if-you-must-appoint-

associate-professor-chair-essay

Adamu, A. Y. (2019). Selection and appointment of higher education leaders in Ethiopia:

An assessment of implementation. *Bahir Dar Journal of Education*, *19*(1), 1-19.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334720993_Selection_and_Appointmen

t_of_Higher_Education_Leaders_in_Ethiopia_An_Assessment_of_Implementatio

n

Albudaiwi, D. (2017). Survey: Open-ended questions. In M. Allen (Ed.), *The SAGE

Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods.* Sage.

https://methods.sagepub.com/reference/the-sage-encyclopedia-of-communication-

research-methods/i14345.xml

Appadurai, A. (2009, April 10). Higher education's coming leadership crisis. *The

Chronicle of Higher Education, 54*(29). https://www.chronicle.com/article/higher-

educations-coming-leadership-crisis/

Applegate, J. H., & Book, C. (1989). Associate and assistant deans of education: Careers

and responsibilities. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(6), 5-9.

Arizona State University School of Music, Dance, and Theatre Faculty. (2021, April 23).

Guidelines for probation, promotion, tenure for faculty at different ranks. Arizona State University, pp. 7-8.

https://academicpersonnel.asu.edu/sites/default/files/design-and-the-arts-music-dance-theatre-criteria-clean-copy.doc

Armstrong, D. E., & Woloshyn, V. E. (2017). Exploring the tensions and ambiguities of university department chairs. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *47*(1), 97–113. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1140046.pdf

Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business. (2021). *Deans survey participant report, 2020-21.* https://www.aacsb.edu/-/media/publications/research-reports/deans_survey_2021_report.pdf?rev=401c3d1a8f914e6db3928015dfe607ce&hash=6C57F04C2ADECF10B7230ACEC785BCB2

Aziz, S., Mullins, M. E., Balzer, W. K., Grauer, E., Burnfield, J. L., Lodato, M. A., & Cohen-Powless, M. A. (2005). Understanding the training needs of department chairs. *Studies in Higher Education*, *30*(5), 571–593. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070500249260

Backes-Gellner, U., Bäker, A., & Pull, K. (2018). The opportunity costs of becoming a dean: Does leadership in academia crowd out research? *Schmalenbach Business Review*, *70*(2), 189–208. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41464-018-0048-0

Bailey, J. R. (2022, September 22). The best managers are leaders—And vice versa. *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2022/09/the-best-managers-are-leaders-and-vice-versa?registration=success

Bennis, W. G. (2009). *On becoming a leader*. Basic Books.

Berdrow, I. (2010). King among kings: Understanding the role and responsibilities of the department chair in higher education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *38*(4), 499–514. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143210368146

Berlinsky-Schine, L. (2018, September 7). What prospective music majors need to know. CollegeVine. https://blog.collegevine.com/what-prospective-music-majors-need-to-know

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1997). *Reframing organizations* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Bornstein, R. (2010). Succession planning: The time has come. *Trusteeship, 18*(5), 28-33.

Bossmann, U., Ditzen, B., & Schweitzer, J. (2016). Organizational stress and dilemma management in mid-level industrial executives: An exploratory study. *Mental Health & Prevention*, *4*(1), 9–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mhp.2016.02.001

Bowman Jr, R. F. (2002). The real work of the department chair. *The Clearing House*, *75*(3), 158–162. https://www.jstor.org/stable/30189727

Boyko, L., & Jones, G. A. (2010). The roles and responsibilities of middle management (chairs and deans) in Canadian universities. In V. Meek, L. Goedegebuure, R. Santiago, & T. Carvalho (Eds.), *The changing dynamics of higher education middle management* (pp. 83–102). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9163-5_5

Branson, C. M., Franken, M., & Penney, D. (2016). Middle leadership in higher education: A relational analysis. *Educational Management Administration &*

Leadership, *44*(1), 128–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214558575

Braun, S., Nazlic, T., Weisweiler, S., Pawlowska, B., Peus, C., & Frey, D. (2009).

Effective leadership development in higher education: Individual and group level

approaches. *Journal of Leadership Education*, *8*(1), 195-206.

Brinkley-Etzkorn, K. E., & Lane, I. (2019). From the ground up: Building a system-wide

professional development and support program for academic department chairs.

Studies in Higher Education, *44*(3), 571–583.

https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1389877

Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies

in Higher Education*, *32*(6), 693–710.

https://doi.org/10.1080.03075070701685114

Bryman, A., & Lilley, S. (2009). Leadership researchers on leadership in higher

education. *Leadership*, *5*(3), 331–346. https://doi.org/10.1177.1742715009337764

Buller, J. L. (2012). *The essential department chair: A comprehensive desk reference*

(2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

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

Butin, D. (2016, January 13). So you want to be a dean? *The Chronicle of Higher

Education*, 16–18. https://www.chronicle.com/article/so-you-want-to-be-a-dean-

234900/

Carnicer, J. G., Garrido, D. C., & Requena, S. O. (2015). Music and leadership: The role

of the conductor. *International Journal of Music and Performing Arts*, *3*(1), 84-

88. http://dx.doi.org/10.15640/ijmpa.v3n1a8

Carroll, J. B., & Wolverton, M. (2004). Who becomes a chair? *New Directions for*

    Higher Education, *126*, 3–10. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.144

Caza, B. B., Moss, S., & Vough, H. (2018). From synchronizing to harmonizing: The

    process of authenticating multiple work identities. *Administrative Science*

    Quarterly, 63(4), 703-745. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839217733972

Cervino, J. D. (2018). *Department chairs' research-related roles and responsibilities at a*

    public research university [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The University of

    Alabama.

Charles, J. N., Jr. (1989). Searching for deans: A political perspective. *PS: Political*

    Science and Politics, 22(4), 855-861.

Cipriano, R. E. (n.d.). Department chairs: Trends and issues over time. *Academic*

    Briefing. https://www.academicbriefing.com/administration/department-chairs-

    trends-and-issues-over-time/

Cipriano, R. E., & Riccardi, R. (2010). What is unique about chairs? A continuing

    exploration. *The Department Chair*, *20*(4), 26-28.

    https://doi.org/10.1002/dch.20038

Cipriano, R. E., & Riccardi, R. L. (2016, June). The department chair: A nine-year study.

    The Department Chair, 27(1), 16-18. https://doi.org/10.1002/dch.30093

Cipriano, R. E., & Riccardi, R. L. (2017). The department chair: A decade-long analysis.

    The Department Chair, *28*(1), 10–13. https://doi.org/10.1002/dch.30144

Cipriano, R. E., & Riccardi, R. L. (2018). The department chair revisited. *The Department Chair*, *28*(3), 18–19. https://doi.org/10.1002/dch.30176

Cleverley-Thompson, S. (2016). The role of academic deans as entrepreneurial leaders in higher education institutions. *Innovative Higher Education, 41*(1), 75–85. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-015-9339-2

Coll, K., Niles, S. G., Coll, K. F., Ruch, C. P., & Stewart, R. A. (2018). Education deans: Challenges and stress. *Journal of Organizational & Educational Leadership*, *4*(1), Article 2. https://digitalcommons.gardner-webb.edu/joel/vol4/iss1/2

Colvin, G. (2008). *Talent is overrated: What really separates world-class performers from everybody else.* Portfolio.

Conger, J. A., & Fulmer, R. M. (2003, December). Developing your leadership pipeline. *Harvard Business Review*, *81*(12), 76–84. https://hbr.org/2003/12/developing-your-leadership-pipeline

Coyle, D. (2009). *The talent code.* Bantam Books.

Creaton, J., & Heard-Laureote, K. (2019). Rhetoric and reality in middle management: The role of heads in academic departments in UK universities. *Higher Education Policy, 34,* 195–217. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-018-00128-8

Creswell, J. W. & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage.

Danilowicz, B. S., & McCartan, A. M. (2017). *Organizing academic colleges: A guide*

for deans. Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences.

Dean, Y., Nickel, J., Miller, J., & Pickett Seltner, R. (2021). Creating an academic ecosystem where chairs can thrive: A call for action in postsecondary institutions. *Brock Education: A Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, *30*(2), 99–115. https://journals.library.brocku.ca/brocked

Degn, L. (2015). Identity constructions and sensemaking in higher education–a case study of Danish higher education department heads. *Studies in Higher Education*, *40*(7), 1179–1193. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.881345

DeLander, G. E. (2017). Lessons from a recovering department chair. *American Journal of Education, 81*(3), 1-3. https://doi.org/10.1111.ejed.12169

DeZure, D., Shaw, A., Rojeweski, J. (2014, February). Cultivating the next generation of academic leaders: Implications for administrators and faculty. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 46* (1), 6–12. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/270847483_Cultivating_the_Next_Generation_of_Academic_Leaders_Implications_for_Administrators_and_Faculty

English, D., & Kramer, R. (2017, May 31). Can deans fix higher-ed dysfunction? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. https://www.chronicle.com/article/can-deans-fix-higher-ed-dysfunction/

Filipelli, J. A. & Clements, R. A. (2019). Seven leadership skills: Moving from the stage to higher education. *Journal of Performing Arts Leadership in Higher Education*, *10*(Fall), 27–37. https://cnu.edu/jpalhe/pdf/jpahle_volume10.pdf

Flaherty, C. (2016, December 1). Forgotten chairs. *Inside Higher Ed*.

https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/12/01/new-study-suggests-training-

department-chairs-woefully-inadequate-most-institutions

Floyd, A. (2016). Supporting academic middle managers in higher education: Do we

care? *Higher Education Policy*, *29*(2), 167–183.

https://doi.org/10.1057/hep.2015.11

Floyd, A., & Dimmock, C. (2011). 'Jugglers,' 'copers,' and 'strugglers': Academics'

perceptions of being a head of a department in a post-1992 UK university and

how it influences their future careers. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and

Management*, *33*(4), 387–399.

https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2011.585738

Freedman, K. (2011). Leadership in art education: Taking action in schools and

communities. *Art Education*, *64*(2), 40–45.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00043125.2011.11519119

Freeman, R. (2020, September 18). A brief guide to the appointment of visionary music

school deans. *Arts Interactive*. https://www.artsinteractiveinc.com/blog/brief-

guide-to-the-appointment-of-visionary-music-school-deans/

Freeman, S., Karkouti, I. M., & Ward, K. (2020). Thriving in the midst of liminality:

Perspectives from department chairs in the USA. *Higher Education*, *80*(5), 895–

911. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00521-6

Gallos, J. V. (2002). The dean's squeeze: The myths and realities of academic leadership

in the middle. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *1*(2), 174–184. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2002.8509367

Garavaglia, S. B., Dun, A. S., & Hill, B. M. (1998, October). A smart guide to dummy variables: Four applications and a macro. In *Proceedings of the northeast SAS users group conference* (Vol. 43) .

Gardner, S. K., & Ward, K. (2018). Investing in department chairs. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *50*(2), 58–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2018.1483181

Gavin, M. (2019, October 31). Leadership vs. Management: What's the difference? *Harvard Business School Online*. https://online.hbs.edu/blog/post/leadership-vs-management

Gigliotti, R. A. (2021, November 11). Department chairs in distress. *Inside HigherEd.* https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2021/11/11/growing-challenges-confronting-department-chairs-opinion#.ZDBeQnTj7BA.link

Gladwell, M. (2008). *Outliers: The story of success.* Little, Brown and Company.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction.* (5th ed.). Longman.

Gmelch, W. H. (2000, February 25-28). *Rites of passage: Transition to the deanship.* [Paper presentation]. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education 52nd Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL, United States. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED439094.pdf

Gmelch, W. H. (2002). The deans' rites of passage: Transition to leadership. In W. H. Gmelch (Ed.), *Deans' Balancing Acts: Education Leaders and the Challenges They Face* (pp. 59–78). AACTE Publications. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED481388.pdf

Gmelch, W. H., & Buller, J. L. (2015). *Building academic leadership capacity: A guide to best practices.* Jossey-Bass.

Gmelch, W. H., & Buller, J. L. (2016). Skill development for academic leaders. *The Department Chair*, *4*(26), 25–27.

Gmelch, W. H., & Burns, J. S. (1993). The cost of academic leadership: Department chair stress. *Innovative Higher Education, 17*(4), 259–270. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00917050

Gmelch, W. H., & Burns, J. S. (1994). Sources of stress for academic department chairpersons. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *32*(1), 79–94. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578239410051862

Gmelch, W. H., & Miskin, V. D. (1993). *Leadership skills for department chairs.* Anker Publishing.

Gmelch, W. H., & Miskin, V. D. (2011). *Department chair leadership skills*. Atwood Publishing.

Gmelch, W. H., Roberts, D., Ward, K., & Hirsch, S. (2017). A retrospective view of department chairs: Lessons learned. *The Department Chair*, *28*(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1002/dch.30140

Gmelch, W. H., Wolverton, M., & Wolverton, M. L. (1999, February 24-27). *The education dean's search for balance*. [Paper presentation]. American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Annual Meeting, Washington D.C., United States. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED428055.pdf

Goleman, D. (2011). *Leadership: The power of emotional intelligence*. More Than Sound, LLC.

Goles, T., & Hirschheim, R. (2000). The paradigm is dead, the paradigm is dead…long live the paradigm: The legacy of Burrell and Morgan. *Omega*, *28*(3), 249–268. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-0483(99)00042-0

Golosinski, M. (2008). *Wide awake in the windy city: Celebrating a century of excellence at Northwestern University's Kellogg School of Management*. Northwestern University Press.

Gonaim, F. A. (2016). Department chair: A lifeguard without a life jacket. *Higher Education Policy, 29*, 272-286. https://doi.org/10.1057/hep.2015.26

Gordon, B., Stockard, J., & Williford, H. (1991). The perceived and expected roles and responsibilities of departmental chairpersons in schools of education as determined by teaching faculty. *Education*, *112*(1), 176–182.

Greicar, M. B. (2009). *The professional preparation of academic deans.* [Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University]. https://etd.ohiolink.edu/apexprod/rws_etd/send_file/send?accession=bgsu1230669095&disposition=inline

Gunsalus, C. K. (2006). *The college administrator's survival guide.* Harvard University Press.

Halonen, J. S., & Dunn, D. S. (2017, September 24). When no one answers the call. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* https://www.chronicle.com/article/when-no-one-answers-the-call/

Hammersley-Fletcher, L., & Kirkham, G. (2005). *Distribution, collaboration, and collegiality: Issues for primary middle leaders* [Paper presentation]. British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Glamorgan.

Harvey, M., Shaw, J. B., McPhail, R., & Erickson, A. (2013). The selection of a dean in an academic environment: Are we getting what we deserve? *International Journal of Educational Management*, *27*(1), 19–37. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541311289800

Hearn, J. C. (2003). *Diversifying campus revenue streams: Opportunities and risks*. American Council On Education. https://ihe.uga.edu/sites/default/files/inline-files/Diversifying_Campus_Revenue.pdf

Hecht, I. W. (2004). The professional development of department chairs. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *126*, 27–44. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.146

Hecht, I. W., Higgerson, M. L., Gmelch, W. H., & Tucker, A. (1999). *The department chair as academic leader.* Oryx Press.

Henk, W. A., Wepner, S. B., Ali, H. S (2021, October). Factors academic deans consider in deciding whether to remain in their positions. *The ACAD Leader*.

https://acad.org/resource/factors-academic-deans-consider-in-deciding-whether-to-remain-in-their-positions/

Hinson-Hasty, E. L. (2019). Departmental chair as faculty advocate and middle manager. *Journal of Moral Theology, 8,* 126–140. https://jmt.scholasticahq.com/article/11418-departmental-chair-as-faculty-advocate-and-middle-manager

Hofmeyer, A., Sheingold, B. H., Klopper, H. C., & Warland, J. (2015). Leadership in learning and teaching in higher education: Perspectives of academics in non-formal leadership roles. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research (CIER)*, *8*(3), 181–192. https://doi.org/10.19030/cier.v8i3.9348

IBM. (2023). Cramer's V. *IBM Cognos Analytics.* https://www.ibm.com/docs/en/cognos-analytics/11.1.0?topic=terms-cramrs-v

Inman, M. (2011). The journey to leadership for academics in higher education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *39*(2), 228–241. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143210390055

Jenkins, R. (2016, July 10). Your to-do list as chair. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. https://www.chronicle.com/article/Your-To-Do-List- as-Chair/237052

Johnson, H. L. (2017). *Pipelines, pathways, and institutional leadership: An update on the status of women in higher education*. American Council on Education. https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/bitstream/handle/10919/84062/UpdateWomenHigherEducation.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Joly, H. (2021, October 28). Creating a meaningful corporate purpose. *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2021/10/creating-a-meaningful-corporate-purpose

Jones, F. R. (2011). *The future competencies of department chairs: A human resources perspective* (Publication No. 3483570) [Doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/future-competencies-department-chairs-human/docview/902632487/se-2The Florida State University

Kaplan, G. E. (2004). How academic ships actually navigate. In R. Ehrenberg (Ed.), *Governing academia: Who is in charge at the modern university?* (pp. 165–208). Cornell University Press. https://doi.org/10.7591.9781501704765-009

Khurana, R. (2007). *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands*. Princeton University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7rkkb

Kohoutek, J., Pinheiro, R., Cabelkova, I., & Smidova, B. (2017). The role of higher education in the socio-economic development of peripheral regions. *Higher Education Policy*, *30*(4), 401–403. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-017-0068-2

Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management.* Free Press.

Kruse, S. D. (2022). Department chair leadership: Exploring the role's demands and tensions. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *50*(5), 739–757. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220953601

Kumar, A. (2023, May 18). Pearson correlation coefficient: Formula, examples. *Data Analytics.* https://vitalflux.com/pearson-correlation-coefficient-statistical-significance/#:~:text=If%20a%20Pearson%20Correlation%20Coefficient,can%20be%20considered%20statistically%20significant

Laerd Dissertations. (2012). *Types of variables.* https://statistics.laerd.com/statistical-guides/types-of-variable.php

Laerd Dissertations. (2012a). *Purposive sampling.* https://dissertation.laerd.com/purposive-sampling.php

Laerd Dissertations. (2012b). *Total population sampling.* https://dissertation.laerd.com/total-population-sampling.php

Laerd Statistics. (2016). *Chi-square test for independence using SPSS statistics.* https://statistics.laerd.com/spss-tutorials/chi-square-test-for-association-using-spss-statistics.php

Laker, B. (2021, February 9). Five ways to be an influential leader. *Forbes.* https://www.forbes.com/sites/benjaminlaker/2021/02/09/five-ways-to-be-an-influential-leader/?sh=ab1ae131d978

Lincoln, Y., Lynham, S. A., & Guba, E. G. (2011). Paradigms and perspectives in contention. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 91–95). Sage.

Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W., & Silverman, S. J. (2013). *Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals* (6th ed.). SAGE.

Lodico, M. G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtle, K. H. (2010). *Methods in educational research: From theory to practice*. John Wiley & Sons.

Luna, G. (2012). Planning for an American higher education leadership crisis: The succession issue for administrators. *International Leadership Journal, 4*(1), 56–79. https://campussuite-storage.s3.amazonaws.com/prod/1280306/3a32f069-629b-11e7-99ef-124f7febbf4a/1690382/fa65f7c2-019a-11e8-a6d9-1208950ee77c/file/ILJ_Winter_2012-final.pdf

MacFarlane, B. (2014). Challenging leaderism. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *33*(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2014.864590

Maddock, L. C. (2023). Academic middle leaders, middle leading and middle leadership of university learning and teaching: A systematic review of the higher education literature. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management.* https://doi.10.1080/1360080X.2022.2160888

Manning, K. (2018). *Organizational theory in higher education.* Routledge.

Mead-Fox, D. (2009, April 24). Tackling the leadership scarcity. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* https://www.chronicle.com/article/tackling-the-leadership-scarcity/

Meek, V., Geodegebuure, L., Santiago, R., & Carvalho, T. (2010). Introduction. In *The changing dynamics of higher education middle management.* (pp. 1–14). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007.978-90-481-9163-5

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Homosocial. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. Retrieved

April 9, 2023, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/homosocial

Merrion, M. (2009). A prophecy for the arts in higher education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *41*(5), 16–21. https://doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.41.5.16-21

Mintzberg, H. (2009). *Managing.* Berrett-Koehler.

Monaghan, P. (2018, February 18). An organizational guide for the harried dean. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* https://www.chronicle.com/article/an-organizational-guide-for-the-harried-dean/

Morris, T. L., & Laipple, J. S. (2015a). How prepared are academic administrators? Leadership and job satisfaction within US research universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *37*(2), 241–251. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2015.1019125

National Association of Schools of Music. (2023). *Welcome to NASM.* https://nasm.arts-accredit.org/

Nietzel, M. (2022, March 1). New evidence shows large gender gap in leadership of major U.S. universities. *Forbes*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaeltnietzel/2022/03/01/new-evidence-shows-large-gender-gap-in-leadership-of-major-us-universities/?sh=30389a30302a

Northouse, P. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). Sage.

Notgrass, D. (2014). The relationship between followers' perceived quality of relationship and preferred leadership style. *Leadership & Organization*

Development Journal, *35*(7), 605–621. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-08-2012-0096

Palm, R. (2006). Perspectives from the dark side: The career transition from faculty to administrator. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *134*, 59–65. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1002/he.217

Parrish, D. (2011). *Developing emotionally intelligent leadership in higher education.* Lang Publishing.

Parrish, D. R. (2015). The relevance of emotional intelligence for leadership in a higher education context. *Studies in Higher Education*, *40*(5), 821–837. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.842225

Paturel, A. (2019, June 11). *Where are all the women deans?* Association of American Medical Colleges. https://www.aamc.org/news-insights/where-are-all-women-deans

Pepper, C., & Giles, W. (2015). Leading in middle management in higher education. *Management in Education*, *29*(2), 46–52. https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020614529987

Perlmutter, D. D. (2023, February 7). Admin 101: Should you take this unexpected job offer? What to consider before you accept (or reject) a surprise appointment to become an administrator. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. https://www.chronicle.com/article/admin-101-should-you-take-this-unexpected-job-offer?cid2=gen_login_refresh&cid=gen_sign_in

Portugal, L. (2006). Diversity leadership in education. *Academic Leadership Journal*, *4*(3). http://scholars.fhsu.edu/alj/vol4/iss3/2

Preston, D., & Floyd, A. (2016). Supporting the role of associate dean in universities: An alternative approach to management development. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *70*(3), 264–280. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12099

Preston, D., & Price, D. (2012). 'I see it as a phase: I don't see it as the future': Academics as managers in a United Kingdom university. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *34*(4), 409–419. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2012.689201

Rajoo, L. (2022, February 8). *How to write a user interview script-A (fairly specific) example.* Bootcamp. https://bootcamp.uxdesign.cc/how-to-write-a-user-interview-script-a-fairly-specific-example-e9164f73755e

Reichert, A. C. (2016). *Deans' way of knowing: The lived experiences of baccalaureate nursing school deans* (Publication No. 10103954) [Doctoral dissertation, Mercer University]. ProQuest Dissertation LLC.

Rhodes, S. J., & Lees, N. D. (2016). What deans expect from chairs. *The Department Chair, 26*(3), 3–4. https://doi.org/10.1002/dch.30057

Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative analysis.* Sage.

Riley, T. A., & Russell, C. (2013). Leadership in higher education: Examining professional development needs for department chairs. *Review of Higher Education & Self-Learning, 6*(2), 38–57.

Roberts, C., & Hyatt, L. (2019). *The dissertation journey* (3rd ed.). Corwin.

Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2012). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Sage Ocean. (2020, November 4). How to analyze qualitative data using Delvetool. https://ocean.sagepub.com/blog/tools-and-tech/how-to-analyze-qualitative-data-using-Delvetool

Sanaghan, P. (2016, January). Building leadership resilience in higher education. *Diagnostic*. https://www.academicimpressions.com/sites/default/files/0116-leadership-resilience-md.pdf

Salters-Pedneault, K. (2022, October 22). *The use of self-report data in psychology.* Verywell Mind. https://www.verywellmind.com/definition-of-self-report-425267

Sayler, M. F., Pedersen, J., Smith, M. C., & Cutright, M. (2017). Hidden leaders: Results of the national study of associate deans. *Studies in Higher Education*, *44*(7), 1119–1129. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1418309

Schloss, P. J., & Cragg, K. M. (2013). *Organization and administration in higher education.* Routledge.

Scott, G., Coates, H., & Anderson, M. (2008). *Learning leaders in times of change: Academic leadership capabilities for Australian higher education*. University of Western Sydney and Australian Council for Education Research. https://research.acer.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=higher_education

Seagren, A. T., Creswell, J. W., & Wheeler, D. W. (1993). *The department chair: New roles, responsibilities, and challenges*. Faculty Publications in Educational Administration, 110.

https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedadfacpub/110

Selingo, J., Chheng, S., & Clark, C. (2017). Pathways to the university presidency: The future of higher education leadership. *Deloitte Insights*.

https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/insights/us/articles/3861_Pathways-to-the-university-presidency/DUP_Pathways-to-the-university-presidency.pdf

Sessa, V., & Taylor, J. J. (2000). *Executive selection: Strategies for success*. Jossey-Bass.

Shepherd, S. (2017). Why are there so few female leaders in higher education: A case of structure or agency? *Management in Education*, *31*(2), 82–87.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020617696631

Silbert, A., Punty, M., & Ghoniem, E. B. (2022). *The women's power gap at elite universities: Scaling the ivory tower.* [Women's Power Gap Study Series]. Eos Foundation. https://www.womenspowergap.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/WPG-Power-Gap-at-Elite-Universities-v17.pdf

Skinner, R. A. (2023). *Recruiting department chairs (when no one wants the job): Some modest advice.* [White paper]. Harris Search Associates.

https://harrissearch.com/web/files/Recruiting_Dept_Chairs_WP_copy_140.pdf

Smith, D. L., Rollins, K. B., & Smith, L. J. (2012). Back to the faculty: Transition from university department leadership. *Innovative Higher Education*, *37*(1), 53–63.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-011-9186-8

Stephen F. Austin State University School of Music. (2022). School of Music Tenure and

Promotion Policy, pp. 13–14. https://www.sfasu.edu/docs/music/resources-tenure-

promotion-policy.pdf

Subedi, D. (2016). Explanatory sequential mixed method design as the third research

community of knowledge claim. *American Journal of Educational*

Research, *4*(7), 570–577. http://pubs.sciepub.com/education/4/7/10/

Taggart, G. (2015). Department chair advice on teaching and research at U.S. research

universities. *Innovative Higher Education*, *40*, 443–454.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-015-9329-4

Thornton, K., Walton, J., Wilson, M., & Jones, L. (2018). Middle leadership roles in

universities: Holy grail or poisoned chalice. *Journal of Higher Education Policy*

and Management, *40*(3), 208–223.

https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2018.1462435

Tomes, Y. A. (2020, November 2). Reflections on "becoming" a department chair.

Academic Leader. https://www.academic-

leader.com/topics/leadership/reflections-on-becoming-a-department-chair/

Trowler, P. (2008). *Cultures and change in higher education: Theories and practice*

(Universities into the 21st century). Macmillan.

Tucker, A. (1981). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers*.

American Council on Education.

Tucker, A. (1992). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers* (3rd ed.). American Council on Education.

Turner, V. (1969). *The forest of symbols: Aspects of Ndembu ritual*. Cornell University Press.

U.S. Department of Education. (2015). Table 318.10. In *Digest of Education Statistics*. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_318.10.asp

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). Table 315.20. In *Digest of Education Statistics*. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_315.20.asp

University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. (2017). College of Fine Arts School of Music Guidelines for Annual Evaluation, Tenure/Promotion, Post Tenure and Workload Review, pp. 8-13. https://www.utrgv.edu/cofa/_files/documents/school%20of%20music%20-%20annual%20review%20tenure%20%20promotion%20final%205%2010%2017.pdf

Van Gennep, A. (1960). *The rites of passage*. Routledge.

Warner C. H., Appenzeller, G. N., & Grieger T. (2011). Importance of anonymity to encourage honest reporting in mental health screening after combat deployment. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 68*(10), 1065–1071. https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapsychiatry/fullarticle/

Weaver, L. D., Ely, K., Dickson, L., & DellAntonio, J. (2019). The changing role of the department chair in the shifting landscape of higher education. *International*

Journal of Higher Education, *8*(4), 175–188.

https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v8n4p175

Webster, R. L., Hammond, K. L., & Harmon, H. A. (2006). A study of market orientation in American business schools. *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*, *10*(2), 9.

Weick, K. E. (2009). *Making sense of the organization, Volume 2: The Impermanent organization.* Wiley & Sons.

Westfall, C. (2019, June 20). Leadership development is a $366 billion industry: Here's why most programs don't work. *Forbes*.

https://www.forbes.com/sites/chriswestfall/2019/06/20/leadership-development-why-most-programs-dont-work/#2e66935d61de.

Whitchurch, C., & Gordon, G. (2017). *Reconstructing relationships in higher education: Challenging agendas*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315749358

Wilkerson, J. M. (1999). On research relevance, professors' "real world" experience, and management development: Are we closing the gap? *Journal of Management Development*, *18*(7), 598–613. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621719910284459

Williams-June, A. (2014). To change a campus, talk to the dean. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *61*(13). https://www.chronicle.com/article/to-change-a-campus-talk-to-the-dean/

Wolverton, M., Ackerman, R., & Holt, S. (2005). Preparing for leadership: What academic department chairs need to know. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *27*(2), 227–238. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600800500120126

Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W. H., Montez, J., & Nies, C. T. (2001). *The changing nature of the academic deanship* (ED457708). ERIC. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED457708.pdf

Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W. H., Wolverton, M. L., & Sarros, J. C. (1999). Stress in academic leadership: U.S. and Australian department chairs/heads. *The Review of Higher Education*, *22*(2), 165-185.

Wolverton, M., & Poch, S. (2000). The nexus between academic deans and corporate CEOs: An opportunity in the making. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *7*(3), 122–132. https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190000700309

Yungclas, T. T. (2007). *Multiple roles of fine arts deans: An emerging profile* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut]. Open Commons. https://opencommons.uconn.edu/dissertations/AAI3265819

Zahneis, M. (2022, July 18). Higher ed. is looking to refill jobs. But it's finding a "shallow and weak" candidate pool. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. https://www.chronicle.com/article/higher-ed-is-looking-to-refill-jobs-but-its-finding-a-shallow-and-weak-candidate-pool?cid=gen_sign_in

APPENDIX A

Public Institutions: 401+ Music Majors(2020-2021)

Name of Institution	Name of Institution (cont.)
Appalachian State University	University of Colorado, Boulder
Arizona State University	University of Florida
Ball State University	University of Georgia
Bowling Green State University	University of Houston
California State University, Fullerton	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
California State University, Long Beach	University of Iowa
Florida State University	University of Kansas
Georgia State University	University of Kentucky
Indiana University	University of Maryland
James Madison University	University of Memphis
Kent State University	University of Michigan
Louisiana State University	University of Missouri, Kansas City
Michigan State University	University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Rowan University	University of North Texas
Sam Houston State University	University of Northern Colorado
State University of New York, Fredonia	University of Oklahoma
State University of New York, Potsdam	University of Oregon
Stephen F. Austin State University	University of South Carolina
Temple University	University of Southern Mississippi
Texas State University – San Marcos	University of Texas at Arlington
Texas Tech University	University of Texas at Austin
University of Arizona	University of Texas Rio Grande Valley
University of Central Florida	West Chester University of Pennsylvania
University of Central Oklahoma	Western Michigan University
University of Cincinnati	

APPENDIX B

Section V: MUSIC ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL AND PROCEDURES

A. MUSIC EXECUTIVES

1. Is the music executive appointed by the administration/Board of Trustees?
   No   ○
   Yes   ○

2. Is the music executive elected by faculty?
   No   ○
   Yes   ○

5. What percentage (estimate) of the music executive's time is assigned to the following duties? (Percentages must total 100%. The figure is not assigned F. T. E. but actual time spent.)
   a. Teaching   [   ]
      %
   b. Research/Creative Activities   [   ]
      %
   c. Administrative Matters   [   ]
      %
   d. Service (to professional organizations and community)   [   ]
      %
   e. Fundraising   [   ]
      %
      TOTAL (Must Equal 100%)   [   ]
      %

9. What is the gender of the music executive?
   Male   ○
   Female   ○

APPENDIX C

How to write a user interview script— a (fairly specific) example
I've written this example user interview script as a way of codifying some of the key things I've learnt over the last 5 years of conducting and observing user interviews as a product manager.
This guide will be written from the perspective of a hypothetical app development project, and will illustrate how a user interview script could be written for the discovery phase of this specific project — i.e., before any concepts, solutions or prototypes have been developed. The principles behind the questions are fairly universal, however, so you should be able to apply the concepts illustrated here to your project fairly easily.

For this example, I will be taking the perspective of a designer for that most classic of apps — the to-do list. Because the world definitely needs another to-do list app.

Why conduct user interviews in the discovery phase of a project?
When you're launching a new product or feature, exploratory user research is a critical first step to understand and validate your target user's needs and pain points. That way, you can be sure that whatever product or feature you're developing will be solving real problems for users. User interviews are one of the fundamental tools that you'll be using most often to conduct exploratory research.

However, an important point to note according to Nielsen Norman Group — "a discovery phase does not involve testing a hypothesis or evaluating a potential solution".
While it may be tempting to go into an exploratory user interview with some product concepts to test, by creating concepts to test even before you've completed any user research, you'll risk fixating on solutions that aren't based on problems that have been validated with users.
Testing concepts would be more appropriate in a subsequent phase, after you've consolidated the insights from the interviews in the discovery phase.

Setting research objectives

All user interviews need some specific objectives to ensure that the interview can actually achieve some actionable insights.

Context-setting:

- To-do list apps aim to help users manage and recall their tasks
- To-do list apps are only one way of managing tasks; other ways include other apps (e.g., calendar apps) or physical products (e.g., post-its, handwritten lists)

Assumptions on user needs and pain points:

Before going into a user interview, you would often have some idea about their key needs and pain points. This could come from secondary research or even from the experience of the team members themselves (this would be true in this case because most people would have used a to-do list at some point in their life). An example of an assumption is below:

- Assumption: Users have too many items on their to-do list, leading to them feeling overwhelmed and not being able to complete their most important tasks

Objectives:

Based on the above context and assumptions, we can set the following objectives for this piece of research:

1. To understand how users currently manage and recall their tasks
2. To understand users' key pain points in managing and recalling their tasks
3. To understand users' key pain points when using to-do list apps
4. To validate our assumption that users have too many tasks on their to-do list, leading to an inability to complete their tasks

Recruitment:

Since many of the questions would require us to understand how users use other to-do list apps, the main screening criteria would be that the participant must have some experience using to-do lists in the past (they need not be currently using them since someone who used to-do list apps before but eventually stopped might be able to share interesting insights about *why* they stopped).

A minimum of 5 participants would be required for these interviews (more is possible, but since you'll be having a separate set of sessions for usability testing, it might make sense to stick to 5, to manage the time spent on this project). Check out this useful article from Nielsen Norman Group on why interviewing 5 users is sufficient.

Note Taking:

1. Ensure that you have a note-taker — facilitating an interview while taking notes isn't fun.
2. Where possible, notes should be taken without rephrasing what the user is saying. If you're unable to type fast enough and there is a recording, take note of the time

that the user mentioned that point and include it in the note so you can go back to recording and review it.

3. When taking notes, one recommended approach is to use an app with sticky note functionality like Miro.

- Notes for each of the interviewees should be taken in a different coloured sticky note

- When synthesizing the research, this makes it easy to move the sticky notes around and cluster them, and to quickly identify which insights resonated with multiple users.

Example Interview Script
Preamble:
1. *Thank the participant for their time*
2. *Engage in some light opening conversation to help build rapport and put the participant at ease.*
3. *Clarify the objectives of the session — but try not to use the word 'interview' e.g., 'Today is just a casual chat for us to find out more about how you manage your tasks and use to-do list apps'*
4. *If appropriate, clarify that all findings from this interview will be kept anonymous, and that any insights shared from this session will not mention specific individuals*
5. *Ask for permission to record the session*

General questions about how the user achieves a particular objective (in this case, managing and recalling tasks):
1. *How do you currently manage your tasks?*
2. *Walk us through the last time you had to manage your task list.*
3. *What's the hardest part about managing your task list?*
4. *How do you currently recall tasks that need to be done?*
5. *Tell us about the last time you had to recall a task.*
6. *What's the hardest part about recalling tasks that need to be done?*
7. *How do you work around [issue mentioned by user]?*

Note: We ask these questions separately from the app-specific questions because users may have their own ways of achieving an objective that may not involve applications (e.g., in the case of task management, they may be putting post-its on the fridge or keeping a handwritten task list on their desk).

We also wouldn't ask about their usage of apps immediately because the user might fixate on software issues and not raise more fundamental issues.
App-specific questions:

1. *What to-do list apps are you currently using/did you use in the past to help you keep track of your tasks?*
2. *How did you find out about this to-do list app?*
3. *Is this a paid or free app?*
4. *What platform do you use this app on (mobile/desktop/both)?*
5. *Walk us through the most recent occasion when you used the app.*
6. *What did you like most about managing your tasks through the app?*
7. *What was the biggest problem or the hardest part about managing your tasks through the app?*
8. *How did you work around [issue mentioned by user]?*

Remember to probe deeper when users raise issues. For example, the user might mention an issue in passing while describing how they used the app, at which point you should ask additional probing questions such as:

- *Could you tell me more about that issue you just mentioned?*
- *How did that affect your process of completing your task?*
- *Tell me more about why you felt that way.*

Testing specific assumptions:
Assumption: Users have too many tasks on their to-do list apps, leading to them feeling overwhelmed and not being able to complete their most important tasks on time

1. *Tell me about how you would go about completing tasks on a day-to-day basis.*
2. *What is the hardest part about completing tasks on your to-do list?*
3. *How many tasks do you typically have on the to-do list app?*

When reviewing the data, we can then see if users with a relatively high number of to-do list items compared to others in the participant group face more issues with completing their tasks.

Note that the question on 'how many tasks do you typically have on your to-do list' is asked at the end, so as not to lead the users into referencing that point.

General tips:
- Always prepare a script.
- Have someone join as a note taker, or at the very least, take a recording of the session.
- Make sure to let users finish their thoughts—this entails being a bit comfortable with silence. If you move on too quickly as soon as the user has paused, you may lose out on key insights.
- Don't share your own experiences, even if it seems like a good way to build rapport—this will distract from the key purpose of the interview, which is to find out more about the user.

- It's important to remain neutral and not affirm users' ideas or statements one way or another — this could lead the user to try and say what they think you want to hear.
- Where possible, ask users to recall a specific time when they performed a task rather than asking them how they generally go about performing it. This will guide them to share specific insights rather than more general impressions.
- Remember to probe deeper. The 'five whys' technique is an established technique to determine the root cause of a problem by repeating the question 'Why?'. You generally won't need to ask it five times, but you get the point!
- Stay under 20 questions — this gives you more time to probe the participants' responses further.
- Make sure not to ask leading questions—keep your questions short and don't include any suggestion of an answer or response in the question.
- Users might make mistakes in an interview (e.g., while describing how they used a particular app). Don't correct them during the interview, as this might spoil the flow of the interview and make them feel guarded. Just note them down and inform them at the end of the interview if it's helpful.

Outcome of the interviews:
After the interviews are completed, the notes should be grouped into various insights about the user (this is where sticky notes come in handy).
At the end of this synthesis process, you should have insights on some specific problems that users need to solve (which may or may not include the assumptions you originally had at the start of the process) that can form the basis for ideating what your product will look like.
That's it for this example user interview script! If you found this useful, I'd love to hear from you.

APPENDIX D

SFASU Notification of IRB Approval

Good afternoon Dr. Qualls and Ms. Murphy
Thank you very much for submitting an IRB application for the following study:

Analysis of the Appointment, Experiences, and Job Satisfaction of Leaders in Large Schools of Music

The application was reviewed and approved until **June 7, 2024 – # AY 2023- 0170.**
Emmerentie

Emmerentie Oliphant, PhD
DSW Program Director
Buddy Zeagler Endowed Professor of Community-Based Research
Institutional Review Board (IRB) Chair
School of Social Work
Stephen F. Austin State University
P. O. Box 6104
Nacogdoches, TX 75962-6104

APPENDIX E

Email Invitation to Participate

Subject: Role of leaders in large schools of music

Hello,

     My name is Claire Murphy, and I am a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership program at Stephen F. Austin State University. I am conducting a study about the appointment and experiences of middle-level leaders in NASM-affiliated schools of music or music departments with 401+ music majors and the challenges and factors that impact their job satisfaction and professional agendas.

     Your participation will involve one Zoom panel discussion on Wednesday, June 14 at 1:00 p.m. CDT, which will occur through a secured server. Participants will be audio and video recorded during the Zoom meeting. The 30-minute discussion will allow the 4-8 participants to interact and share responses to questions about their leadership experiences. Identifiable information will not be published. CITI standards of educational research ethics will be maintained. The study was reviewed and approved on June 7, 2023, by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) Committee at SFASU, # AY 2023- 0170**.** Participation is voluntary and will not involve any type of compensation.

     After participants are selected, you will be informed accordingly. Thank you so much for your time in reading this email and for your potential interest. If you are willing to participate in this research project, please reply to this email before Monday, June 12, 1:00 p.m. CDT. A simple "Yes, I will participate" will be sufficient. Should you have any questions about the research, please contact me at claire.murphy@sfasu.edu, or you may contact the dissertation chair, Dr. Barbara Qualls, at quallsba@sfasu.edu.

Sincerely,

Claire Murphy
Assistant Professor of Music Education
Stephen F. Austin State University
Nacogdoches, TX 75962
936-468-4567

SFASU

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY
Analysis of the Appointment, Experiences, and Job Satisfaction
of Leaders in Large Schools of Music

The following information describes the research study in which you are being asked to participate. Please read the information carefully. At the end, you will be asked to sign if you agree to participate.

PURPOSE OF STUDY:

You are being asked to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to contribute to the existing literature on middle-level leadership in higher education by offering specific insight into the experiences of leaders in large schools of music. While there are numerous studies on leaders in other fields in higher education, little is found on leaders in music departments or schools of any size in higher education.

You are being asked to be in the study because you serve as the leader of one of the 49 NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors. Leader experiences of those serving in large schools of music is the focus of this study.

PROCEDURES:

- The leaders of the 49 NASM-affiliated public institutions with 401+ music majors were emailed and invited to participate in the study.
- Participants for this panel interview are randomly selected among those who expressed an interest in participating by responding to the invitation email. If participant interest numbers are between 4-8, the desired number for the panel discussion, all will be included for the panel discussion. If more than 8 leaders respond, a proportional group will be identified by the results of a https://randomizer.org run.
- After participants are selected for the panel interview, they will be contacted via email and informed of the Zoom panel discussion time and date. This consent form will be included in the email.

- Participants will sign the consent form and return it via email to the researcher prior to the panel interview.

PANEL INTERVIEW INFORMATION AND PROTOCOL:

Your participation will involve one Zoom panel discussion, which will occur through a secured server. Participants will be sent a secure Zoom link to join the meeting. The beginning of the panel discussion will include an introduction of the researcher and panel participants may introduce themselves. Additionally, participants will be reminded that their names and identities will not be published in the study. During the Zoom interview, participants will be able to see and interact with other panel discussion participants. However, names and identifiable information will not be included in the printed study. Those participating will be expected to engage in the panel discussion via Zoom with their camera on. While participants will be able to introduce themselves in the panel discussion, the names of participants will not be used in the printed study. Instead, pseudonyms will be used.

Following introductions, the researcher will inform the participants that the recording will begin. Panel participants will be audio and video recorded during the Zoom meeting. Questions will be open-ended to allow participants to respond freely. The panel discussion will be based on the findings of the quantitative analysis of survey responses to questions about music leaders in the HEADS Music Data Survey. One example of a question generated from the Survey analysis might ask panel participants how their distribution of time toward fundraising relates to that of their peers.

The purpose of the panel discussion will be to gather viewpoints and opinions from participants to explain the quantitative survey data further and offer a deeper understanding of the research problem. The discussion should take no more than 30 minutes and will include a panel of 4-8 participants. The discussion will allow participants to interact and share responses to questions about their leadership experiences.

STANDARDS:

High standards of educational research ethics will be maintained, including SFASU Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, protecting the identity of participants in the printed study, and making sure the research does not cause any harm, risk, or discomfort to the participants. Participation is voluntary and will not involve any type of compensation. The video, transcripts, and coding materials will be maintained according to confidentiality standards.

TIME EXPECTATIONS:
The length of time estimated for your participation in the panel interview is approximately 30 minutes.

RISKS AND/OR DISCOMFORTS:
We do not anticipate you will experience any personal risk or discomfort from taking part in this study.

BENEFITS:
One possible benefit for participants in the panel discussion may include insight into the experiences and responses of those in similar leadership roles in large schools of music.

Retention and recruitment of middle-level leaders in higher education have been identified as a challenge and concern in higher education. While studies that examine the appointment and experiences of leaders in higher education exist, little is known specifically about leaders in schools of music. Music faculty who may have an interest in a leadership role will benefit from the study because it will offer insight on leader experiences and factors that influence job satisfaction from leaders in schools of music.

CONFIDENTIALITY:
Participants will be audio and video recorded during the Zoom meeting. Participants who are identified for the panel discussion agree to not share the names or any other identifiable information on panel participants and their institutions beyond the creation of the panel interview. Names and identifiable information will not be included in the printed study. Pseudonyms such as "Participant 1, Participant 2; Institution 1, Institution 2" will be used instead. The video product and all transcripts and coding materials will be maintained according to confidentiality standards established by CITI training of confidentiality standards.

Data will be saved on a password-protected computer that belongs to the researcher. Following the study, data will be moved to a flash drive that will be locked in a personal file cabinet in the personal home office of the researcher and kept for a minimum of 7 years after the completion of the study.

COST AND COMPENSATION:
There will be no cost or compensation involved in this study.

RIGHT TO DECLINE OR WITHDRAW:
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to refuse to participate in the study or withdraw your consent at any time during the study.

If you are an employee or student at SFASU, your desire not to participate in this study or request to withdraw will not adversely affect your status as an employee or grades.

CONTACT INFORMATION:
Claire Murphy ██████████ or Dr. Barbara Qualls ██████████) will gladly answer any questions you may have concerning the purpose, procedures, and outcome of this project. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject you may contact the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) 936-468-6606 or the SFASU IRB at irb@sfasu.edu

PARTICIPANT AGREEMENT:
I have read the information in this consent form and agree to participate in this study. I have had the chance to ask any questions I have about this study, and they have been answered for me. I am entitled to a copy of this form after it has been read and signed.

_____   _____

Signature of Participant   **Date**

_____   _____

Signature of person obtaining consent   **Date**

APPENDIX G

Dr. _____,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the panel discussion tomorrow at 1:00 CDT/2:00 EST. I am really looking forward to our Zoom meeting tomorrow and will cross my fingers that all technology works!

The Zoom link for tomorrow is here:

Should you have any issues logging in or have any questions, please feel free to contact me on my cell phone, █████████, or use my personal email address, █████████████

I have also attached the adult consent form in Word and pdf formats. I would be grateful if you could please sign and return it to this email address (not claire.murphy@sfasu.edu as indicated in the form).

Again, I look forward to talking with you tomorrow!

All the best,

Claire

Claire Murphy
Assistant Professor of Music Education
Stephen F. Austin State University
Nacogdoches, TX 75965

APPENDIX H

Name,

Thank you again for making time to participate in the panel discussion and sharing your perspective and insight on the data and questions! I thoroughly enjoyed getting to speak with you and the panel this afternoon!

Wishing you a wonderful remainder of your week,

Claire

VITA

Claire Chesson Murphy attended East Carolina University and earned her

Bachelor of Music degree in vocal performance in 1995 and a Master of Music Education

with K-12 certification in 1999. Before joining the School of Music faculty at Stephen F.

Austin State University, Murphy was an assistant professor of music education at the

University of Idaho and adjunct faculty at Barton College and East Carolina University.

She has taught all levels over the past 25 years in North Carolina, Florida, and Texas,

both in public and college preparatory schools. In 2019 she returned to higher education

as an assistant professor of music education and music education coordinator at SFASU.

Murphy earned a Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership in August of 2023.

Permanent Address: 3421 St. George Circle
                              Nacogdoches, Texas, 75965

Style manual designation: *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 7th ed.*

This dissertation was typed by Claire C. Murphy.

190