BECOMING THE UNIVERSITY:
EARLY PRESIDENTIAL DISCOURSES OF GORDON GEE

By

Michael W. Rishell

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

HIGHER, ADULT AND LIFELONG EDUCATION

2011

Abstract

BECOMING THE UNIVERSITY:
EARLY PRESIDENTIAL DISCOURSES OF GORDON GEE

By

Michael W. Rishell

The author explores Gordon Gee's career as a university president. There is a special focus on the journey Gee made between 1990, when he first became president of The Ohio State University, to 2007, when he returned to Ohio State for another term as university president ten years later. During this time away from Ohio State, he served as the president (or chancellor) of both Brown University and Vanderbilt University. Data are reviewed from these presidencies, as well.

Individual discourse, professional discourse, and organizational discourse were examined through a variety of data, including discourse analyses of the speeches given by Gee in the early days of each of these four presidencies.

The dissertation provides a model, The Triangle of Leadership Discourse, which serves to illustrate the necessary balance of discourses which must remain in harmony with one another for the tenure of leadership to be successful.

Dedication

To my wife, Ann Snyder Rishell, and my daughter, Sabine Rishell: No one makes me laugh like you do, and no one makes me happier. Thank you, both, for making this possible.

Acknowledgements

First of all, a grand thank you to my committee: Marilyn Amey, you made this happen and I will forever be grateful. Should this faculty career not work out, you have a future as an editor. And any future notes to you will include plenty of hyphens and sentences that start with "And". Avner Segall, you have been a constant source of inspiration. John Dirkx, thank you for showing me the world. MaryLee Davis, thank you especially for always believing in me.

To my colleagues in the Tweed Cohort: We meshed, didn't we. Special thanks are due to Melissa McDaniels, Mike Messner, and Jen Hodges. All of you helped me continue.

To all my employers, I am grateful for all of the free photocopies – even if you didn't know about it. Likewise, I appreciate all the stolen time that I used to work on this seemingly-never-ending project.

To my informants, thank you for your availability, your willingness to participate, and your trust.

There is a special thank you to Becki Crowell, who never questioned my requests but simply enabled me. You made this a much easier journey.

And finally, to anyone who has ever doubted or slighted me. Your punishment is to read this tome word for word.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

Chapter One

An Introduction and A Rationale

Gordon Gee was named president of The Ohio State University – the first time – in 1990. As much as any academic could be, Gordon Gee might be described as a professional university president. This is his life's work. Since 1981, he has served continuously as a university president, first at West Virginia, then Colorado, and then Ohio State. Following his first tenure at Ohio State, he moved to Brown and onto Vanderbilt. Then, in 2008, Gee returned to become president, once again, of The Ohio State University. This circle – leaving Ohio State, serving as president of two well-known private research universities, and then returning to lead Ohio State – breaks new ground in the field of presidential careers. It is presumed that returning to a university to lead it once again after an absence of nearly a decade, and after leading two other institutions, is absolutely new territory.

Gordon Gee as a subject of study provokes thoughts of how men and women continually find themselves in leadership positions one after the other and receive permission from new constituencies to place themselves at the center and in the heart of the organization and institution. The university presidency itself is a job with demands around the clock. These demands show there is a complex interplay that exists in how leaders of organizations manage the give-and-take between their personal lives and their professional lives, and how, especially, leaders use their own personal stories – their individual discourse – to help shape, manage, and complete their work agendas. One perspective has work/life domains separated by boundaries, and the boundaries are described by two dimensions: flexibility and permeability (Hall & Richter, 1989). Another perspective has that work/family facilitation is enabled by

environmental resources, that work and family enable and influence each other (Grzywacz & Butler, 2005).

Just as Grzywacz and Butler (2005) suggested that work and family enable and influence each other, discourses, too, overlap in leadership (Ford, Harding, & Learmonth, 2008a). Many looking at discourse in organizations fail to look at both process (how an individual navigates the structure) and structure (Fairclough, 2005). I believe an approach that integrates personal stories (or individual discourse), organizational saga (or rather, organizational discourse), and the discourse of positional power (or professional discourse) incorporates the relationship between process and structure. Work/life interplay and the discourses of leadership intertwine like a strand of DNA, creating the experiences, stories, and patterns that create a leader's own leadership discourse.

The leader, in many circumstances, embodies the institution (Winston, 1993). But in most cases, this is not automatic from Day One. How does a university president work to establish a persona as big as the institution he or she leads? In other words, must the leader grow or mature their leadership discourse to fit the arena? Or at least change their discourse? Discourses and discursive practices are relative to time and place (Cherryholmes, 1988a), and to individuals. A leader must go through certain actions to be recognized as a leader, and those very actions then create the leader and the leader's persona (Ford, Harding, & Learmonth, 2008c). The interplay of these variables has guided the formation and execution of this study.

Statement of the Problem and Research Question

Discourses produce organizations and organizations produce discourse (de Graaf, 2001). Discourse is the principal means by which organization members create a coherent social reality

that frames their sense of who they are (Fairclough, 2005). Discourse models become simulations that we run in our minds to help us think about things and prepare for action (Gee, 2005f), and in some professions (I suggest the role of a university president) an organizational leader has to manage the incommensurable dimensions of a boundary position between profession and organization by positioning across different discourses (Fairclough, 2005). In this study, I look at Gordon Gee's individual discourse via the paradigm of big "D" discourse presented by James Paul Gee (Gee, 2005a). I intersect this individual discourse with the institutional discourse of The Ohio State University grounded in Burton Clark's concept of organizational saga (Clark, 1972) along with the effects of positional power. The power of the leader within the organization is a variable adding complexity to the study. There is a certain given power that comes with a leadership position in an institutionalized manner (Felluga, 2003), and it will vary within differing contexts (Nye, 2008)

In universities, the risk with the selection of new organizational leaders is quite high (Clausen, 1997). If one were to consider just salary and other budgetary considerations in a vacuum, the numbers would be intimidating. If the new leader proves ineffective, or if the fit is bad, the organization is potentially set backward significantly by having to redo the necessary steps to find another leader, to regain or rebuild the lost financial resources, and to repair both the concrete and intangible damage done by this misstep (whether accidental, consequential, or malicious).

Universities, as loosely-coupled organizations (Weick, 1976)**,** are perhaps more challenging to lead than most institutions. Personnel monies, the primary assets for an academic institution, often make up 80% of a university's budget (Boulus, 2003)**.** The assets represented by this 80% of the budget go up and down in the elevator at the beginning and the end of each

day. They communicate with one another, and they especially relay stories and personal perspectives to various other stakeholders such as alumni, politicians, and students. Dissent is common (Lindholm, 2003). As mentioned earlier, Fairclough believed that many looking at discourse in organizations fail to look at both process and structure (2005). This interplay created within the organization and outside of the organization, by the people belonging to the organization and by people holding an interest in the organization, showed tension between the processes (the people and the discourses behind the processes) and the structure (the organization) (Fairclough, 2005).

Oral and written discourse and a host of non-verbal acts provide clues through which we can better understand the cultural dimensions of an organization (Chaffee & Tierney, 1988d). Via informal networks and through casual means in addition to those that are more formal, we pass along our impressions of individuals and organizations. We tell stories that illustrate what we feel is right, or wrong, about an organization. Our storytelling describes things that we instinctively feel are important to know, and these stories become part of the collective knowledge of the organization (Deal & Kennedy, 1982b). Storytelling, part of the DNA making up a corporate culture, relays the values necessary for surviving and thriving (Deal & Kennedy, 1982b). People tell stories to gain power and influence (Deal & Kennedy, 1982b), as well as to navigate the organization. The accumulation of stories within an organization becomes an organizational saga and is located between ideology and religion, partaking of an appealing logic on the one hand and sentiments similar to the spiritual on the other (Clark, 1970b).

The accumulation of these stories, or organizational saga, helps illustrate the belief and power in a personnel core such as the role and influence of the presidency, the importance of a program of work, the integral importance of an external social base, the role of students, and the

force of organizational ideology (Clark, 1970a). The discourses of leaders in the organization are the principal means by which these organization members create a coherent social reality that frames their sense of who they are (Fairclough, 2005). I believe these stories, the discourse of the leaders of the organization, and the saga which frames the organization, all are models that organization members use in their sensemaking activities. Examining how these three discourses interact, and the leader's role in negotiating this interaction, is unique in the literature and the focus of this research.

The research question in this study examined how an individual leader's discourse is shaped by the organization's saga, the personal history of the leader, and the power and influence of the leader's position. This study reviewed Gordon Gee's return to Ohio State in 2007 for his second tenure as the institution's president, and looked at how he utilized leadership discourse in the first speech to the faculty in his four most recent presidencies to show how his work and accumulation of both life and professional experiences shaped his approach to his return to Ohio State.

The results were anticipated to help understand why some leaders may succeed in some environments and fail in others. The study could demonstrate whether experience in a position influences professional discourse evidenced through selected presidential speeches, and the extent to which even with maturing professional discourse, presidents still need to negotiate organizational discourse in order to lead an institution.

Method and Conceptual Framework

I framed this inquiry as a case study of one. Yin (2003b) suggested that a single-case design rather than one of multiple cases can provide a critical test of a significant theory. This

case study served as an empirical inquiry of Gordon Gee as an example of an institutional leader utilizing, massaging, nurturing, and manipulating organizational culture. Within the case study of one, I looked at multiple elements to provide triangulation within this example. For instance, there are multiple methods of qualitative inquiry (observation, active interviews, discourse analyses), and within the specific inquiry there are multiple instances (as an example, discourse analyses of speeches from Gee's two terms at Ohio State, from his time at Vanderbilt, and his time at Brown). The perspective offered through discourse analysis was especially important as leadership implies power. The perspective developed through the discourse analysis examined how language and words, through the communication of layered meaning to (and the resulting sensemaking of) specific audiences, became the avenue in which the leader negotiated permission to lead.

Part of the grounding for this work, Burton Clark's (1972) concept of organizational saga, is one of the very roots for what we now recognize as organizational culture. The concept of individual-organization fit, I-O fit (Kristof, 1996), was a key issue in how the culture existing at The Ohio State University gave or denied permission to be massaged and manipulated via Gordon Gee's leadership. The boundaries between the phenomenon – Gordon Gee – and the context – Ohio State – are not clearly evident (Yin, 2003a). To some extent, this study reviewing examples of the presidencies of Gordon Gee contained elements of a back story that was built hand-in-hand with his personal life and his professional journey. There is a complex interaction between an individual's understanding of the world and that world itself (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). From a larger perspective, this review illustrated how the discourse of a particular leader and the saga of an institution reflexively amplify each other. One shapes the other, and vice versa.

Discourse analysis, *pro forma* non-critical, is a primary tool used to interpret data in this study. As critical discourse analysis necessarily looks at power, hegemony, and dialectic, Toolan (Toolan, 1997) proposed a necessary aim of critical discourse analysis would be to suggest how a control-revealing, hegemony-eliciting, manipulative text might have been created. Rather than fully embrace the "critical" of critical discourse analysis and all that it implies, I have chosen to not let power be the sole or dominant catalyst within my analysis. The expressed desire of leaders to be considered formal peers, as members of the faculty, may be unique to research universities. It is this "back and forth" perspective between the power of the presidency and the collegial nature of the faculty that leads me to discount the "critical" and exercise a discourse analysis not so focused on power alone. During the course of the review of speeches and other elements of the discourse of Gordon Gee, this approach served as part of the lens for interpretation.

Acknowledging that Toolan (1997) suggested a subsequent aim of critical discourse analysis is to work toward the construction of a non-manipulative and non-hegemonic text, my position, especially when reviewing the discourse of leadership, is that a non-manipulative and non-hegemonic text is impossible to achieve as long as there are leaders leading followers. Thus, "critical" can be over-emphasized. Despite these statements that might seem at odds with each other, I do believe a flavor of critical discourse analysis is important for the interpretation of messages of leaders as it breaks away oft-superfluous vestiges of power and highlights the role of complex issues of culture and setting (contents of discourse, really). It is with this perspective that I chose to analyze the discourse of leadership and, specifically, how leaders work to integrate their texts into new settings and structures. A discourse analysis should not merely be

concerned with languages and orders of discourse, but also with texts as (elements of) processes and structures, and with the relations of tension between them (Fairclough, 2005).

Studying this intersection of individual discourse, saga, and positional discourse, it was important to review, define, and illustrate both the subject institution and the individual whose discourse helped define the delivery of the discourse of leadership. My review of Ohio State included documents of recent times illustrating both strategic thought and popular opinion, and it consisted of active interviews (Holstein & Gubrium, 2002) with institutional leaders and others of interest, including those who helped produce Ohio State's saga and those key in the exploitation of saga for recruiting, speechwriting, speechmaking, and fundraising. These interviews illustrated the strategy behind the institutional discourse (as seen by the interviewees) and the individual discourse of the leader, along with shedding light on the positional power of the presidency. These three avenues of data collection (interviews, observation, and documentation) helped with triangulation and thus with advancing validity (Patton, 1990).. As with other forms of qualitative research, as a set of interpretive practices this approach privileges no single methodology over any other (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994).

Focusing upon Gordon Gee, the study similarly consisted of a triangulation of data regarding Gee himself. There was a personal interview with Gee. There was a review of presidential speeches delivered by Gee, and news articles about his day to day activities illustrated his performance and activities at previous institutions. Finally, interviews with and stories told by those a bit more distant (faculty, staff, and students) shed light on what is so compelling about Gee and offered additional qualitative data on his effectiveness as a leader.

Based on discourse analysis being a tool of inquiry used to ask questions of data (Gee, 2005a, 2011; Threadgold, 2003), this research was conducted from a poststructuralist lens.

Perspectives within social linguistics (Gee, 1996) and social semiotics (Threadgold, 2003) via discourse analysis played a significant role in the study, and issues of power were a subtext. Deconstruction is among the tools in the poststructural toolbox (Inayatullah, 1998), and discourse analysis explores language, destabilized meaning, identity, and cultural politics in a way inspired by Derrida (Threadgold, 2003). While the subject here, a university president, attempted to construct messages at the primary level along with coordinated (and occasionally conflicting) subtexts, all was dependent on how the message was received. From these data, validity became apparent as meaning converged from the various sources to move toward theory illustrating agreement.

Definition of Terms

There are several key terms, concepts, and phrases that I will identify at the start of this study. This is to clarify and stabilize the meaning and definition of each, helping the reader to ensure consistency with the intent of the author. In many ways, this is like learning the key attributes of characters in a play.

The Multiversity

Although Clark Kerr might point to Abraham Flexner as the pioneer (1963), Kerr is recognized as the first to comment incisively on the nature and administrative challenges of the contemporary research university as a distinctive entity. In the Godkin Lectures at Harvard in 1963, and in numerous published editions of *The Uses of the University* (the more familiar name of Kerr's Godkin Lecture) from that point forward, Kerr used his *The Uses of the University* to present a new name for the institutions that had evolved into the leading research universities of

the day: "the multiversity". Saying that those who had written before him could not really set the tone for the modern university (Kerr, 1963), he penned the aforementioned term. For whatever reasons within popular culture and the *zeitgeist* of the eras that followed, the term "multiversity" never really caught on outside the classroom and the culture of higher education scholarship. But the concept, via many names, continues to define leading research universities.

The multiversity is an inconsistent institution (Kerr, 1963). Its edges are fuzzy. It reaches out to alumni, legislators, farmers, and business professionals, all of whom are related to one or more of its internal communities (Kerr, 1963). The concept is important to this study as a key definition for the type of college or university studied, contrasting the liberal arts institutions observed by Burton Clark. In leading research universities, such as The Ohio State University, there are several competing visions of true purpose, each relating to a different layer of history, a different web of forces (Kerr, 1963).

The Ohio State University

For examining this case study of Gordon Gee, I primarily focused on The Ohio State University specifically, and to a lesser extent Gee's time at Brown University and his time at Vanderbilt University. I did not address in-depth his relationships with other former employers, although they are referenced from time to time. If this were a play, Ohio State would be the setting. At any given time, this university is a community of roughly 100,000 people split approximately 60/40 between students and faculty/staff, situated in the midst of a larger community of Greater Columbus numbering in excess of one million people, and within the state of Ohio, home to more than 11 million.

Just by the numbers alone, the complexity is multiplied exponentially from the liberal arts college studied by Clark (1970a). Combine this with the variety of missions espoused by Ohio State such as health care, graduate study, research, undergraduate study, and entertainment, it is easy to see how this behemoth could be nothing at all like the liberal arts college Clark termed an academic village. But yet, I posit that it is similar to the world dissected by Clark as a primary business is the education of undergraduates in an organization that strives to be identified as an academic community. Within this concept of community are stories that become part of the collective knowledge of the organization (Deal & Kennedy, 1982b). Surely there are many stories in these larger institutions; however, there will still be dominant narratives that define the loosely-agreed upon collective sense of identity.

Discourse

Discourse is one of the most oft-used words in scholarship, theory, and criticism and this is likely because it can mean so many things. In this case, I looked toward James Paul Gee for guidance. He wrote of D/discourse, or big D discourse and small d discourse (Gee, 2005a). For J.P. Gee, D/discourse (or big D discourse) involves situated identities; ways of performing and recognizing characteristic identities and activities; ways of coordinating and getting coordinated by other people, things, tools, technologies, symbol systems, places, and times; and characteristic ways of acting, interacting, feeling, emoting, valuing, gesturing, posturing, dressing, thinking, believing, knowing, speaking, listening, reading, and writing (Gee, 2005b). Gee distinguished big D discourse from small d discourse, which he indicated is about how such language is used on-site, or in real time, to enact activities and identities (Gee, 2005a).

A significant issue is the filter that one uses in constructing one's discourse. Gee notes that "recognition work" is what people engage in when they try to make visible to others (and to themselves, as well) who they are and what they are doing (Gee, 2005b). Sometimes such recognition work is conscious, sometimes it is not (Gee, 2005b). Likewise, the creation of discourse is sometimes conscious, and sometimes not. It is possible that one could hold within, personally, key values within a discourse. This withholding could, theoretically, prevent a discourse from being fully a social construct. With this in mind, I will acknowledge that such a thing as personal discourse represents the potential of an unknown, and will thus use the term "individual discourse" as we describe a person's discourse that does not include the withheld or the unknown, and is representative of a collection of experience over the passage of time.

Organizational Saga

Organizational saga will be based in the definition of the concept put forward by Burton R. Clark in the 1950s and 1960s, and is treated as tantamount to an institutional or organizational discourse as it is composed of a collection of narratives and people's experiences over the passage of time. Clark's work was in-depth and designed to show how organizational saga led to distinctive colleges in the academic marketplace, and utilized as a strategy on the road to success. A significant outcome in Clark's work was that values and campus culture can contribute to long-term success for a college or university (Martin, 1994).

In his seminal work *The Distinctive College* (1970a), Clark developed the concept of organizational saga as the central ingredient in the making of the distinctive college. Outside scholarly circles, one might say these organizations have "it," a certain *je ne sais quoi.* His work focused on Swarthmore, Antioch, and Reed, and he used these close-knit communities to

illustrate his concept. "Distinctive" by itself means essentially "different," leaning toward "unique," which is a singular term but more often used as a comparative. Clark added implied values to "distinctive" to what should essentially be a valueless but loosely descriptive word. As he endeavored to define "distinctive" in the introduction to the aforementioned work, Clark (Clark, 1970a) played with possible synonyms such as "character", "durable," and "noteworthy." "Distinctive" can be a fleeting concept, and perhaps the cliché of "excellence" is really that for which he was striving. Ultimately, Clark (Clark, 1970a) rooted the concept in the successful employment of a college's mission, and admitted that what he is working to illustrate is "a matter of the heart" (p.9).

Rather than looking at the brethren of Swarthmore, Antioch, and Reed, my study illustrated organizational saga on the other side of the coin from the liberal arts college. Seldom do these colleges – villages, really – number beyond 2,500 students and faculty. The research universities are typically composed of communities in the tens of thousands. One could posit that the liberal arts college is less complex and simpler to define. The arena and complexity of a large research university provides a different view of how organizational saga is used as a driver.

Individual-Organizational Fit

Individual-organization fit (I-O fit), or person-organization fit (P-O fit) is generally defined as the compatibility between individuals and organizations (Kristof, 1996). Positive I-O fit in the traditional corporate setting leads to greater commitment in both directions (Valentine, Godkin, & Lucero, 2002); however, with the complexity of a multiversity this can be a challenging concept for leaders – for anyone – to master. Faculty tend to relate to their organizations through their home departments (Lindholm, 2003), and organization-wide

perceptions of culture and climate do not tend to emerge as clearly within multiversities as they do in other types of work environments.

Singer (1991) discussed the difficulty of nailing down anything that can accurately be called community and described a group defined by members who embody multiple, conflicting, and overlapping identities. If this is the case, then groups made up of these members are similarly fluid (Singer, 1991). Perhaps there is no community where this is more the norm than a multiversity community, with regular turnover of undergraduates and graduate students, and upwardly mobile faculty and staff seemingly always having opportunity for what may appear to be greener pastures. With this paradigm, I posit that I-O Fit may be a more fleeting concept within academe than in the corporate world.

Positional Discourse

Positional discourse is the message and actions given authority by an organizational leader, and consists of how the leader exercises the power that comes with the position, rather than grounded in personal history or other phenomena (Weber, 1986). In Western culture, whether by tradition or experience, leadership positions are automatically granted a certain amount of influence by those subject to the leader's power. Power is a by-product of organizational relationships, and those with less power adapt to the perspective of those with influence (Galinsky, Magee, Inesi, & Gruenfeld, 2006).

I posit that the discourse which is in part rooted in the positional authority of a leader is part of the blend that constitutes leadership discourse, and is part of the equation in which followers give permission for an individual to lead.

University Presidency

For three of the leadership experiences (Ohio State, Brown, and Ohio State) of Gordon Gee profiled in this study he benefited from the title of "President." At Vanderbilt University, he was titled as "Chancellor." Anecdotally, "president" appears to be the more common title in use in higher education in the United States. Other titles can include chancellor, principal, and vice-chancellor, among others. I will use "president" as the term signifying the academy's chief executive officer, following what appears to be the most common usage.

Study Limitations and Assumptions

This study focused on one leader and one leader only, Gordon Gee. He likely is not representative among university presidents; however, he provides illustrations of the concepts of discourse reviewed within, and he provides many examples of how individual discourse works (or does not work) hand in hand with institutional discourse, also known as organizational saga and the professional discourse, which incorporates positional power. As Clark reviewed Antioch College, Reed College, and Swarthmore College in *The Distinctive College* (Clark, 1970a) and developed the concept of organizational saga, my study roughly four decades down the road looked very specifically at one research university. An intent of my study was to show the conscious effort through which organizational saga was finessed and employed by a president in a large research university, as opposed to the smaller communities of liberal arts colleges that Clark used to develop the concept.

Rather than a comparative exercise, this grounding in Clark's work (Clark, 1970a) was positioned as a starting point for a similar quest in a different realm of the large complex research university. Unintentional bias may be present, as I have spent the vast majority of my

professional life in large research universities. I hope this work might be used as a starting point for organizational thought for these realms as there are many generalities common to a number of organizations, within and outside of education. I endeavored to show the importance of setting and culture, and noted that the role of the institutional leader using organizational saga and its strategic use will be different for each organization.

Believing that organizational saga is a meaning-making concept (Clark, 1970b) for those expressing allegiance to an institution as well as for those trying on identities, my focus was on the current representation along with adjustments made for today's marketplace. Historical saga does exist and was indeed a factor in the creation of current saga identified in this study; I worked with the idea that historical saga is a subset of the current saga developed and massaged daily. Ohio State's history is a part of the equation, certainly, but my study did not mine the archives for the roots of today's saga.

Summary

This case study, like a theatrical play, contains a lead character, a plot, and a setting. Key definitions function as a cast, interacting with lead characters and providing context and meaning. Continuing the metaphor, the presence of a narrator can run the gamut from absent to omnipresent. This first chapter introduced the play, told us the importance of the cast and the setting, and showed us how this case study would illustrate that the personal and professional history of the lead character integrated and weaved in relationship with that same lead character's professional agenda. The research question equates to the plot, as the narrative/case study will help us understand and enlighten the plot development.

The multiversity as a concept, The Ohio State University, discourse, organizational saga, individual-organizational fit, professional discourse, and the university presidency make up the seven-member cast that surround and define this story. The author, too, will surface from time to time, just as Hitchcock always made a point to appear in the films he directed.

The next chapter will provide a review of the relevant literature, in many ways adding additional background on the seven-member cast, thus helping the audience understand their positioning and enabling greater sensemaking of the plot – the research question.

Chapter Two

A Review of the Relevant Literature

An Introduction

The framework constructed for this study explored the intersection of organizational saga, individual discourse, and positional power, and this literature review was shaped in the same fashion. Built on this foundation, this study went beyond the use of discourse as a tool of inquiry and has attempted to show that discourse is also a tool to organize, to define, and to communicate to those who belong to an organization and subscribe to a common set of values.

From this discussion of discourse, I looked at individual discourse and individuals' relationships to organizations, and I reviewed institutional discourse and organizational saga paying special attention to the stories that develop in organizations and how these stories are used as a tool to both advance an organization and to interpret one. Next, positional power and discourse were reviewed, with a special attention focused on how these discourses related to organizational culture. Finally, I reviewed the university presidency as a place where positional power, institutional discourse, and individual discourse come together, and how the convergence of these discourses are applied by leadership.

Discourse as a Tool of Inquiry and Interpretation

Discourses govern what is said and what can be thought, and they do not work in a straightforward way. While language makes certain things possible, it also brings challenges and makes other things impossible (Ford, Harding, & Learmonth, 2008b). Discourse is only part of the equation. Knowing and reading the text of leadership does not mean individuals

automatically become leaders (Ford et al., 2008a). Discourses intersect, interweave, and inform each other, so the term "leader" will be informed by overlapping discourses. The meaning of what appears to be such an easily comprehended term as "leader," therefore, becomes so complex and so elusive that it slips out of our grasp (Ford et al., 2008a).

Likewise, calling certain practices "administration" and others "management" is not simply to name them; it does something to them, most obviously perhaps, in the sense that it values them in different ways (Ford et al., 2008b). Citation – a word's history – is prior intention; indeed it is a condition of possibility for intention to operate (Ford et al., 2008b). This is not to deny that intention and context have a role in speech acts, but as Derrida argued, intention and context will no longer be able to govern the entire scene and system of utterance (Derrida, 1979). While authoritative speech can provide grounding (Butler, 1993), the person identified as a leader must go through the actions deemed necessary to become a leader, and those very actions create that person as a leader (Ford et al., 2008c). Discourse itself is crucial, but it is only part of the equation.

Discourse models are an important tool of inquiry because they mediate between the micro level of interaction and the macro level of institutions (Gee, 2005f). This turn to language involves a fundamental shift in the social sciences that began, principally, with Wittgenstein's philosophy of psychology and language in the 1950s (Wood & Kroger, 2000a). Discourse models are like simulations we run in our minds to help us think about things and prepare for action (Gee, 2005f), and are the language above the sentence (Stubbs, 1983). The simulations are not neutral, but rather help us develop a personal perspective (Gee, 2005f). Perhaps the classic challenge in interpreting meaning is that we often rely on our own viewpoint, rather than endeavoring to determine meaning based upon the social and cultural worlds of those for whom

we attempt to read (Gee, 2005d). From a poststructuralist lens, language is not looked upon as a neutral means of communication, but as a process that forms the objects and subjects of which we speak: Conversations always take place in a preconstituted meaning and value system (Shapiro, 1992). Language is not just seen as reflective of what goes on in an organization; discourses and organizations are one and the same (de Graaf, 2001). Discourses produce organizations and organizations produce discourse (de Graaf, 2001).

With this in mind, it is important to note that discourse models can be partial and inconsistent (Gee, 2005f), and that we all belong to a variety of groups and are influenced by a wide array of groups, texts, institutions, and media that color our perspective (Gee, 2005f). James Paul Gee's approach to discourse analysis is to balance talk about the mind, talk about social interaction and activities, and talk about society and institutions. If discourse analysis is the set of social practices that make meaning, then many of the texts produced in this process are multimodal (Jaworski & Coupland, 1999). It is necessary to get one's body, clothes, gestures, actions, interactions, symbols, tools, technologies (be they guns or graphs), values, attitudes, beliefs, and emotions right as well, and all at the right places and times (Gee, 2005a). Other nonverbal discourse modes include painting, sculpture, photography, design, music, and film (Jaworski & Coupland, 1999). The human unconscious is oft structured like a language itself (Lacan & Fink, 2006), and Lacan posited a circular causality (reflexivity) between the symbolic and the real, or the spoken and the unspoken (or represented) (Bracher, 1994). Roland Barthes has shown that everyday things generate meta-languages with secondary connotations alongside their more obvious meanings, which support the dominant values of petit-bourgeois society (Moran, 2005).

Discourses necessarily contain both facts and values (de Graaf, 2001). The way one looks at the world, the way one perceives the facts, necessarily determines the way one values it. (de Graaf, 2001). When facts and values are thus viewed as inseparable, this has an effect: the object of study changes. The uncertainty in meaning that arises from changes in context is irreducible and a given in all texts (Manning & Cullum-Swan, 1994). A text is not an object or thing, but an occasion for the interplay of multiple codes and perspectives. One must seek to extract and examine the operations or means by which meaning is conveyed (Manning & Cullum-Swan, 1994).

A discourse analysis is based on the details of a speech (and gaze and gesture and action) that are arguably deemed relevant in the context where the speech was used and that are relevant to the arguments the analysis is attempting to make (Gee, 2011). James Paul Gee provided a simple way to analyze discourse. To help understand discourse analysis, it is possible to divide things into "grammar 1" and "grammar 2" (Gee, 2005e). The first is the traditional set of units like nouns, verbs, inflections, phrases, and clauses (Gee, 2005e). The second – less studied, but more important – are the rules that signal patterns or characteristics within discourse (Gee, 2005e). From this base, Gee develops a division of form-function analysis (which roughly matches the first grammar) and language-context grammar, which encompasses an ever-widening set of factors that accompany language in use (Gee, 2005c). These sets of factors are inevitably context-related, and the resulting situated meaning is often referred to as an assembly (Gee, 2005c).

Language is a virus (Burroughs, 1998), and thus spreads and mutates. Discourses draw upon other discourses, using tools such as intertextuality (discourses and texts from other media, and from other contexts and circumstances), and are thus internally variable (Foucault, 1984).

Thinking and using language is an active matter of assembling the situated meanings that you need for action in the world (Gee, 2005c). Discourses are constituted by communities; that is, people use discourses to signal their membership to others inside and outside their groups, and the terms of membership are given in discourse (Gee, 1996). Language used in a text can activate pre-existing assumptions, beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge (Dworin & Bomer, 2008). The sense or coherence of a whole text is generated in a sort of chemical reaction that you get when you put together what is in the text and what is already 'in' the interpreter (Fairclough, 1989).

Thus, discourse – while an extraordinary tool of inquiry as suggested by Gee (2005f) – is also used as a tool to organize and to define during an individual's interpretative meaning-making process.

For instances where individuals interact with society at large, and with both micro and macro cultures, Fairclough (1995) used the term "critical discourse analysis" in order to incorporate the influence of wider social and cultural structures, relations, and processes (Fairclough, 1995). From his perspective, discourses are built less by the will of individuals than by the pervasiveness of particular social constructions. Power, from this lens, is a structural artifact rather than an intent or exercise of will. Thus, critical discourse analysis is a tool to connect language to larger patterns of privilege and power (Dworin & Bomer, 2008).

Some of these voices may be competing with each other or representing conflicting interests or ideologies (Jaworski & Coupland, 1999). All knowledge, all objects, are constructs: Criticism analyzes the processes of construction and, acknowledging the artificial quality of the categories concerned, offers the possibility that we might profitably conceive the world in some alternative way (Fowler, 1981). Critical discourse analysis tends to incorporate the perspectives

that are the most macro analytical (Wood & Kroger, 2000b). Envisioning a social semiotics order, the message is the smallest semiotic form and the text and discourse are the larger units (Hodge & Kress, 1988).

Derrida (1976) famously declared that there is nothing outside the text, and consequently every utterance entails a context (Anward, 1997). Discourse is socially constructed as well as socially conditioned, and it helps reproduce the social status quo and contributes to transforming it (Wodak, 1997). Texts are shaped by two sets of causal powers and by the tension between them: On the one hand, social structures and social practices; on the other hand, the agency of people involved in the events of which they are a part (Fairclough, 2004). These causal powers represent the conflict and negotiation which becomes a part of the culture of an organization where members endeavor to advances texts, or causes, through an organization while a leader (such as a university president) does the same. This becomes the social construction of discourse.

Since it is so socially consequential, discourse also gives rise to important issues of power (Wodak, 1997). Strategic discourse moves beyond communicative discourse, becoming power-laden and goal-directed (Thornborrow, 2002). Hegemonic power shapes people's perceptions in such a way that they accept the order of things as if there were no alternatives (Hall, 1982), thus members in an organization are compelled to follow leaders. Organizational culture and symbolism is part of the make-up of institutional discourse (Mumby, 1988). A discourse can exist only in the form in which it exists, so long as it is not simply grammatically correct but also, and above all, socially acceptable and used in the appropriate situation (Bourdieu, 1991). Postmodernity as a condition often erodes confidence in larger narratives, and consequently the tool of repetition enters the equation to fight against that which undermines

certainty (Locke, 2004a). The repetition of words will also provide a complex of connectedness throughout a text (Locke, 2004b).

Features of the mind are not to be viewed as decontextualized abstractions or putative structures that are expressed in behavior. Rather, cognition, emotion, and the like are seen as constituted in language and social interaction; that is, they are constructed, oriented to, and utilized within communication (Shi-xu, 2000). Self-definition is a complicated matter, as we are all multifaceted (Blader, 2007). We constantly struggle with multiple and even paradoxical voices, which together become the heterogeneous text that is finally produced (Harju, 2003). The multiple selves, and the heterogeneous ideas, mainly built of choices between different in betweens, amidst pairs of opposites, in jungles of paradoxes, in some manner form the outcome, after the author(ity) has chosen the limits and constraints, drawn parallels, and finally imprisoned her/himself into various cages or boxes (Harju, 2003).

In this study, discourse analysis became a key tool in reviewing the relationship between individuals and organizations (in this case, The Ohio State University and the individuals within the organization), bringing into consideration the discourses that govern the relationships amidst uncertainty and serving as a tool for interpretation.

Individuals and Their Relation to Organizations

Individuals must negotiate their role and their sense of place within an organization. The relationship between an individual's values and the organization's proclaimed values is an important element that leads to a greater comfort for the individual and the individual's sense of identity and fit with the organization.

The realization becomes that people's self-definition – their answer to the question "Who am I?" – plays a critical role in understanding the dynamics of organization behavior (Blader, 2007). Self-verification theory (Swann, 1983) argues that one core motive that people have in their social relationships is to acquire support for their enduring self-views. Blader (2007) suggested that overall self-definition draws from multiple components, including individual identity, relational identity, and collective identity. Conflicts between these identities have important relevance for everyday dynamics in organizations (Blader, 2007). These can vary as a function of which self is situationally activated (Blader, 2007).

Negotiating the role between self-definition and an individual's relationship with and perspective toward an organization is where values play a key role. A value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence (Rokeach, 1973).

Values are centrally held cognitive elements that stimulate motivation for behavioral response (Vinson, Scott, & Lamont, 1977). Personal values are aimed at supporting the individual's well-being rather than that of the group or the society (Sagie & Elizur, 1996). Value patterns seem to agree with the vocational choices and other activities of individuals (Woodruff, 1942). First, it appears that each person develops personal values as a continuously growing residue of his or her total experience, characteristically in a rank order from high positive value, through a neutral area, to high negative value (Woodruff, 1942). Second, the value pattern of a person is the criterion by which that individual judges the possible effects of any situation that might be confronted, as well as the criterion by which a course of action is selected in that situation (Woodruff, 1942). Woodruff (1942) also mentions that attitudes are expressions of the individual's opinions of how affairs are going for him in the light of personal values and are thus

functions of the combination of value pattern and specific situation. Very complex patterns exist among the many values in an individual's pattern, and among those values are the almost unlimited possibilities presented by the constantly changing panorama of situations (Woodruff, 1942). The behavior that arises most naturally, comfortably, spontaneously, and profusely is behavior that springs from values (Chaffee & Tierney, 1988e).

In a study focusing on marketing professionals, the corporate (or organizational) climate was found to have little effect on an individual's normative values (Vitell, Rallapalli, & Singhapakdi, 1993). Hemingway and Maclagan also showed that an individual manager's organizational decisions are driven by a variety of personal values and interests, in addition to the official corporate objectives (2004). They do qualify, though, that such action depends on the amount of autonomy with the individual's role in the organization, and the opportunity to influence events through organizational political processes (Hemingway & Maclagan, 2004). Further work confirmed that personal values supersede that of the organization (Rallapalli, Vitell, & Szeinbach, 2000). It would be naïve to think that all organizational values are inherited from senior management, like some sort of organizational DNA (Hemingway & Maclagan, 2004).

An ethical relativist would assert that there are no absolutes when it comes to values. Each ethical choice is situationally specific (Barnett & Karson, 1987). A suggested way to categorize personal values would be – again, in rank order – global beliefs, which tend to be more abstract and generalizable, to domain-specific values, which reflect the beliefs that people acquire through experiences in specific situations and cannot be understood or efficiently predicted except in the context of a specific environment (Vinson et al., 1977). Value orientations can be expected to vary across geographical regions and from socio-cultural

influences, along with differences in age, education, income, and other demographics (Vinson et al., 1977).

Leaders must change in order to align with organizations, and organizations must change in order to align with the leader's strategic design or operational style (Dym & Hutson, 2005). Individual-organization fit (I-O fit) is generally defined as the compatibility between individuals and organizations (Kristof, 1996). There is considerable research focusing on business organizations and I-O fit, and it tends to be quantitative in nature as it leads to proposed theory (Lindholm, 2003). While this is helpful, colleges and universities tend to reflect an amalgam of institutional subcultures (Lindholm, 2003) and are often not as clearcut in their goals and end-products as business organizations. Indeed, the lion's share of the research really could be described as individual fit with situations, rather than with the complex polyglot culture of universities.

Positive I-O fit leads to greater commitment in both directions (Valentine et al., 2002), and a psychological contract emanates from positive I-O fit. Joyce, et al, suggested three models of person-situation interaction: effect congruency, where characteristics of both the situation and individual are important; general congruency, which exists when conceptually similar dimensions of persons and situations are correspondingly high or low; and functional congruency, which suggests that either an achievement-oriented person or a motivating task may be sufficient to produce high performance, but the joint occurrence of both may do little to improve satisfaction or performance (Joyce, Slocum Jr., & Von Glinow, 1982). Another perspective is that organizations have different life-stages, and that I-O fit can be different for each stage of maturation (Dym & Hutson, 2005), and even variables such as the *zeitgeist* can affect fit. Other theories of person-organization interaction include the Match-Fit model

(Stoddard & Wyckoff, 2009) where an individual's abilities, personality, and energy – and how these issues blend – fit with the culture of the company, or the C.O.P. (competency, organizational needs, passion) model using a Venn diagram to show how competencies, organizational needs, and passions combine to create a leadership sweet spot (Zenger & Folkman, 2002). Even so, Kerr's idea of the multiversity (one such as Ohio State) did hold up certain cultural attributes one would expect to see in play when studying organizational discourse and the I-O fit of the its president.

Lindholm (2003) used a qualitative approach to fit issues and focused on universities. She noted that faculty tend to relate to their institutions most extensively through sub-institutional units, primarily their academic departments, and that consequently organization-wide perceptions of culture and climate do not tend to emerge as clearly within academic institutions as they do in other types of work environments. Her research showed that many found it virtually impossible to have a sense of shared values about much of anything, other than at a very abstract level (Lindholm, 2003) within the large research university. Going hand-in-hand with this, her work also showed little expressed sense of community within the large research university. Faculty saw advantages in being with small departmental units that could promote a more localized sense of institutional community (Lindholm, 2003). Singer (1991) discussed the difficulty of nailing down anything that can accurately be called community within organizations, and felt the call for community was actually a demand to overcome differences. She described a group defined by members who embody multiple, conflicting, and overlapping identities. When this has been the case, she found the groups made up of these members to be similarly fluid (Singer, 1991). These comments from Lindholm and Singer indicate that

cohesion in a large, loosely-coupled institution such as an AAU research institution can be fleeting.

The concepts of "position" and "positioning theory" are found in both the literature of marketing as well as the literature of discourse and social constructionism. These concepts help explain how individuals negotiate and navigate their roles within organizations, and the role that their personal history discourse can play in these exercises. Within the marketing literature, Kotler and Fox (1985) described positioning as how a person or a group perceives the institution in relation to other institutions. Within social constructionism, there are two basic principles: what people do is intentional, and people are themselves a product of a lifetime of interpersonal interactions (Harre & van Langenhove, 1999). The study of local moral orders as ever-shifting patterns of mutual and contestable rights and obligations of speaking and acting has come to be called positioning theory (Harre & van Langenhove, 1999). Generally speaking, positions are relational, as are definitions of positioning. For one to have power in a relationship or in an organization, others must be positioned as having less power or even as being powerless (Harre & van Langenhove, 1999).

It can be proposed that there are three levels of interaction in positioning: interpersonal, institutional, and cultural (Harre & van Langenhove, 1999). A university president might position an initial speech to a faculty senate as beginning a dialogue or an ongoing conversation. In opening a conversation, a person adopts a position that is determined by what they bring to the equation, as well as by cultural and institutional forces (van Langenhove & Harre, 1999). From this point, conversation may modulate and even negotiate positioning as it moves forward (van Langenhove & Harre, 1999). This triad of interaction produces an external validity that confirms the value and appropriateness of the conversation (van Langenhove & Harre, 1999). Interacting

through symbolic forms carries with it claims, tacitly or consciously, about the kind(s) of person one (and the other) is, how one is (currently being) related to others, and what feelings are to be associated with the social arrangement (Carbaugh, 1999). Thus, a university president speaking to a faculty senate would be operating within an accepted cultural arena, with customs built through the traditions of academe. The traditions and the arena, in this case, offer the seemingly contradictory position of president as both leader and peer to be possible.

Institutional Discourse and Organizational Saga

Institutions have been positioning themselves for centuries, ever since Yale first tried to differentiate itself from Harvard. An organizational saga is the story – the institutional discourse – of the organization, and is part of the definition of an organization and thus elemental in positioning an organization vis-à-vis its competitors. It is also important as it recruits new members to the organization and endeavors to retain current members. Regarding saga, the intellectual forbearer of this concept is Burton Clark, based upon his studies of organizational saga and small colleges. My study is grounded in his work, but applied to larger, complex organizations: research universities.

Within the concept of organizational saga are five elements that Clark (1970a) deemed as the fundamental tools of the making of a college saga:

- The development of belief and power in a personnel core
- The importance of a program of work
- The integral importance of an external social base
- The role of the students
- The force of organizational ideology

In many ways, the application of organizational saga to the various publics is tantamount conceptually to marketing, and especially positioning, within the marketing mix. Academic institutions have historically been reluctant to use marketing strategies – the thought in the academy has been that there is something unseemly about promoting oneself and that marketing is incompatible with the educational mission (Kotler & Fox, 1985). Historically and culturally, there has been pride that one's work – that an institution's work – should speak for itself and that marketing should not be needed (Kotler & Fox, 1985). This thinking has now essentially passed; the current academic marketplace is clearly too competitive for this approach. Simply put, if there is competition, there is marketing. One can look toward the classic 4 "P's" of marketing – product, price, promotion, and place (McCarthy, 1960) – to see that institutional strategy involves the manipulation of one or all of the aforementioned P's.

Rather than saying that they have been reluctant, it might be more accurate to say that universities have traditionally been subtle in their marketing. Branding has been present since Harvard (and its European predecessors) first put the name on a diploma, and branding continues to be the primary way that universities – at least on the surface – differentiate themselves. Branding is described as making a certain promise to customers and participants about delivering a fulfilling experience and a level of performance (Kotler, 2005). Kotler (2005) points out that branding is the foundation of deep market planning and experience shows us that planning is something that universities seem to do incessantly. In the competition for resources, educational institutions can use the following marketing assets, among others: program quality, program uniqueness, price, convenience, reputation, and well-qualified students and faculty who attract others like themselves (Kotler & Fox, 1985).

How does branding create loyalty and position a university for successful competition? A name becomes a brand when people link it to other things (Calkins, 2005). "Harvard" ceases to be merely the founder's last name and becomes a brand when people link the institution with academic excellence, as an example. Additionally, a brand provides reasons for people to believe (Tybout & Sternthal, 2005) in the product or the mission by the way a brand positions itself, provides points of difference, and a frame of reference. There becomes an emotional connection with the brand (Tybout & Sternthal, 2005). The concepts and terminology are virtually identical to those identified by Clark in describing organizational saga.

Organizational saga – institutional discourse – is inherently linked to branding. Clark described saga as a story that at some time has had a particular base of believers (Clark, 1972) – very similar to Tybout and Sternthal's (2005) words about branding. Modifying saga, or story, with "organizational," Clark focused on a collective understanding of a unique accomplishment in a formally established group. He also moved deeply into the construct of the saga, showing how they can be built, maintained, or diminished over time. In his work *The Distinctive College*, Clark (1970a) illustrated saga in a new context (Reed), a revolutionary context (Antioch), and in an evolutionary context (Swarthmore). He believed that "newness" is perhaps the most favorable status of a system in which to develop saga (Clark, 1970b). Perhaps the most important characteristic and consequence of an organizational saga is the capturing of allegiance and the commitment of staff to the institution (Clark, 1970b).

Clark (1970) also intimated that saga, certainly based in the organizational culture, is deeply rooted and in some ways fixed, despite his work illustrating the creation and structure of saga. He did discuss identifying components of an organizational saga, saying that they can be manipulated and ultimately maintained to ensure the newly won character (Clark, 1970a). He

also placed a significant emphasis on charismatic leadership of the institution (Clark, 1970a). Clark (1970) concluded his introduction to saga by saying that it is first of all a matter of the heart, and only secondarily a social entity characterized by plan and reason. His is a decidedly pre-postmodern view.

Like individuals, organizations can be viewed as subsuming a multiplicity of identities, each of which is appropriate for a given context or audience (Gioia, 1998). Organizational identity is much more fluid than individual identity (Gioia & Schultz, 1995), though core features of identity are presumed to be resistant to ephemeral or faddish attempts at alteration because of their ties to the organization's history (Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000). Blader (2007) pointed out that the relationship between "Who am I?" and "Who are we?" is a critical part of the make up of an organization. Organizational identification, or the extent to which one identifies with his or her employing organization, refers to a cognitive linking between the definition of the organization and the definition of the self (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994). The more an individual identifies with the organization and the more he or she has internalized the organization's values, the higher the individual's normative commitment to the organization (Spataro & Chatman, 2007). Thus, I-O fit.

From the postmodern view, the relationship with identity is altered; rather than seen as emerging from its origin and depth of values, identity becomes a chameleon-like imitation of images prevailing in the postmodern marketplace (Gioia et al., 2000). From this lens, the presumption that organizational identity even exists is questioned, and that the identity deeply held by its members is better construed as an illusion (Gioia et al., 2000). Given the superficiality, malleability, and influence of image in the postmodern view, the assertion that either image or identity is enduring is simply dismissed (Schultz, 1992).

As Clark (1970) closed his work, he stated that he had come away from his research believing that a strong organizational saga or legend is the central ingredient of the distinctive college. Continuing, he stated that saga can transform – to some degree – institutional missions, and that mission in effect becomes saga by telling what an organization has been, is, and will be (Clark, 1970b), ultimately illustrating the more contemporary concept of reflexivity. As far as communicating and continuing the saga over time, Clark (1970) noted the significant role played by various student subcultures, as these micro-organizations are where identity is often shaped for individuals and for the organization at large.

Perhaps most interesting is the overarching role Clark gave to charisma and what has become known as the "Great Man" concept. Much discussion has shown that the Great Man of historic leadership theory was someone who became great due to the circumstances in which he found himself (Ford et al., 2008c). Rather than potential, what is valued from a Great Man approach is what appears to be some form of inner glow that can be generated outward (Ford et al., 2008c).

Wood (2002) posited that *The Distinctive College* is a limiting text. Noting that the research was done during the '50s and '60s, Wood (2002) argued that Clark overlooked any possibility that saga could come from within the institution, rather than coming solely from the Great Man top down. Also conspicuously absent was any role that race or ethnicity might play in the development and maintenance of saga (Lawson, 2002), nor was gender mentioned, though it must be pointed out that gender was less of a complicating factor (for better or worse) during the time of Clark's writing. Sheldon (2005) also pointed out that organizational players hired during a particular period generally maintain the perspective and perceptions of the era in which they were hired, forcing resistance to the evolution of saga. Revisiting his idea nearly 30 years

after the initial publication, Clark (1998) downplayed the role of the great person with a large idea and described saga as an embellished story of successful accomplishment, hinting that he now believed it can be manipulated. Summarizing, Clark (1998) described an idea that makes headway and ultimately becomes pervasive to the point of becoming a group belief and then embraced sufficiently to be identified as culture. Thus culture is then crowned with saga, signifying enduring success (Clark, 1998).

This group belief identified as culture became the coin of the realm for Terrence Deal and Allan Kennedy. With an initial focus on the historical, Deal and Kennedy (1982) demonstrated that early leaders of American business valued culture highly, believing they had a responsibility to create an environment where employees could be secure and thereby do the work necessary for success. Deal and Kennedy (1982) examined the role of slogans, which they labeled "superordinate goals" and recorded a definitive correlation between companies with strong qualitative beliefs and outstanding corporate performance. They identified a taxonomy of elements that make up a corporate culture, including the business environment in which the organization operates (which they deemed most important), values, heroes, rites and rituals, and a cultural network. Deal and Kennedy (1998) also suggest that a simple, umbrella belief can help bring together fragmented and autonomous subcultures within an organization. Mining the organization's history, too, can be useful. An organization's stories can exemplify core values, and emphasize key performances from employees over time (Deal & Kennedy, 1999a).

Universities have been accused of having an organizational structure and culture that resemble organized anarchy (Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 1977). Certainly, the culture and structure are distinctive. There are vague, ambiguous, and multiple goals (Baldridge et al., 1977), and the favored employees (faculty) demand high levels of autonomy and feature divided

loyalties (Baldridge et al., 1977). External interest groups, from politicos to alumni, endeavor to place their interests among the priorities.

All organizations have multiple cultures (Kotter & Heskett, 1992a) that can differ based upon variables such as geography or work task. Organizational culture can be thought of as having two levels (Kotter & Heskett, 1992a). At the more visible level is a type of culture that spreads from employee to employee in a surface manner, more similar to group behavior norms (Kotter & Heskett, 1992a). A deeper and less visible type of culture refers to values shared by the people in a group. These values tend to persist even when group membership changes (Kotter & Heskett, 1992a). Each level of culture has a tendency to influence the other (Kotter & Heskett, 1992a). Despite this, there does seem to be a parent culture that governs the larger organization and helps to determine the sub-unit cultures (Kotter & Heskett, 1992a).

Continuing, Kotter and Heskett (1992) pointed out that cultures can be non-adaptive, and characterized by arrogance, insularity, and bureaucratic centralization. In such cultures, managers tend to ignore relevant contextual changes and cling to outmoded strategies and inflexible practices (Kotter & Heskett, 1992c). Ultimately, holding onto a good culture requires being both inflexible with regard to core adaptive values and yet flexible with regard to most practices and other values (Kotter & Heskett, 1992c). A primary conclusion of their work, like Clark's initial work that developed the concept of organizational saga, is that excellent leadership from the top seems to be the key ingredient in a healthy, productive culture (Kotter & Heskett, 1992c). Within the academic environment, Birnbaum (1988c) suggested that a major function of the energy of university administrators is to prevent the organization's culture from falling apart. Culture, like other aspects of organizations and all other systems, constantly loses energy and moves toward entropy and disorder.

Chaffee and Tierney (1988b) suggested that three general dimensions of culture are structure, environment, and values. These are highly interdependent and interpenetrating, and form the equation of dynamic equilibrium in organizational culture (Chaffee & Tierney, 1988b). Three themes also affect this model of culture: time, space, and communication (Chaffee & Tierney, 1988b). Time is relevant as history, tradition, and habit influence behavior; as members conjure up a desired future; and as individuals pace their current activities. Space issues provide symbolic as well as instrumental contexts for action. Spatial relationships among individuals in the institution and between the institution and its constituents provide valuable information and organizational structure, environment, and values. Communication is the primary vehicle through which members perceive and interpret their world, so it is the *sine qua non* of organizational culture (Chaffee & Tierney, 1988b). Formal speeches, especially from the organization's chief executive officer, are prime examples of this. Oral and written discourse and a host of nonverbal acts provide clues through which we can better understand the cultural dimensions (Chaffee & Tierney, 1988d). Each cultural dimension (structure, environment, and values) and each theme (time, space, and communication) changes according to its own internal logic but not independently of the others. They may change in tempo with one another, or each may turn at its own speed. Structure influences leadership by way of historical context; the power of a leader is determined in part by institutional history. Leaders articulate value and interpret the environment. Leaders help the organization seek a dynamic equilibrium, but they do not do so divorced from the organizational dimensions of culture. Leaders influence culture, and culture defines leadership (Chaffee & Tierney, 1988d).

Organizational saga and the other two primary discourses (individual discourse and positional discourse) discussed in this study are related to Weick's (1995) view of sensemaking

in organizations, from a perspective of perception. He described this exercise as developing a set of ideas with explanatory possibilities, and determined that this happens in the form of an ongoing conversation (Weick, 1995a) – perhaps like interactive storytelling. Weick (1995b) pointed out that organizations have their own languages and symbols that have important effects on sensemaking. Certainly all seven properties he assigned (Weick, 1995c) to sensemaking in organizations (grounded in identity construction, retrospective, enactive of sensible environments, social, ongoing, focused on and by extracted cues, and driven by plausibility rather than accuracy) have a role in the construction, recognition, and manipulation of saga by both constituents and organizational leaders.

Organizational saga – institutional discourse – would seem to be oft spread through interpersonal communication. Oral cultures are simultaneous in their modes of awareness (McLuhan, 1960), illustrating that many members of a group can share in the effect of the stories. In the essay *Monolingualism of the Other*, Derrida (1998) argued that an illusion of monolingualism allows cultures, traditions, and nations to become thinkable; but that without this illusion of monolingualism thinking as a collective simply cannot take place. Thus, this illusion of monolingualism simplifies and makes the communication of broadly held stories an easier task, and encourages consensus. More recently Brown, Denning, Groh, and Prusack (2005), endeavored to relate storytelling to the corporate sector, focusing on improving organizations. They discuss storytelling about individuals, and about work itself and the organization's activities. Perhaps most interestingly, they noted that as knowledge becomes more valuable, so, too, do stories (Brown, et al, 2005). While their focus was primarily within the organization, their work was applicable for stakeholders such as students and alumni, as it concentrated on those in far-flung, loosely-coupled, and highly complex organizations. This

latter idea aids in defining the organization, helps individuals navigate the organization, and gives leaders an invaluable tool as they define their place and role in the organization.

Bolman and Deal (1997) also find storytelling to play a significant role in corporate (or organizational) culture. The concept of culture was coined to represent, in a very broad and holistic sense, the qualities of any specific human group that are passed from one generation to the next (Kotter & Heskett, 1992a). The magic of stories in creating cultural focus, direction, and cohesion is well known among enlightened managers (Deal & Kennedy, 1999a), and that corporate culture – for which I believe that organization saga is a subset – is where myths, heroes, and symbols give meaning to those who work within the organization (Deal & Kennedy, 1982a).

Storytelling is an act of creating belief and faith (Simmons, 2001). Part of sensemaking and storytelling is selection. It is often said that in the current environment we have too much information. Discourses are abundant. The choice of a discourse in which to believe is an act that the storyteller depends on (Simmons, 2001). For saga to work organizationally there must be a core group of believers (Clark, 1970b).

Storytelling is an innate part of organizational saga. Simmons (2001) described storytelling as a "pull" strategy, contrasting story to persuasion, bribery, or charismatic appeals – strategies she labeled "push" strategies. Storytelling is not a one-sided process, as Weick (1995) infers. For there to be effective storytelling, there has to be listeners almost by definition. Through this "tell and listen" process, both sides search for common values and other shared aspects that bring together the two sides to one. Each performance helps the teller emphasize the aspects that he or she feels should be important to the listener (Norrick, 2000). The storytelling process also acts as a catalyst to activate memory (Norrick, 2000), helping to personalize the

process. The dialogue, especially through repeated tellings, serves to frame the key aspects of the story (Norrick, 2000). Norrick (2000) also described the teller as a special kind of listener, saying that with each telling of the story the experience refines the tale. Conversationalists will manipulate talk and segue into stories of their own (Norrick, 2000). This aspect is what helps stories in research universities catalyze the wide variety of needs and projects within a research university. It is how a department chair or a college dean can make the overriding saga work locally.

Positional Discourse and Power

Kotter and Heskett quote a CEO of a medium-sized organization as saying, "I cannot imagine trying to run a business today with a weak or nonexistent culture; why, people would be going off in a hundred different directions" (Kotter & Heskett, 1992b, p.17). This glimpse foreshadows the difficulty many might find in leading a large research university, a highly-complex organization that actually is made of hundreds of smaller distinctive units. In 1962, Tom Watson, Jr. made the case for the strong-culture perspective in a speech at Columbia University (Kotter & Heskett, 1992b). Said Watson, Jr.:

> The basic philosophy, spirit, and desire of an organization have far more to do with its relative achievements than do technological or economic resources, organizational structure, innovation, and timing. All these things weigh heavily on success. But they are, I think, transcended by how strongly the people in the organization believe in its basic precepts and how faithfully they carry them out. (Kotter & Heskett, 1992b, p.17)

Kotter and Heskett (1992b) pointed out a key issue about culture that seems to limit its value being endorsed by consensus in the community of organizational theorists. They note the

reflexivity showing that strong cultures cause strong performance, yet the reverse is known to occur, too: strong performance can create strong cultures. The issue is causality. The key variable is whether the actions catalyzed by the culture are the deployment of intelligent business strategies (Kotter & Heskett, 1992c). Strong cultures with practices that do not fit a company's context can actually lead intelligent people to behave in ways that are destructive (Kotter & Heskett, 1992c). I would suggest that the question of causality and the reflexivity between the two points indicate that both strong culture and strong performance can be manipulated and thus in many ways determined and designed. In many ways, this is the role of leadership discourse.

A positional (or professional) discourse is the message and actions relayed by an organizational leader. People accept, internalize, and act according to shared ideas they believe are true and valid (Cherryholmes, 1988a). Power becomes the avenue in which the discourse is traveled. Within positional discourse, power is a relationship whose strength and domain will vary with different contexts (Nye, 2008). The relationships have certain asymmetries – perhaps based on social, political, or material issues – and the result is that some are indulged and rewarded while others are negatively sanctioned and deprived (Cherryholmes, 1988a). Using the panopticon as a metaphor, Foucault envisioned power as being able to be institutionalized (Felluga, 2003), though in his later work he moved toward acceptance that power ultimately resides in individuals as they interpret relationships within organizations. In Western culture, whether by tradition or experience, leadership positions are automatically granted a certain amount of authority by those subject to said power. Weber (1986) credited two types of power that depend on position: traditional authority, for which one is granted power by some sort of traditional process such as heredity, and rational/legal authority, which is based upon election or proper appointment.

Leadership and power, then, represent a relationship between leaders and followers (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Presidents should know their followers (Birnbaum, 1988f), just as writers or performers should know their audience. These relationships help a leader define their position in an organization vis-à-vis other discourses. In a relationship, those in a position of power are less likely to take on the perspectives of others (Galinsky et al., 2006); rather, those with less power adapt to the perspective of those with influence. Power is not a tangible thing, and it exists only in the imagination and perception of the engaged parties (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Nye (2008) divides power into hard power, which can be used through perceived force and inducements, and soft power, where one gains the outcomes one wants by attraction and by shaping the preferences of others.

The University Presidency

A place where positional power, institutional discourse, and individual discourse meet is the university presidency. The CEO utilizes the granted positional power, along with the narratives of the institution and of personal history and values (individual discourse), to lead a mission-driven organization full of mission-driven people. Clearly, there are challenges in this equation. The president is expected to lead thousands with little but an ability to inspire confidence, trust, and hope (Fisher, 1984c). Meanwhile, the leader's personal characteristics and values must appear to fit the needs and aspirations of his or her following (Katz, 1973).

As sources of money (and thus, power) have become more diffused within the academy, the rise of the power of the administrator in the university, separated by job description from faculty, leads to separated and isolated communities in which administrators talk only with people in roles similar to theirs (Birnbaum, 1988b). Good presidents understand and protect the

organization, continue its present level of functioning, and make modest marginal improvements; bad presidents make mistakes without detecting error, do not attend to the proper problems, and allow institutions to fall apart (Birnbaum, 1988f).

To become influential, a president must be visible as presence helps to enable the exercise of power. To become visible, the president must be bold, which demands an embrace of potential controversy. To remain at all comfortable and retain the presidency under such conditions, it is essential to have a broad range of knowledge and familiarity (Birnbaum, 1988d) with issues important to various constituencies of stories defining the institution. For the president, status differences should be overlooked as much as possible, as these differentials inhibit communication (Birnbaum, 1988d). Presidents should cultivate the emergence of leadership within the various sub-units of the institution (Birnbaum, 1988f). To keep superior people, a president must take care of them and be exciting. Being exciting means being visible and bold (Fisher, 1984d). Being exciting, being visible, and being bold involves the conscious exercise, the communication, and the strategic use of individual discourse, organizational discourse, and positional discourse.

Given the dynamic nature of contemporary society, effective presidents must be opportunistic and take advantage of new and seemingly unpredictable circumstances as they emerge (Fisher & Koch, 2004). Presidents should remember that events are equivocal and that many opportunities to interpret organizational meaning afford them unusual influence without inducing the alienation that may arise from giving orders (Birnbaum, 1988f).

Power for a president, like beauty, may be in the eye of the beholder. Earlier in this chapter, I discussed power and positional discourse in more foundational terms. Here, I reviewed applied power, in the way that university presidents use their own power and positional

discourse. A figure like Clark Kerr is representative of one approach as he chose to emphasize the role of the college president as mediator (Fisher & Koch, 2004). Others suggest the presidents' role is more commonly sporadic and symbolic than significant (Cohen & March, 1986). University presidents can be very cognizant of the tools and issues surrounding power. One typology of power consists of coercive power, reward power, legitimate power, expert power, and referent or charismatic power (French & Raven, 1959). Fisher, in particular, seemed to place a high value on charismatic power. His analysis posited that three principal conditions for charisma are distance, style, and perceived self-confidence (Fisher, 1984b). For most, charismatic qualities tend to diminish with time (Fiedler, 1970).

Symbolic leadership is part of the equation, as timely appearances and words of encouragement and inspiration can serve to revitalize those within an organization (Western, 2008b). For better or worse, leaders in organizations both good and tyrannical have recognized this aspect for years (Western, 2008b). Ideas are often introduced in symbolic manners that can be similar to undergoing or observing the experience itself (Denning, 2007). Often these actions may not be immediately seen, but often soak in as time passes (Deal, 1999).

Leaders are changed by the very task of leading (Ford et al., 2008a), and those who are unwilling to exercise power and influence may experience unhappiness (May, 1972). Birnbaum (2002) suggested that the stature and influence of presidents are closely tied to the stature and influence of higher education, and are indeed diminished by growing corporatization. Since higher education is driven by mission and not by profit, its attraction to corporate practice diminishes its distinctiveness and legitimacy (Birnbaum, 2002).

Key constituencies accord legitimacy to a president they perceive as a good cultural fit and an effective leader (Bornstein, 2003c). The matching of a president and an institution can in

some ways be thought of as a marriage. There is a courtship during which each tries to exhibit best behaviors and most favorable traits to the other, and consummation requires the acquiescence of both parties. There is a honeymoon period in which both parties are pleased and relieved that the strain of the courtship has been concluded and nights at the singles bars are at last over, and each party is almost certainly in for some surprises when the honeymoon ends (Birnbaum, 1988f). It is really during this honeymoon period that fit is confirmed or denied.

Bornstein (2003a) wrote of legitimacy in the successful academic presidency and stated that without it no president can advance an ambitious agenda. Unless an institution is in a crisis requiring immediate and drastic action, presidencies tend to develop in a cycle of three stages, generally wrapped around a fundraising campaign. These three stages, which overlap, are: gaining legitimacy, creating legitimate change, and assuring a legitimate presidential succession. For a presidency to be successful, each stage must be characterized by legitimacy (Bornstein, 2003a). Continuing, Bornstein (2003a) suggested a construct of four factors necessary to implement and institutionalize change that is accepted as legitimate: presidential leadership, governance, social capital, and fundraising. She also presented an analytical construct of five multilayered factors that influence presidential legitimacy: individual (background, preparation, personal story), institutional (process and context), environmental (external), technical (skills), moral (devotion and service to the mission and values of the institution (Bornstein, 2003d). For Bornstein, legitimacy is similar to the concept of leadership fit presented in this study; however, she added complexity to the equation by emphasizing external issues and separating moral elements apart from the individual discourse.

Summary

The literature reviewed within Chapter Two illustrates not just discourse as a tool of inquiry, but discourse used as a tool to organize, to define, and to interpret. It is through this method of inquiry that I explored discourse and organizational saga to illustrate how leaders strategically advance universities. I have attempted to focus on a paradigm that highlights the intersection of individual discourse, organizational saga (or discourse), and positional power. Each portion making up this triangle is analyzed, and ultimately culminates in a review of the literature of the university presidency, where I believe this converging paradigm is found. Burton Clark's work on organizational saga provided significant historical grounding, and showed how saga and strategy combine to form institutional discourse – a subset of organizational culture.

Looking to Chapter Three, I describe the research design for the project, and show how the president of The Ohio State University, Gordon Gee, provides superb illustration for many of the concepts I discuss.

Chapter Three

Introduction and the Application of Qualitative Research

Revisiting the research question, *this study examined how an individual leader's discourse is shaped by the organization's saga, the personal history of the leader, and the power and influence of the leader's position.* Essentially, I explored the intersection where the discourse of positional power and the leader's personal discourse cross and blend with the larger story – the organizational discourse – of an institution. In this case, I looked in-depth at Gordon Gee and his current institution, The Ohio State University, where he returned to serve as president for a second tenure after leaving the same position roughly a decade prior.

As a set of interpretive practices, qualitative research privileges no single methodology over any other (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994), and it is fundamentally interpretive (Creswell, 2003). Within this paradigm, I chose to frame this inquiry as a case study of one. Yin suggested that a single-case design rather than one of multiple cases can provide a critical test of a significant theory (Yin, 2003b). This case study, then, served as an empirical inquiry of Gordon Gee as an example of an institutional leader utilizing, massaging, nurturing, and manipulating organizational culture by using different kinds of discourse as tools. Within the case study of one, I looked at multiple elements to provide triangulation and validity within this example. While there are multiple methods of data collection used for this study, including observation, active interviews, unobtrusive data and other written documents; the primary form of analysis used throughout was discourse analysis (Patton, 1990). Within the specific method of data collection in this study, there are multiple examples explored to help further validity. As an example, I performed discourse analyses of speeches from Gee's two terms at Ohio State, and from his time at Vanderbilt and at Brown.

This study was written with a post-structuralist lens, as uncertainty is a given when differing perspectives are brought into play (Manning & Cullum-Swan, 1994). Another key concept to this lens is that individual speakers disappear into discourse patterns (Moerman, 1988) meaning that consistencies can be present but interact with variables that can bring uncertainty. Linguistic scholarship played a significant role in the study through the utilization of discourse analysis and with the knowledge that issues of power were present as a modifying subtext (Rogers, 2004). Additionally, while the subject, a university president, attempts to construct messages at the spoken and/or written primary level along with coordinated and occasionally conflicting subtexts, a significant variable is message reception (Benoit & Smythe, 2003). From the data collected, meaning converged to illustrate patterns, move toward alignment and confirmation, and thus, to show validity.

Document Analysis

As I began my work on the study, my first task was to review published documents regarding Ohio State and Gordon Gee. The term "publication" in this study is inclusive of old-fashioned hard-copy documents as well as electronic versions that one might find representing a university on the Internet, as well as any other (comparatively) new media. For this example of a research university, significant undergraduate programs and big-time athletics – the entertainment division of the university (Duderstadt, 2000) – are integral parts of the ongoing culture. This might not be true at all AAU research universities; however, to fully analyze and appreciate the organizational saga in this case, material representing these realms also needed to be examined.

I worked to explore what makes Ohio State distinctive as an organization, primarily via data from both current and historical publications, and searched for what I identified as organizational saga. Within these data was a review of The Ohio State University admissions viewbook, which I believe is close to the official story about the institution at any given time. In many ways, this is a document designed to entice young students to become lifelong members of the organization, as they move from freshmen to alumni. In other words, the viewbook is an identity for an 18-year-old to try on for fit. A viewbook fit the intentions of this study better than the alternative of a student handbook, which may tend more toward rules and guidelines. Other documents reviewed included the university website and publications from Ohio State's development operation that set the tone and tell a compelling story for its fundraising efforts. Additionally, I explored the published media guide for varsity football from the intercollegiate athletic program to see how this significant part of the public story of the institution was presented directly to the media. I searched these publications for distinctive patterns with the copy and the visual rhetoric in the data, as well as for distinct contradictions that somehow stood apart from the patterns.

I then moved to examine Gordon Gee's early life prior to the advent of his professional career via published material describing his life story (Baroway, 2002; D., 2008; Decker, 2008; Gee, 1992; Wood & Duncan, 2007), and I also reviewed articles and books that told stories from his presidencies throughout the years (Angelo, 2006; Duncan, 2006; Galts, 1998; Marrison, 1996; Powers, 1997; Pyle, 2008; Redden, 2006; Unknown, 2009; Zeff, 2000). This life history is inseparable from his individual discourse, as there is a complex interaction between an individual's understanding of the world and that world itself (Marshall & Rossman, 1999), though there are perhaps things personal to the individual discourse that others will never know.

The key elements in these data from Gee's early personal life are experiences that have found their way into his professional life, coloring perspective and approach.

I also performed discourse analyses of presidential speeches early in the tenure of each of his last four positions (Ohio State, Brown, Vanderbilt, Ohio State). The intent of the discourse analyses was to look for patterns and differences in Gee's professional discourse through his four most recent presidencies, to see how he utilized his personal discourse as a tool in his approach to leadership, and to see if the organizational discourse of each institution led to variations in his approach to each presidency. Ultimately, this tool became a central part of the study. I will further discuss this issue and the process undertaken to secure material for use with discourse analyses later in this chapter.

Identifying Informants and Securing Interviews

By focusing on one institution and one leader, I had an opportunity to follow directions heretofore unseen in the initial design as directed by the data. This limited focus, as an example, provided opportunity to bring Gee's personal history into account and to interview individuals central to the present saga such as faculty or alumni in the selected institution (Ohio State), even though they may not have a parallel in other institutions.

In developing my interview schedule, I used purposeful sampling (Seidman, 1998) to intentionally select those who might be in position to reflect on Gordon Gee in ways relevant to my research. I chose to interview a faculty member, an administrator who worked to design stories told by the university, and the fundraising consultant. Later, this sample was expanded to include an alumni professional, an undergraduate student, and a graduate student, all from Ohio State. Additionally, I wanted to include a development professional from Vanderbilt University, Gee's previous employer, to provide an additional perspective from a different type of

university. The fundraising consultant ultimately covered this base, as she was a former associate vice-chancellor of development at Vanderbilt during Gee's tenure there. With each participant included in this purposeful sample, I wanted to make sure as best as possible to interview those with influence within the areas they represented and, ideally, individuals who might be able to speak from more than one lens, e.g., an alumni professional who is a former collegiate athlete.

I worked first to secure the interview at Ohio State with Gordon Gee, knowing that securing (or not securing) this conversation would affect both my ability to gain other interviews and the tone of those conversations. To do so, I worked with Becki Crowell, the professional who manages Gee's schedule. As with some of the others in this study, I had a previously existing relationship with Crowell from my past staff experience at Ohio State.

From this point, I scheduled in-depth interviews with others at Ohio State discussing Gordon Gee from their perspectives. Of particular interest to me in these interviews was how Gee positioned his story and his approach to leading the universities and Ohio State specifically, and how the greater saga of the institution is (or is not) used to strategically advance the university. Beyond the interview with Gee, the other six individuals were chosen for interviews because they fit into the ideal of a purposeful sample, they interpret the discourse of Gee to members of the groups they lead, or they help initiate the application of Gee's discourse. Two were current students in leadership roles (or with access to leadership), three were current faculty or staff, and one, an external consultant, managed to be both outside and inside the institution. Those interviewed were:

- Roger Addleman, Ohio State University director of development communications. Addleman, as the director of development communications creates what often becomes the official storyline of the institution.
- Gordon Gee, president, The Ohio State University
- Archie Griffin, president and CEO of The Ohio State University Alumni Association and the only two-time winner of the Heisman Trophy, college football's annual award for the most outstanding player. As CEO of the alumni association, Griffin is in a unique position to monitor and massage the narratives both within and outside the university. Additionally, being known as perhaps the greatest ever football player at Ohio State, he is more than familiar with the role of athletics in the discourse of Ohio State.
- Peter Koltak, president of the Undergraduate Student Government at Ohio State. Koltek, by position, is representative of the undergraduate students at Ohio State. In this role, Koltak works with President Gee on a regular basis on issues of interests to students.
- Aaron McKain, PhD student studying Rhetoric. In addition to being a doctoral student, McKain is a member of Gee's speechwriting team.
- James Phelan, Humanities Distinguished Professor of English. As a former department chair and as a member of the group of chaired and distinguished faculty, Phelan provided viewpoints representative of the faculty. He is an expert in narrative, so he could speak within the discourse of the subject matter. Finally, he has been a faculty leader during both of Gee's tenures at Ohio State.

- Eloise Stuhr, former associate vice chancellor for university development and alumni relations at Vanderbilt University, and currently a fundraising consultant for Grenzenbach, Glier, and Associates, where she manages the relationship for the firm with Ohio State.

Initial face-to-face interviews took place on campus with all the informants but Eloise Stuhr. Although originally scheduled for the same time period, unexpected business issues caused the interview to be rescheduled and took place via phone. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed, and field notes were reviewed.

The aforementioned conversations could be described as active interviews (Holstein & Gubrium, 2002), an interpretive practice involving respondent and interviewer as they articulate, navigate, and negotiate ongoing structures, resources, and orientations. Because of their professional roles, this small group of interviewees also had an understanding of and experience with leadership strategies, something that likely would not have been present in a larger sampling.

Observation

I designed my travel to Columbus to take place during a regularly-scheduled Board of Trustees meeting in November of 2008. It was this situation that I specifically wanted to observe as representative of a cultural domain (Spradley, 1980) within which Gordon Gee worked. Board of Trustee meetings are often inquisitive but cautious because of the mixed and multiple identities present on the board as members serve different interests simultaneously and represent multiple perspectives (Hillman, Nicholson, & Shropshire, 2008). Even so, there are two wild cards that can produce observational data unavailable elsewhere. The first is that the president,

Gordon Gee, serves at the pleasure of the board. They are his "bosses" (Kauffman, 1980) and ultimately responsible for judging his job performance, and are the only ones that can dismiss him should the need arise. The public dynamic of the leader reporting to his organizational superiors is likely different than most public instances of the behavior of the leader (Pettigrew, 1992). Also, this board in particular is one consisting of appointees of the governor of the State of Ohio. Consequently, political grandstanding takes place from time to time. Observing the president manage this maneuvering illustrated a slice of his leadership discourse.

Ultimately, my interview with Gordon Gee was itself multifaceted and enlarged my collection of observational data, as the interview took place in a car, at an event, and between phone calls. This distribution of my conversation with Gee gave the welcome experience of shadowing Gee during several hours of his day on Friday, November 7, 2008. The additional observations of Gordon Gee took place as he spoke with a community group, as he interacted with his staff and with his daughter by phone.

Discourse Analyses of Early Presidential Speeches

As a theme of this work is the intersection of discourses, the discourse analyses of four presidential speeches from Gordon Gee are an important aspect of this study. The data reviewed were official communications, speeches prepared or transcribed for or from Gordon Gee, transmitting an institutional position. It has been posited that discourse analysis is not a method, and that it requires adopting a certain perspective on asking and answering questions (Jaworski & Coupland, 1999). From my perspective, the tool is the inquiry, just as inquiry is accomplished with the tool.

Institutional leaders provide a goldmine of evidence pointing toward their culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982a). Presidents speak daily about their university's mission, values, vision, and goals in a piecemeal fashion. There are certain speeches that are all-encapsulating and whose very purpose is to transmit the feeling and purpose (the saga) of the university. These speeches are both "State of the University" and "State of the Presidency" speeches, with the idea that the tradition and ceremony of the moment is befitting of the tradition within the saga, and both enabling and establishing the professional discourse of the leader. Using discourse analyses, the text of these speeches was combed for meaning that helped shed light on the political and cultural feel of the moment and how Gee planned to navigate always treacherous waters.

The speeches are each from early in Gee's tenure during his last four presidencies. Each speech is Gee's first address to the faculty as a whole following his presidential appointment, as this occasion is often one where coded language meant to be understood by a specific audience and organizational saga are incorporated. Of the four discourse analyses, three are readings via a printed version of the speeches. The fourth, from Brown University, is from an abridged excerpt of Gee's inauguration speech reprinted in the *Brown Alumni Magazine*. This exception is necessary since Brown closes all presidential records and prevents access of presidential documents for 25 years following the conclusion of the leader's term. I posited that an early address like each of these could signal the terms and themes of the presidency, as well as position the individual president's personal story and approach vis-à-vis the institution as a whole. Worth exploring here was how Gordon Gee presented himself and communicated as a president of three different universities, one of them twice, and of The Ohio State University specifically. The end result of these comparative discourse analyses showed the evolution of personal and professional discourse over the course of an 18-year period.

The initial speech from Ohio State, *Time and Change,* was secured via email with the help of an archivist in Ohio State's University Archives. The speech from Brown University, untitled in the alumni magazine excerpt, was utilized after email correspondence with the university archivist proved to be unsuccessful in obtaining a speech to their faculty senate. The Brown University archivist outlined a process for appeal; however, she also told me from her own search that no such document existed in the Gordon Gee files. The speech from Vanderbilt, also seemingly untitled but featuring a headline of *Gee outlines challenges facing faculty, University* from the *Vanderbilt Register*, the former internal news organ for faculty and staff at the university, was also difficult to secure. Most traces of Gordon Gee have vanished from their website, and with calls and emails to the Chancellor's Office, University Archives, and ultimately assistance from the Vanderbilt News service I was able to locate the desired speech from an article in the aforementioned *Vanderbilt Register*. The second speech from Ohio State, *It's About Time . . . and Change* was secured via Ohio State's website, in the section identifying the administration and profiling the university president.

During these analyses, I looked to determine how much of this discourse was that of a university president, and how much of it was of Gordon Gee specifically. I was curious about the role played by personal discourse in the make-up of professional discourse. I wondered if the institution itself played an important role, if his discourse was significantly different at each institution, and if it would be different still when he returned to Ohio State than it was first time he served the university. Finally, I was eager to see if Gee followed what might be considered the standard text of a university presidency, or if his approach and discourse somehow this standard text in a graceful and acceptable (to his publics) manner.

In analyzing these speeches, I acknowledge the question of authorship. It is well known that speeches of organizational leaders are seldom, if ever, solely authored. More than likely, certain issues are identified by the leader and then passed along to a speechwriter(s). Drafts are then created, passed back and forth, and ultimately the speech is delivered by the leader. While this issue is a topic for research beyond this small mention, I must assume that any speech given by a leader is at least approved by that leader prior to its delivery; however, authorship should likely be shared by ghostwriters.

I sent a follow-up email to Gordon Gee regarding this issue, and a subsequent electronic correspondence with Ohio State speechwriter Melinda Church to whom Gee referred me confirmed the role of other writers working with Gee for his major speeches (Church, 2009). When he approached major addresses, Church said that Gee gathered a team to talk through large themes. The team included his chief of staff, his senior assistant, the provost, the writer crafting the speech, the senior vice president for communications, the secretary to the Board of Trustees, and Church as the senior speechwriter. After that meeting, Church took a week or two to devise a detailed outline, and then ran it back informally to Gee, the chief of staff, and the senior assistant. From there, a first draft was created in less than a week and sent to the large team for edits, but not typically yet to Gee. After that, Church narrowed her reviewers to the chief of staff, the senior assistant, and perhaps the board secretary. At that stage, Church might have worked through two or three more drafts very quickly, and then have a working draft ready for review by Gee and for a final pass from the provost. Gee might provide broad thematic edits (e.g., wanting more of a "soaring ending") and a few line-item edits for style and word choice preferences (Church, 2009). A version that Church considered final would be ready three or four days in advance. Two or three days before the speech, Church then sat with Gee while he read

through it. Any phrases that caused him distress in the verbal delivery were caught at that point (Church, 2009). While we could comfortably attribute these words to Gordon Gee, they likely deserve an unwritten asterisk that acknowledged the input of others. But ultimately, the control was his, as the words would come from his mouth and over his signature.

In many ways, these speeches served as an illustration of the application of linguistic strategy for the leader, and these data highlight the proactive, verbal use of saga by institutional leadership. Gordon Gee's own personal discourse is on full display here, as well. The timing of the speeches are in harmony with the study, showing early and key moments in the ongoing development of Gordon Gee personally, his initial approach to leadership issues and strategy at Brown University, Vanderbilt University, and The Ohio State University, and how Gee anticipated managing his own presidency.

The hegemony of the university presidency gave these words more power than if one of the rank-and-file professors were to use these same words in a similar manner in a classroom, and provided the power to transmit value(s) and to move toward accomplishment of the leader's agenda. At the same time, the setting itself – a public forum aimed (primarily) at faculty – provided a certain symbolic importance that added value to somewhat ordinary statements, as well.

My analysis of the data worked to illustrate the ways that a university president, in this case, Ohio State's Gordon Gee, utilizes as a leader the power and influence of both his own individual discourse and his professional discourse along with the aura created by the organizational saga present.

Study Limitations

A strength of this study is also potentially limiting. This case study focused on one leader and one leader only, Gordon Gee. As mentioned in the first chapter, he is not likely representative among university presidents; however, Gee provides illustrations of the concepts of discourse reviewed within, and he provides many examples of how individual discourse works (or does not work) hand-in-hand with organizational discourse, also known as organizational saga and the professional discourse that incorporates positional power.

Also, had other participants been selected for interviews, their interpretations of Gee and the data they provided would likely have been different. I could have expanded the sample considerably, trying to gather more and different perspectives on Gee and his presidency; however, I believe those chosen for interviews have backgrounds and experiences that allowed them to contribute informed and relevant data for inclusion in this study.

My positionality is a factor in the data collection and the analysis of the study. I am a higher education professional, and a veteran of more than 20 years on development staffs at large, complex research universities. With this experience, I have developed perspectives that one less familiar with higher education might not have, I have developed networks that aided in securing the data, and I have a feel for and experience with the culture of these organizations that served as a foundation for the direction of the study. I also worked at Ohio State for six years (though not in this century), and I was there for the first two years of Gordon Gee's initial tenure at Ohio State. This background may bring limitations to my perspective, and it may offer advantages, as well.

Summary

Chapter Three showed the design of this study, and also highlighted the processes and paths taken to collect data. I illustrated my efforts to ensure triangulation and thus validity for this qualitative study. The results of this design are exhibited in Chapter Four, which begins with key data from the interviews of Gordon Gee, then presents discourse analyses of his early presidential speeches, reviews observational data from the Board of Trustees meeting in early November, 2008, provides data from interviews with Gee's colleagues, and ultimately concludes with analysis of university publications.

Chapter 4

Findings

"You become sort of a narrative yourself, and being a narrative, you have to understand it."

This is Gordon Gee, offering an idea on how he has managed to successfully lead multiple (and in many ways, distinctively different) universities throughout the course of his career. When becoming a narrative – becoming the university – Gee suggested diving fully into an institution and perhaps losing oneself as a recipe for success in the research university presidency. There are likely many texts for a university presidency, some are more standard and more conventional than others. Gordon Gee is very aware that he becomes part of the discourse of the organization.

In this chapter, I present the findings from my interviews with Gee and other informants, as well as understandings from other key sources on Gee's presidencies, his speeches and other Ohio State artifacts. I lead off the chapter by recounting my interview with President Gee that covered multiple topics across his presidencies. While located in the present, Gee's comments encompass both the present and the past. Following details of this interview, the rest of the chapter is organized to trace his development from the time he became president at West Virginia, but with a particular focus on his four most recent presidencies, as well as the personal discourse evolving during that time.

My interview with Gee was at the end of what many would consider a full day. It began with a lengthy board meeting discussing his job performance following his first year (back) on the job, with assorted associated meetings alongside the session of the Board of Trustees. From Gee's perspective, at the point at which my allotted time came on his calendar our dialogue

might have been perceived as a pleasant diversion on the way to additional presidential appearances. Our conversation, though a bit rushed as it was between engagements on his calendar, seemed quite personal. Many at Ohio State had told me that it surely would be no problem for Gee to open up about himself and his work. They were right.

Gee was much more "Gordon" than "President". He seemed to be refreshed to talk about things that were not normally on his agenda. Before the interview began, he made a phone call to his daughter in my presence, and it served to take him from the unabashed urgency of the present back to the personal. Looking back, I have to wonder if calling his daughter was part of what he wanted to present to me.

With the call to his daughter serving as a convenient segue, our conversation began by discussing how his personal story and history suited some institutions better than others. I moved the conversation to his personal story, and in particular recognizing some of the tragedies he has experienced in his lifetime. Gee said,

> I think it (the tragedies) humanizes my leadership challenges. These are not things anyone would wish for. On the other hand, it has strengthened me and made me better. For the first time in 15 years, I've been a father again (during his daughter's physical rehabilitation).

I wanted to know more about how his personal story affects his leadership approach. Gee referenced his challenges with *The Wall Street Journal* while at Vanderbilt.

> I think my story does (get in the way). I think that there's always that level of baggage. You know I've been through a divorce. That always sort of sits there in the back of people's minds. I think that your friends come and go, and your enemies accumulate. That's just the way that it is.

Moving from the personal to the professional, I asked how did one "fit" at so many different places, places with so many different stories? Gordon Gee, in so many words, declared fit as pliable: "You have to reinvent yourself to the institution you're serving." When asked to expand a bit on reinventing himself, Gee responded,

> There's not a manual that says this is the way you run the university. And if there were, then you're not going to run it very well because it's (a) cookie cutter (approach). What you have to do is you have to say that Colorado's as different from Ohio State as Brown is from Vanderbilt . . . if you try to apply first principle in the very same way to each institution I think you'll end up failing.

As he often seems to do, in effect serving as his own editor, Gee reconsidered his thoughts as the conversation went on. "I was a horrible fit (at Brown) and I knew it even before I went." Almost a decade down the road, it seemed there were still open wounds in his psyche. I wanted to know more about his time at Brown, and was curious if there were other factors that made him a horrible fit. He had a significant challenge for any leader as he succeeded a legendary figure in Vartan Gregorian, his predecessor in the presidency at Brown. Gee immediately expounded,

> A pain in the ass is what he was . . . he never learned to let go and he was always hanging around the edges. And in terms of running the institution, he ran it nearly into the ground but in terms of kind of creating this bigger than life ambiance, he certainly did it very well.

As he reconsidered his comments again, Gee then continued,

> Once I leave an institution, I leave it and I have learned that lesson. Of course, I've always been blessed to move from institution to institution. I have not retired. Now I

> suspect that I'll retire from this institution and stay in Columbus and therefore, then the issue for me is how do I learn to keep my hands off of the institution.

I asked Gee to think about past issues of fit, and how he considered them as he took on assignments. When talking about his early career move to West Virgina to lead the law school as dean, Gee commented, "I was too young to understand all this stuff." Continuing, he said, "I had no business becoming a dean at 32, 33 whatever I was, and I even had no more business becoming a university president at age 36."

Gordon Gee followed Gene Budig as president at West Virginia, another leader who assumed the presidency at a young age. I was curious if following Budig helped him when he became another young president, Gee responded, "I think what it did is give me false hope." Regarding the political side of the presidency at West Virginia, Gee said,

> You know all of a sudden, you're thrust into the midst of a huge political agenda and in West Virginia, politics were not just simply politics, they were very personal, so you had to really get out and work those issues and I understood that. My political instincts at least were sufficiently embedded in my DNA that I didn't make too many mistakes.

By the time of my conversation with him in 2008, Gee had been a president for nearly three decades running. I brought up his relationships with the faculty, broaching that he hadn't been in a classroom in a very long time on a regular basis. He replied, "I think that I've always taken the view that I am first and foremost a faculty member. So I view my role in more of the classic academic leadership role more than simply making the engines run on time." As he continued, Gee said,

> I believe the way I view the world is that I have three responsibilities (as president): 1) to set the vision and values for the institution, 2) to hire really good people who will share in

> that vision and those values and not to agree with me on everything, but who are really driven by the same sense of urgency that I have to reach the same goals, and 3) to provide the kind of intellectual and social and cultural resources to make the whole thing work. You have to focus on talent and culture.

As he laid out his guidelines for his work as a president, I then prompted Gee about working closely with a provost to learn how his perspective of the provost's job further described his own approach as president. Gee said, "Well, they're the chief academic officer, but I don't believe that person's in charge of the inside (of the institution) and I'm in charge of the outside. I believe I'm in charge of him".

When asked about how he might see the stories of the institution 10 years out, Gee replied,

> I have high expectations for the institution (Ohio State). I think that the time of economic turmoil we're in right now provides great opportunity for a very comprehensive leadership university like Ohio State. One of the great opportunities of being at Ohio State is the fact that you're not at Southwest Something State University. You are at one of the most powerful institutions in the country. Therefore, you don't have to say we can't do it that way because that's the way they do it at Ohio State or Harvard. We can do that because we are Ohio State. I tell everyone that what I hope to do is to turn Ohio State from being an elephant into a ballerina. Then I add that if we choose to remain an elephant we'll become a dinosaur.

I raised Campus Partners, a real estate redevelopment project Gee began during his first term, in our conversation, and prompted Gee to say whether this concept was developed to address some of the unofficial narratives – the bad stories – that were around Ohio State. "Yes, and it's also

there to build community, build partnerships, build belief that a university is not this isolated area that does not care for its community, those sorts of unofficial stories".

"Now all that (bad) stuff is gone. You write the narrative as you're going".

Knowing Gordon Gee – A Discourse of Personal and Professional History Built of Time and Experience

On October 1, 2007, Gordon Gee began his second tenure as president of The Ohio State University, one of the nation's largest and most influential land grant universities. While all university presidents are public figures to one extent or another, Gee revels in the attention.

Make no mistake; Gordon Gee was acutely aware that he is the subject of discussion. In an interview published in an internal Ohio State periodical, he remarked that,

> There's a little bit of an urban legend about me from when I was here from '90 to '97. People ask me about a lot of these stories. "Did you really sleep overnight in the residence hall; did you really show up in classes and meet with students?" And the answer is yes, I did all those things. I've done them for years and I will continue to do them. I think it's very important in a very large institution to personalize it as much as possible, and that personalization starts with me. (Gillette, 2007)

Clearly, much of his behavior as a university president has been part of a very specific strategy. For him, it is a successful one and it is a different text than what many would assume for a university president. He revels in the small public details, finding unconventional ways to be the center of attention. Because of his approach, there was little doubt the students and faculty of his institution knew who their president was, and felt they knew him at least somewhat personally. He was right. His behavior personalizes the institution.

Gordon Gee was a distinctive president at every institution he served. Contemplating Gee's comment that he personalized the institution, it should also be added that he, too, personified the institution. As president, he was Ohio State. This means he also worked to be West Virginia, Colorado, Brown, and Vanderbilt. His personal discourse as applied to organizational saga allowed him to personify an institution.

Gordon Gee's return to Ohio State in 2007 placed a significant focus on individual-organizational fit (I-O fit) as a concept tied closely to organizational culture. In remarks to the Board of Trustees at a meeting announcing his appointment, Gee harkened back to the story of the prodigal son. "I experienced the world. I made my way in a different way and a different time, but this place, this father, this magnificent institution never forgot me, and has now forgiven me (for leaving) and welcomed me home" (Gee, 2007b).

Vernal, Utah – The Roots of the Personal Discourse of Gordon Gee

Vernal is a small town on Highway 40 between Salt Lake City and Denver, and was Gordon Gee's original home long before any college town. Gee once described it as a town "surrounded by scenery, and dominated by Mormon culture" (Baroway, 2002). His mother and father, Vera and Gus, met at Brigham Young University and were married in 1933 at the Salt Lake City Temple. Gus had been a teacher but eventually became part of the extended business of automobiles, ranching, and oil that was built by Vera's family (Baroway, 2002). Gee remembers,

> We were a relatively wealthy family in the community. My mother and father were enormously supportive of me, had high expectations of my performance . . . I was one of the few people whose parents came to all my events – the Junior Prom, everything! If you can imagine! The kids today would just be totally embarrassed. I thought it was

> wonderful to have my parents come. They would come and be there and take great joy out of it. (Baroway, 2002)

Young Gordon was a star, graduating from high school with all the requisite honors: student body president, an Eagle Scout, National Merit Scholar, and class valedictorian (Baroway, 2002). He was always in charge, and soon discovered people enjoyed having him in charge. No one would outwork him or outthink him. He could inspire loyalty, motivate others, and lead by example (Baroway, 2002).

From Vernal, where he "had never seen a non-Mormon or a Democrat" (Baroway, 2002), Gee matriculated at the University of Utah, where he graduated with honors in 1968 as a history major (Baroway, 2002). It was there he met Elizabeth, also a history major and in the same class. She was very bright, very beautiful, and very engaged to be married. Gee describes meeting her:

> I saw her at a fraternity-sorority party . . . a wonderful looking woman. I still remember her standing by a fireplace talking to a number of people. I thought, now there is a very striking person I would like to get to know. So I found out who she was. I was introduced to her by a mutual friend, then I started asking her out. Yes, I took her away from somebody else. And, yes, I take great pride in that. (Baroway, 2002)

The years passed. Gordon and Elizabeth would marry, move to New York for graduate school, and start the rise up the academic career ladder. In 1979, at age 35, he became dean of the law school at West Virginia University. Two years later, he was named that university's president. After serving as the WVU president for four and one-half years, he became president of the University of Colorado in 1985. And in 1990, he accepted the presidency of The Ohio State University (Baroway, 2002).

Ohio State – Take One

Early in a presidency, there is almost always a key speech that both introduces the leader to his primary constituency (in this case, the university faculty) and outlines the anticipated general strategic direction of the leader. As Gordon Gee began his tenure at Ohio State, the key address was to the University Senate. This 1990 address is entitled *"Time and Change: An Address by President E. Gordon Gee to the University Senate"* and can be found in the appendix to this study. The first page of the speech indicates the grandness of the language and the content to come. The lead paragraph sets out the forthcoming 12 pages:

> I come before you today at a time unique in the history of The Ohio State University, as only its eleventh president, to speak to you of tradition, of commitment, of focus, and of change.

These four items – tradition, commitment, focus, and change – were in many ways the subject of the speech. What took the audience forward in receiving and interpreting the message was their curiosity about how Gordon Gee would interpret and lead Ohio State.

The audience was treated to a speech that contained many signals of luxurious language. There was alliteration in the second paragraph of "continuity and creativity, through vitality and vision," and the same tool of alliteration was used in the next paragraph with the "continuing dash – no, more correctly – that continuing drive for distinction." Gee utilized intertextuality with references to both Linus and Charlie Brown, along with the Greek poet Hesiod in an academic speech where you would seldom find all three. This was just on the first page of the speech. There are other instances of intellectual intertextuality such as a paragraph that started "Let us today, you and I," which alluded to T.S. Eliot and *The Lovesong of J. Alfred Prufrock*.

There was what I call an intellectual code throughout this speech, signaling that the speaker wanted to show he belonged as one with the audience of intellectuals.

In referencing Ohio State and working to evoke the feel of the institution, Gee offered on page 2 of the speech:

> This is a university with spirit, a breathing in of traditions which results in a breathing out of energy and pride. It is a spirit drawn from sources like The Best Damn Band in the Land, *The Farm Science Review*, and the Wexner Center.

These three subjects saluted the factions both passionate and concerned about athletics (The Best Damn Band in the Land is the more commonly known name of Ohio State's marching band), the university's agriculture history, and the then-new Wexner Center for the Arts. Athletics may have had the largest constituency, especially when the count of supporters moved outside the university. Mentioning *The Farm Science Review* was a nod to the land grant history of the institution, and also acknowledged a traditional power source in the university. The Wexner Center for the Arts, at this time (1990), was a brand-new organization on campus with a world-renown piece of architecture by Peter Eisenman serving as its primary building. Referencing the Wexner Center was a way of simultaneously recognizing both the arts within the university and the programming provided to Columbus and the larger community. It also served as an easy-to-grasp salute to all things new at the institution.

Gee provided a flavor of his presidency on this same page by telegraphing his approach with "Today, we begin a dialogue." Labeling a speech, actually a monologue, as a dialogue signaled his respect for academic traditions and also acknowledged what he puts forth in this speech will become conversation for months to come. He declared that "dialogue" need not be in real time.

On page 5, Gee broached an issue that seemingly must be addressed in every introductory speech by a new president at a research university:

> I have said on numerous occasions that "publish or perish" is not a complete enough statement. Publishing is not enough. Around here, it must be "publish, teach, and serve – or perish"

For the faculty audience, Gee attempted to transmit his perspective on the tenure and promotion process. His manner of doing so acknowledged the culture (publish or perish) of research universities such as Ohio State, and at the same time reinforced what is officially the standard for promotion, and he worked to deliver the message that all three parts of this cultural standard would be meaningful.

With another key phrase, this time on page 6, Gee identified how he sees the research university (in this case, Ohio State) within society, "Together, this academic community can be a tremendous force for social change." This important statement surrounded mentions of cancer research, and of the Colleges of Education, of Human Ecology, of Social Work, of Engineering, of Agriculture, and of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. He put forth the perspective, and the expectation, that "such service is fundamental to our academic tradition."

That Gee spoke of the six colleges just listed, and not of the business school and the law school, is likely purposeful to indicate that he is thinking of the entire university and especially the academic units that traditionally have less funding than the professional schools. The mention of Engineering, a professional school, could be to satisfy the professional schools that were not mentioned in the phrase so as to show that he is not anti-professional school across the board. Across the map of professional schools, one can envision a mention of Engineering as being less threatening than law or business.

In talking about how he saw enacting the change process, Gee began discussion on page 7 of private fundraising, of academic prioritization ("we must focus on our strengths"), and of the coming work ahead of the faculty. In doing so, he joked (on page 8) in the idiom of President George H.W. Bush, the United States president at the time, and the ongoing events of 1990:

> This institution has been engaged in planning in the past. In fact, I have been advised by some to assure you: "Read my lips. No new planning." Regardless of your interpretation of that last line, in light of the new federal budget, I would be negligent in my responsibilities if I did not call for a university-wide planning mechanism.

He also, on page 9, acknowledged that Ohio State may look different in the future, forecasting what he called the new majority of "working and returning students – with families, single parents, full and part-time employed," and noted that the university's systems and processes must be measured against the diversity of the students Ohio State enrolls.

For clarity's sake, Gee then endeavored to list the priorities contained within the initial vision relayed throughout this speech and summarized on page 18. In order, the priorities are:

1) Reduce bureaucracy through reorganization.
2) Seize important new interdisciplinary academic opportunities.
3) Develop a strong sense of community.
4) Enhance the undergraduate environment, and
5) Recommit ourselves to diversity.

As he began to close, Gee brought to the table a subject and a time surely present in many leadership tomes in 1990, but one he labeled in a manner befitting his audience and his environment. Rather than talk about the Year 2000, Gee offered this (on page 19):

> If we do that, if we fulfill the promise of the first steps, and the second, and the third, and the steps without limit, what will The Ohio State University look like 10 years hence, when the first digit in the calendar changes for the first time since shortly before William the Conqueror's victory over the Saxons at the Battle of Hastings. This being our time, what will change show?

Gee then formally concluded his remarks with a paragraph that brought forth the images of Ohio State, of classroom debate, and of the academic process:

> From the sound of the Orton chimes to the utterances of a faculty meeting debate, I hear this University as a symphony of sound. To achieve the symphonic, one must first experience the cacophonous – especially in a university. It is my hope, however, that we will become like a chorus, harmonious, not discordant. I hope we can begin singing in the same hymnal, and that the melody will be of a University confident enough at this time to change.

Gordon Gee's presidency began, as most presidencies do, with hope and optimism, and with a vision to the future. Gordon Gee had always worked to include his family in a profession that demanded around-the-clock attention, and this profession often insisted on roles for his family in conducting the presidency. But an issue from his recent past, his wife Elizabeth's health, would soon come to add additional complexities to his daily life.

Elizabeth Gee

Elizabeth Gee worked to develop her career, in parallel and in harmony with Gordon's, throughout the 1980s. A nationally-recognized expert in medical ethics, she earned her EdD from West Virginia University (Watson, 1992).

While the Gees were at the University of Colorado, Elizabeth became the founding interim director of the Center for Human Caring at the University of Colorado at Denver. Describing an ongoing condition, she battled "significant fibrocystic disease" for many years (Gee, 1992). This disease evolved into an aggressive breast cancer, and she ultimately lost the battle in 1991. She documented her personal experiences as a cancer patient in *The Light Around the Dark*, in which she confesses and illuminates her struggle, and her relationship with her family. Gordon Gee and their daughter, Rebekah, played prominent roles in the book, and Gordon Gee took a significant role during Elizabeth's cancer treatment. He drove her between Boulder and Denver, even if it meant canceling crucial appointments (Gee, 1992). Though several friends offered to assume the chauffer duties, Elizabeth wanted to be with Gordon. When he traveled, Gee said it was hard to be alone in the hotel room with nothing to do but think about what life for Rebekah and him would be like without Elizabeth (Gee, 1992).

As president, Gee spoke of Elizabeth and her cancer surgery in his commencement address in the spring of 1988 at the University of Colorado (Gee, 1992), illustrating to the students some of the challenges they might face in life, and also to also answer yet-to-be-posed questions about the health of Elizabeth. This also illustrates how the personal discourse and the professional discourse intertwine. Around the challenges of the illness, life continued. Elizabeth traditionally hosted a luncheon for commencement honorees, and always knew that the spring was Gordon's favorite time of year because the ceremonies affirmed who he was professionally (Gee, 1992), an academic, among the many roles that a president must play. Elizabeth always said that Gordon's idea of a good time was a reception for 400 people (Gee, 1992), indicating that Gee was perhaps at his best during the ceremonial roles of the presidency.

Elizabeth tried to share her thoughts and concerns about the future and about her illness with Gordon (Gee, 1992), but often felt he did not connect with much of what she had to say. Sometimes she felt as if this was denial on his part, that he was unwilling to confront notions and innuendoes about death (Gee, 1992). Finally, there was a very intimate conversation about what each would do in the event the other died. Both felt they would not remarry, and they agreed the surviving spouse would work hard to keep memories of the other alive. Deep inside, Elizabeth said she felt she would be forgotten when she died (Gee, 1992).

As Elizabeth fought her battle, she often felt that Gordon looked tired, and that he was more stressed than at any time since her surgeries. She always felt he could handle professional pressures remarkably well, almost in a way that seems unnatural for most people (Gee, 1992). But she also felt that Gordon was distancing himself from her and Rebekah: There were no quick trips to Dairy Queen, fewer questions about homework, less back-and-forth teasing and taunting between Gordon and Rebekah (Gee, 1992). Finally, Gordon told Elizabeth about the pressures in his professional life, and she thought about how lonely his world must often be, how infrequently someone ever says "thank you," how he has few friends who can share up and down times. She wondered how much longer they could endure this lifestyle of the university presidency (Gee, 1992). There were clear advantages, but the emotional costs were high (Gee, 1992).

An escape for the couple, even during her illness, was professional meetings of other CEOs and university presidents. These peers discussed their lives, and found comfort in each others' struggles and foibles (Gee, 1992). Elizabeth always enjoyed telling the story of how a four-year-old Rebekah protested leaving her television program when a sitter tried to bring her downstairs to meet the Chief Justice of the United States, Warren Burger. Rebekah stood at the

top of the second floor landing and shouted, "The Chief Justice stinks!" The story was something that perhaps only their peers could identify with, and showed the tricky balance of the professional and the personal for university leaders.

Another popular story of Rebekah involved a visit to campus by Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger (Gee, 1992). Gordon said he looked out of a window, and saw the Secretary bent over the hood of Gordon's car with the Secret Service wiping something off of the back of his pants. The car had been borrowed to escort Secretary Weinberger to his various campus destinations and, in true military fashion, they put him in the back seat where Rebekah had been eating a chocolate bar the previous evening.

Life would continue. Elizabeth said that she would see Gordon sitting at his desk in the upstairs bedroom in their home, simply closing his eyes, while other times he tried to talk about what her illness meant to him, and how different he came to feel about his work and his family because of it. But he said it was difficult to find words. This alone said a lot about how tough the illness was for Gordon, because normally he expressed himself easily (Gee, 1992).

Phyllis Updike, a professional colleague of Elizabeth's and an associate professor in the School of Nursing at the University of South Carolina, concluded Elizabeth Gee's book with a coda that showed the toll this battle with cancer took on Gordon Gee, and concluded the narrative with Elizabeth's passing. By this time, the Gees had left the University of Colorado, and Gordon was a bit more than a year into his first presidency at Ohio State. In October of 1991, Updike began this piece (Updike, 1992):

> When I arrived at the hospital from the airport, I navigated through security by using her maiden name, and went to her room. Many of Elizabeth and Gordon's personal things I recognized, but the bed was empty. It was a sunny, crisp autumn day and I thought

perhaps Gordon had taken her out for a brief walk. The assumption was in vain and it quickly took a nosedive as I learned she was in ICU. My heart sank with sadness as I sensed what was unfolding. Gordon met me in the hall with his usual affable greeting but this time coupled with an uncharacteristically stern voice, "We need to talk before you see her." We did. Then we went in to see her.

Gordon turned to me and said, "Well, what do you think? She's pretty damned sick, isn't she?" Elizabeth then opened her eyes, and with an audible sigh, "Oh, I'm so glad you're here."

Gordon came to her side and held her as we encircled her bed with clasped hands – her husband, her daughter in spirit, her mother and father, and myself. I was especially touched by Gordon's offering of Thanksgiving, which preceded requests for healing. We each gave her a quick hug. The reality of not being allowed to touch her during and after the treatment seemed to be an alienating counterpoint to what had just transpired.

Martha Graham spoke of our bodies as sacred garments in that we are born in them, live in them, and are required to honor them (Gee, 1992). On December 17, in early morning, Elizabeth left this garment and moved more fully toward the sacred (Updike, 1992).

In a 2003 interview with Gordon Gee, conducted during his Vanderbilt presidency, Marvin Zahniser reviewed with Gee his 1990-1997 tenure at Ohio State. Foreshadowing his return to Columbus just a few years later, Gee talked about how he would "always consider (himself) ultimately to be a Buckeye" (Zahniser, 2003). Gee said that one of the great tragedies of his time at Ohio State was that Elizabeth died shortly after they arrived (Zahniser, 2003). He reminisced fondly about the kind of warm embrace he received from everyone in the state, and that it was still very emotional for him even to that day.

Leaving Ohio State and Leading Brown

Gee said during the Zahniser interview that the biggest push for his leaving Ohio State was simply burnout. Following the death of his wife, Gee said that he sustained himself by throwing himself totally into work. Toward the end of his first tenure at Ohio State, he remarried and he realized he needed to have time for his new wife, Constance Bumgarner Gee, and time for their personal lives (Zahniser, 2003).

Ultimately, he felt that he was not rewarded for the hard work put forth. "The University wasn't rewarded, but I'll put it in personal terms, I wasn't rewarded. I constantly felt like I was a goalie on an ice hockey team . . . constantly trying to keep these destructive pucks from going into the net," (Zahniser, 2003).

At the start of 1998, Gordon Gee became the seventeenth president of Brown University. Seemingly the transition from a large public university like Ohio State to an elite private institution such as Brown might signal the apex of Gee's professional career as he became an Ivy League president. Perhaps this man who perpetually wore a bow tie would find a long-term home among the Eastern intellectual establishment, and among peers for whom a bow tie might not be considered unusual neckwear. Brown University was his fourth presidency, after terms at West Virginia, Colorado, and Ohio State.

The Brown Alumni Magazine of July/August 1998 offered a reprint, with little explanation or set up, of Gordon Gee's inaugural speech from Saturday, May 23, 1998. This is a speech with less ambition than a speech to the faculty; rather, it is a speech meant by the speaker to celebrate the institution, while everything else at the event celebrates the speechmaker. It was Gee's presidential inauguration.

Gee began with an introductory paragraph previewing what this comparatively short speech was about:

> Standing on this campus, surrounded by these centuries-old buildings – their cornerstones laid when my hometown was still an unclaimed patch of wilderness – I am exhilarated by the convergence of history and potential. And I am inspired by the greatness of the charge leading this most venerable institution into the future.

Despite having two Ivy League degrees from Columbia University, Gee referenced a quote from a previous Brown president, Henry Merritt Wriston, who offered the perspective when he was inaugurated in 1937 that "by this ceremony of adoption . . . I have entered into your heritage." Gee continued a conversation of sorts with Wriston through his predecessor's writings, offering comments on what Brown should expect of a president, and what a president should do for Brown. Gee proposed considerable focus on the history of Brown University, pointing out that:

> From the day James Manning landed in Newport in 1763 with a plan for a liberal institution of learning, to the day in 1765 when he was sworn in as its first president, Brown has prevailed. From the seven students in the class of 1769 to the 1,492 seniors, the 436 graduate students, and the 81 medical students who graduate this month, Brown has prevailed. From 1864, when Anna Weeden and Mary Wooley became the first women to graduate, to Sarah Elizabeth Doyle and the unique coalition of women's clubs that eventually formed Pembroke, to Margaret Stillwell, who, in 1909, was the first woman to be a full professor – Brown has prevailed. From Manning, to Wayland, to Faunce, Wriston, Swearer, and Gregorian, this University has grown and prospered through revolution and wars, and it will prosper and grow in the new century.

Gee offered repetition as a rhetorical tool, combining it with a recitation of significant moments in university history, many which focus on the achievements of women at Brown, to bring forth a vision of the future. His point seems to be summarized with:

> There are those who have criticized our adventurous spirit. But today they look to Brown to learn the secrets of our success. Our innovative, flexible curriculum is the jewel of our university-college. No one has more cause for celebration and optimism than the men and women of Brown, past and present, here and remembered, for we are different. We have always been unique. We have always traveled to a beat of our own, and we are the drummers at the center of what will continue to be an extraordinary educational journey.

This *vive la difference* appeared to be a badge of courage at Brown. Gee used it as a foundation from which to build a new vision. This portion of the speech appears to be aimed at the university community as a whole: faculty, staff, students, parents, and those from far beyond the gates, rather than at a particular constituency (page 3):

> The future of Brown demands that our leadership, along with every member of this community, come together to address the range of complex, troublesome issues we face: How do we balance the needs of an undergraduate liberal arts institution with a graduate and research university? How do we attract the best faculty and students? How do we limit administrative costs? How do we motivate every member of the Brown community to take an active role in its future? How do we balance fundraising and financial pressures with continued academic excellence? How do we balance research and scholarship with our commitment to becoming a private university with a public purpose?

Gee offered Brown University as the model for higher education in America. Continuing, Gee stated that:

> The truth is that Brown will be the model as higher education radically reconfigures itself to promote true, engaged learning and thinking. No institution can afford to rely on the hierarchy separating departments and programs as well as academic and nonacademic cultures. The new university, like Brown, must be a borderless intellectual center, promoting community over isolation and dedicated to sharing objectives over guarding individual concerns. The new university must be a superdisciplinary learning community, based on the moral imperative of our experience, our creating, our imagination and boldness, and our willingness to take risks. If we continue to do these things, we will have fulfilled our mission. We will have set the standard for the new university in the next century.

This vision was offered with a guiding thought from the leader to the followers (page 2) that "our only risk is complacency." He then closed by offering that, "Brown is a place where together we see with the world's eye, and together we understand with the world's heart."

On February 7, 2000, Gordon Gee resigned the Brown University presidency after just two years on the job to assume the top position at Vanderbilt University. Those at Brown were eager to point out ways in which he did not match their culture (Zeff, 2000). As an example, Gee aroused wariness among faculty early in his presidency when he failed to consult the appropriate channels within the faculty governance process before signing off on an ambitious brain-science program (Zeff, 2000).

For not the first or the last time, personal issues became part of the challenges of his service to the university, and the perception of that service. His new wife, formerly a respected arts education professor at Ohio State, had earned a tepid reception as an associate professor at Brown. Many pointed to inadequate teaching skills, and William O. Beeman, an associate

professor of anthropology, said that he was "taken aback to learn that she met some classes in her bedroom while she pumped away on an exercise bicycle," (Zeff, 2000). Aspects of his presidency were also an issue, as renovations to the personal residence was cited as a factor wearing on Gee's fit at Brown (Zeff, 2000). The renovations reportedly cost the university a seven-figure sum, a number many viewed as excessive, especially since Gee's popular predecessor, Vartan Gregorian, had lived comfortably there with his wife throughout his tenure as president of Brown without renovating the residence (Zeff, 2000).

Despite their later assertions of poor fit, the community was stunned that Gee would leave after such a short period of time. Gregorian felt that Gee's departure was inappropriate for the traditions of higher education, saying that,

> People have to fulfill their moral obligations. The issue is: Is the university a special institution in society? If it's a corporation or a business, there's no problem of ethics. But if it's a special institution in which certain standards have to prevail – that are not just legal standards but are moral standards – then there's something else. Then you have certain obligations to act according to the tenets of the institution. (Zeff, 2000)

Gee does not deny that he made a mistake in going to Brown. "The opportunity to become an Ivy League President, I let my conscious get ahead of me" (Zahniser, 2003).

> I was not a good fit for Brown. I went from an institution of 60,000 to an institution of 7,200 students. I went from an institution that was the most complex in the country, to an institution that after 10:00 in the morning, I'd say, "What will I do now?" I felt like an antelope in a telephone booth. (Zahniser, 2003)

Several years down the road, Gee's presidency is generally acknowledged on all sides to be one that was not a success. The only sign of his time on campus appears each Spring Weekend,

when a collection of port-a-potties appearing for the event is labeled the "E. Gordon Gee Lavatory Complex" (Loverro, 2010).

Leading Vanderbilt

During this time of transition for Gee from Brown to Vanderbilt, the trustees of Vanderbilt University offered a different perspective upon Gee's career decision to move to another presidency, arguing that a university president ought to be viewed in much the same way as a corporate CEO – free to pursue all professional options – and that there was no obligation to stay at a university for any amount of time. "Universities are complex, multi-billion dollar organizations that demand sophisticated executive management, fundraising skills, and the ability to build consensus and make decisions," said Martha Ingram, chairman of Vanderbilt's Board of Trust (Zeff, 2000). While emphasizing that "universities are first and foremost academic colonies," she believed that "successful leadership in the academic setting is not much different from the corporate environment" (Zeff, 2000). Vanderbilt's position on the matter was easy to understand, given they were the university that Gee was choosing over Brown. With Gee's peripatetic history, they may have anticipated that they could find themselves in a similar circumstance as Brown someday down the road.

At the beginning of the 2000 academic year, Gee addressed the Faculty Assembly at Vanderbilt University. It was his seventh month of his presidency (chancellorship) at Vanderbilt; however, it was his first fall "back to school" period at the institution.

The theme of this speech appears to be two-fold: first is an introduction of "I am really just like you" and then a move into the more traditional visionary proclamation of a new organizational leader. Gee began by introducing two people he brought with him to Vanderbilt:

his wife, Constance Gee, who received an appointment within the Peabody College of Education and Human Development, and David Williams, who was named vice chancellor, general counsel, and secretary of the university. Williams also had an appointment as a professor of law. Williams worked closely with Gee at Ohio State, both on the law faculty and as a student affairs administrator, though he had not accompanied him to Brown.

As self-deprecating humor seems to be a character trait of Gee's, one of his first remarks, and perhaps the first time he used the line, was, "I haven't heard such a round of applause from a faculty group since I announced to the Brown faculty I was leaving." After introducing the colleagues he brought with him to Vanderbilt, he then began the speech saying his audience should expect to hear about who he is, what he is, what his values are, and what his expectations are of himself and of the relationships he will develop among the university faculty. To this point in the speech, he followed the presumed text of both an experienced speechmaker and of a university president.

Then Gee brought Clark Kerr to the table. At the time, Kerr was perhaps the standard-bearer for presidents seeking to communicate about the university beyond the walls of the academy, and at this point in time (2000) Kerr was someone with whom many of Vanderbilt's faculty might be familiar. It might be said that Kerr was the standard text for the university presidency. But Gee then changed the text. Rather than saying that Kerr was a role model, he said that Kerr was wrong, and that he had made a mistake following Kerr's advice when Gee was early in his career as a university president. Specifically, Kerr recommended that a university president should not become too involved with the university. Contrary to the advice of Kerr, Gee said:

> I will be so deeply involved in this school that its successes and misfortunes are my own, that I will feel them as deeply as my own. I am inextricably bound to it, as much as if we were strung together by nervous tissue. (page 3)

This statement and admission of error did two things: First, it continues the introduction of Gee and his own personal discourse to the audience of Vanderbilt faculty. Next, it gave his audience, the faculty, permission to go against the status quo, and permission to make mistakes. In effect, Gee problematized the text of the presidency. This was likely music to the ears of the faculty, as risk-taking and rebelliousness are often part of the personal discourse of many in the audience.

Next, he returned to the more standardized text of the presidency, explaining that what he envisioned as an ongoing conversation between himself and the faculty had already begun. From these first few months in office Gee had noticed things, and he had things about himself he insisted that the faculty recognize:

- "I want you to feel able to debate me, and to disagree with me" (page 4).
- "I believe in faculty governance" (page 4).
- "Change in an institution like ours must be centrally-driven, but not centralized, and that it will never, ever come unless it is faculty-supported and faculty-led" (page 4).
- "I have observed that at Vanderbilt teaching and research are balanced more accurately than at most schools" (page 4).
- "Teaching and research are not mutually exclusive; they are mutually inclusive" (page 5).
- "The university . . . should be a Utopian community, based on the most enlightened teaching on social organization and business organization" (page 5).

- "An academic community clearly will not be one unless we value all of its members and unless we understand that respect for the individual is the only way to earn respect for the University and for its intellectual values" (page 5).

Gee closed this list by saying it is important that all in the community agree on a list of first principles, and that these principles should govern what is done, what is not done, and what is subject to change. In effect, he designed an agreeable list of items based upon non-controversial items that his audience will be able to easily accept.

Gee then began to speak of larger narratives such as the need for unifying ideas and of institution-specific issues including the prevalence of ETOB (Every-Tub-on-its-Own-Bottom) budgeting at Vanderbilt, and how it is limiting. He gave grand warnings that "Vanderbilt is often encumbered by past success, and that academic priorities should be the creative driving force of the university," and he offered his own coin of the realm that "there is a need to reclaim a sense of urgency." He then offered two statements surely meant to inspire. These statements were challenges, in many ways, to the faculty as a transition to his initial list of goals for his governance:

- Vanderbilt should be at the forefront of intellectual life in this country (page 9), and
- Vanderbilt has to stop using other institutions as benchmarks, and set its own benchmark (page 10).

The transition here was to cheerleading, as he noted, "the pride and integrity here are amongst the best in the world" and attempted boldness as indicated by the two aforementioned statements. Gee then moved to the meat of the speech, with his brief list of five items for focus. What is especially interesting is the amount of effort he went to in claiming ownership of the

goals (challenges, as he labels them at one point), specifying that they were "his ideas" and "his vision," in many ways violating the sanctity of the text of faculty governance:

1. "We must renew our commitment to the undergraduate experience at Vanderbilt" (page 10).
2. "We must reinvent graduate education at Vanderbilt" (page 12).
3. "We must reintegrate professional education with the intellectual life of the University" (page 13).
4. We must "re-examine and restructure economic models "(page 13).
5. "We must renew Vanderbilt's covenant with the community" (page 14).

These five challenges do indeed fit within the text of academic leadership by providing very large umbrellas within which the university normally does its work. There was plenty of room under these umbrellas for faculty leadership, and the specifics range from apple pie (The Red Tape Reduction Effort) to a vision that was likely a new and different value for this private institution, that of service to and engagement with the community. Gee framed this in a way that likely pleased the faculty, framing the community for Vanderbilt as the nation and the world, rather than Nashville, and then focused his definition by saying, "We set standards. We have the responsibility to lead change."

Is the City of Nashville entirely absent in this speech? No. "Peabody students work greatly to improve the quality of local public schools. Doctors and nurses at the Medical Center work around the clock to care for the sick and the injured of our community. The new Ingram Concert Hall at Blair will be made available for public use" (page 16). These inclusions assured that Nashville would not be ignored in the vision; however, the vision was designed for consumption by faculty that tend to focus on the global worlds of their research disciplines. In

closing his comments about service Gee offered a definition of leadership as "engaging people intellectually, empowering them and enabling them to make a difference in their own lives and the lives of others".

Gee finished his nearly 7,500 word speech by re-emphasizing that he "is a teacher," that faculty will participate in and own the change, and that he realizes he must earn trust and support over time. The end result was an introductory speech that attempts to frame a loose vision on the terms acceptable to faculty, such as academic culture and global neighborhood, and within five realms that realistically touch all aspects of the institution. While the vision is never put to one convenient or memorable phrase, I could describe it as, "We are good, and we will get better at all things."

To gain a better perspective on Gee's time at Vanderbilt, I spoke with Eloise Stuhr. Stuhr is a fundraising consultant for Grenzenbach Glier and Associates, and manages the relationship with their client, The Ohio State University. She advises the president and the development leadership team on strategies to increase the flow of private monies. Stuhr previously served as the associate vice chancellor for development at Vanderbilt University during Gee's presidency there and was now in place at Gordon Gee's request. She provided me a source for comparison of the Vanderbilt Gordon Gee versus the new Ohio State Gordon Gee.

The interview with Stuhr focused in part on Gordon Gee and his time at Vanderbilt University, for comparison's sake. Stuhr described Vanderbilt as a place defined by its Southernness:

> There's a belief in the culture that you have to work harder in the South because others (in other parts of the country) don't think you are that smart. Vanderbilt very much likes

> to envision itself as the Harvard of the South and, especially for a Southern institution, is academically ambitious.

When asked if Gordon Gee's personal story matched this narrative, Stuhr replied that she did not think so. She added, though, that the reason Gee fit at Vanderbilt was the university's desire to move beyond its traditional image and to become more ambitious. His background from his previous presidencies was seen as an asset. For many at Vanderbilt, Gee looked like a president from Central Casting, especially since he has no Southern accent. He was "what a president of a strong academic institution should sound like and look like and act like." Stuhr was also prompted about Gordon Gee's Mormon background, as among the interviewees she might have the closest personal relationship with Gee due to her long service as a leader of the development staff at Vanderbilt. She thought that Gee really compartmentalized this particular part of his personal life, and "that's part of what makes him an interesting and complicated person is that this background has so little to do with his institutional leadership." Stuhr added that she would "venture to say that many, many people on campus don't know he's Mormon."

As the second highest ranking fundraising executive at Vanderbilt during her time there, Stuhr was asked whether their donors were investing first in the university, or first in Gee's leadership. Stuhr believed it was always a combination; however, during her time at Vanderbilt, "the vast majority of people were investing largely because of Gordon." Perhaps most interestingly, as someone who oversaw the university's fundraising, Stuhr added that "he's not someone as you know who is always asking for money but he's very much an important ingredient." Continuing, I asked Stuhr whether she thought Gee was sincere and genuine in his leadership. "Totally" she replied, adding,

> He is really an unusual person in that he throws himself totally into the role. Gordon's style was that he knows people's names, and makes them feel like they are an important part of the institution. He would personify the institution.

Stuhr said that you could tell when Gee's passion or his belief was absent in a project, saying that he was always pretty candid with her, though saying things in a nice way. "He knew people around him weren't always working towards the same ends but he stayed on message always." Additionally, Stuhr said that she did not feel Gee picked up a lot of ideas from other people. When it came to discussion about ideas, she said, "he never forgets that he's the president."

I raised the issue of Vanderbilt's new residential colleges, known as The Commons, to Stuhr with the idea that it represented a successful and prolonged effort of Gee's at leading significant change. Stuhr said that what fascinated her, from a fundraising perspective as well as from an administrative view, was that, "Gordon just kept pushing and pushing and pushing and made it happen." In this case, Gee's leadership discourse was likely crucial to instigating this project as it needed political strategy and stamina over a long period of time.

When asked how Gee managed to personify several institutions over time, Stuhr seemed a bit stumped, declaring, "That is a good question." With a bit more thought, she replied, "He's smart, he's a good study." Further, Stuhr added that Gee can envision himself becoming "part of the institutional legend and substance." In winding down that thought, she added that at Brown, "they were less likely to want it to be about him" and this was surely a large part of why it did not work as well for him there.

When asked about Gee's decision to return to Ohio State, Stuhr said at Vanderbilt there was a surprising amount of resentment regarding his decision to leave.

> There was huge disappointment among the staff, and the student body found his decision to be devastating. He was very popular with the faculty because he was someone who went around to departments and made everyone think they were an important part of the institution.

With donors, she said it was a bit more mixed because of *The Wall Street Journal* article (discussed elsewhere in this study), and many also understood that personal issues, such as his divorce, could lead him to want to make a change. Stuhr also said the resentment would have been even higher had he decided to go to a different institution other than Ohio State. Many of the donors, Stuhr said, had long ago accepted that he would not be at Vanderbilt forever simply because of his history leading and leaving other institutions.

From all accounts, Gee had a very successful first few years at Vanderbilt. When the inevitable bumps in the road appeared, the Vanderbilt community rallied around their leader. A 2006 Page One article in *The Wall Street Journal* drew attention to Gee's lavish spending and, much more controversially, to Constance Bumgarner Gee's smoking of marijuana for the treatment of an inner ear ailment in the chancellor's residence, university property (Lublin & Golden, 2006). The newspaper reported that several trustees and a senior official confronted Gordon Gee in his office, telling the chancellor he shared responsibility for allowing marijuana on university property (Lublin & Golden, 2006). Trembling, the chancellor replied, "I've been worried to death over this" (Lublin & Golden, 2006). The article reported that Martha Ingram, the chairman of the board at Vanderbilt, formally reprimanded Mrs. Gee for possessing and using the illegal substance (Lublin & Golden, 2006).

According to Vanderbilt trustee Edward Malloy, former president of the University of Notre Dame himself, supervision of Gordon Gee had "probably been a little loosey-goosey,"

(Lublin & Golden, 2006). "Loosey-goosey" entailed more than $6 million to renovate and enlarge the university-owned chancellors' residence that was never approved by the board, and more than $700,000 spent each year on entertainment at the residence (Lublin & Golden, 2006).

Despite the sensationalist reports, it was clear that the Board of Trustees at Vanderbilt had no interest in running Gee off (Duncan, 2006). In fact, Vanderbilt created a special section within its website to address issues raised by *The Wall Street Journal* article (Angelo, 2006). Norman Tolk, a professor of physics and the vice-chair of Vanderbilt's Faculty Senate, said, "From my vantage point, Gordon Gee has had and continues to have the respect, admiration, and enthusiastic support of the great majority of the faculty" (Redden, 2006).

The hubbub did take its toll. Gee declared the experience to be a "five month colonoscopy" (Pyle, 2008). Eventually, Gordon and Constance Bumgarner Gee agreed upon a divorce, citing irreconcilable differences (Wood & Duncan, 2007).

And then it happened.

After turning down Ohio State's trustees at least once (Gray, 2007a), Gordon Gee made the commitment to return to Ohio State. He called the decision to leave Vanderbilt "by far the most difficult professional decision that I have ever made" (Gray, 2007a). But he decided to follow his heart and return to a place that he considers home (Gray, 2007a).

The Return to Ohio State

Now back at Ohio State and with the opportunity to give that first key governance speech, Gee's situated persona for this speech was like no circumstance he had experienced. Certainly early presidency speeches might be considered old hat for Gee in this, his sixth presidency. Introducing himself was not the key issue, as he was already a part of Ohio State's

history. Perhaps the bigger question might have been why he wanted to return. Gee's speech of October 4, 2007, to the Faculty Council, entitled "It Is About Time . . . and Change" is in the appendix.

The first thing Gee did in this speech was cast himself as the prodigal son "returning with gratitude, with hope, with conviction, and with excitement" (Gee, 2007). Positioning himself this way communicated that he was intimately familiar with the institution, and that he was excited to return. Continuing, he defined his absence in terms familiar to his audience (a 10-year sabbatical) and added that he hoped he has learned a thing or two about being a university president in that decade away (page 2).

In addition to owning the persona as prodigal son, Gee identified a tone for the speech as well as an underlying theme of his newly-birthed presidency. He said that he had one goal for the speech: to celebrate the institution (page 2). It became clear that this approach would be the foundation for many things highlighted and many goals identified in the speech. Finally, he used a bit of verbal iconography by mentioning the words "time and change" together. This was key, as the phrase is a cornerstone of Ohio State's highly recognizable alma mater, and further identified him as "one of us" from the audience's perspective. This was also similar to the title of the speech given at the same occasion during his first tenure.

President Gee used this speech to identify a stylistic theme, using the phrase early on of "the beginning of a long, rich conversation," which signaled how he would like to work with faculty (Gee, 2007). He also provided a glimpse of humility by saying, "In my absence, Ohio State has become a more interesting, more admired, more powerful institution. Naturally, I hope my absence is not the reason for those differences!" (page 3).

Significantly, he signaled his support of a program of one of his predecessors entitled "Targeted Investments in Excellence Initiatives". This politically astute act continued to signal that it was about Ohio State's success, rather than about his personal or professional accomplishments or his personal agenda. Gee declared he wanted "Ohio State to be the university equivalent of the Great Wall of China: visible to the naked eye from outer space" (page 6), and this intertextuality leveled the playing field by utilizing a shared bit of popular culture that nonetheless signified extraordinary scale.

From this preamble, Gee moved into the business of the speech, stating there were six strategic goals from his perspective that lay out the direction of the university in the coming years:

1. Forge one Ohio State University.
2. Put students first.
3. Focus on faculty success.
4. Recast our research agenda.
5. Commit to our communities and revitalize our covenants with them.
6. Simplify university systems and structures.

With these six items as guideposts, Gee proposed that "Ohio State can launch the university of the future. We can be either the architect of change . . . or its victim. Ohio State can be the visionary that values the trans-institutional as the new norm (page 7)." Using the word "trans-institutional," Gee proposed (unspecified) incentives that "encourage the emergence of free-standing new structures that cut across boundaries and make department and college borders more permeable (page 6)."

Gee also signified a common understanding with his audience and the arena in which he operates with the phrase "core values of this university" (page 7). These values go unspoken, but are clearly understood by those listening. In this same vein, he discussed the hidden meaning of words common to the realm of the academy, specifically pointing out "research opportunities" and "teaching loads," and asked his audience to think about the biases contained within the phrasing.

Perhaps most interesting in this speech, which is more business-like and features significantly fewer poetics and rhetorical flourishes than earlier speeches in his career, is this paragraph that addresses the anticipated cynicism, perhaps fueled by his own:

> My answer to your unspoken questions is that I do not believe that this is rhetoric. I do believe in the power of this magnificent place. I do believe that if we accomplish the goals I have outlined, we will harness our assets in an unprecedented way (page 17).

Beyond his seeming misuse of "rhetoric" when he likely meant "hyperbole," this portion of the speech tells of someone older and wiser, and someone less interested in the self-aggrandizement that a leadership position like this presidency can bring.

Additional Personal Challenges Following Gee's Return to Ohio State

At first glance, life was stabilizing for Gee at Ohio State. It was a place where he felt his heart was most engaged. But seemingly throughout his professional career, the personal side has seeped in and become part of the discourse of his rather public professional life. This again happened as soon as he returned to Columbus. His heart received another shock. On July 12, 2008, Gordon Gee's daughter, Rebekah Gee, and her husband, Allan Moore were riding a motor scooter when it crashed into a sport-utility vehicle in Lower Merion Township in suburban

Philadelphia. The crash put Moore into a coma, and he died 12 days later. Rebekah Gee suffered head trauma and broken bones in the crash, but survived.

Rebekah Gee and Allan Moore were married in 2006. At the time of the accident, she was a Robert Wood Johnson clinical scholar as an obstetrician-gynecologist at the University of Pennsylvania Medical School, and her husband was a Fellow in endocrinology and practiced internal medicine at Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston, where the couple met as medical residents (Decker, 2008). Moore had been an undergraduate at Virginia, and then went to medical school at Vanderbilt University, where he met his future father-in-law during Gee's time as chancellor there. It was with Gee's encouragement that Moore contacted Rebekah when they were both assigned residencies at Massachusetts General (D., 2008). Gordon Gee often referred to Allan as the "son he never had," and the two men enjoyed an extremely close relationship (D., 2008).

So again, tragic circumstances invaded Gordon Gee's professional life. Anecdotal evidence is that, as before, it brought empathy and heartfelt concern to this public figure who is very popular among the masses. Gordon Gee's personal discourse continues to surface in his professional discourse, and not at all for reasons he would wish.

Observing Leadership in Business Theatre

On Friday morning, November 8, 2008, I observed a public meeting of The Ohio State University Board of Trustees. My goal in attending the trustees meeting was to watch Gordon Gee work with his direct bosses (the trustees) and to see him navigate the political environment inherent in a board composed of appointees slated by the governor. I emphasize "public" here,

as for the morning before and evening prior, the Trustees had several (somehow) less official meetings that were closed to the public. Given the nature of the public meeting, it would appear that the real business of this public university is done behind closed doors. My impression of the public session of the board meeting I attended was that it seemed to be only business theatre.

The physical environment for the meeting was the grand room of the university's comparatively new alumni center. It was a place ideal for banquets and receptions, in many ways like most ballrooms but a bit newer. Rather than being crowded with tables of eight and 10 as it might be for the university equivalent of a State Dinner, the room was set in a somewhat standard format for a public board meeting, with a squared series of tables with chairs, chairs around the outer edge of the room for supporting staff, and multiple rows of similar chairs in the rear for the audience witnessing the proceedings. The requisite media and their tools surrounded the setting looking for key sound bites, and the ceiling three stories high lent suitable grandeur for this official meeting.

This particular day seemed fraught with stress for the board and Gee, as for the first time since his re-appointment nearly a year earlier, details about his compensation would become public with the trustees approving his new contract for services. The trustees were prepared and seemed concerned about the perception of the compensation of the man who, prior to returning to Ohio State, was the nation's highest paid university president during his time as chancellor of Vanderbilt University.

G. Gilbert Cloyd, chairman of the board, called the meeting to order and then immediately went into a 30-minute preamble to the business of the day speaking on the compensation of leaders, and of President Gordon Gee in particular. The presentation was equal parts defense of high compensation for talented leaders and explanation of why Ohio State

should venture into this heretofore unknown level in the academy of salary for their president. Cloyd spoke so long that he, in effect, put out the fire beneath what may have been a hot topic.

With the trustees being composed of political appointees, nearly everyone on the board had to have their official say, making sure they were or, in some cases, were not on record with Ohio State's generosity. Even the student representative to the board, a representative who is often a silent partner, commented that Ohio State "had to pay the price" for leadership of this caliber.

Gee managed at least a brief smile hearing this last comment, but for the most part looked less than interested and occasionally embarrassed. Finally, after 45 minutes of nearly everyone chiming in, the defense rested and the audience applauded, generously.

After this point, the meeting was rather ordinary. Gee gave the president's report, commenting on various faculty accomplishments and personnel appointments. There were standard committee reports, and a few celebratory moments such as the announcement at the end of the meeting of a new partnership for Ohio State with England's Royal Shakespeare Company.

For my visit to Columbus to interview research participants, this was my first exposure to Gordon Gee since his return from his other presidencies. He appeared bored and somewhat tired rather than restless throughout the proceedings; I later learned he was battling a cold. Throughout most of the proceedings, Gee took only a few notes but also gave care to always keep a foot in the door of the proceedings should comment be necessary. He looked like he had done this a time or two, and that he considered it a necessary but not a challenging part of his professional responsibilities.

Personalizing Leadership

The next time I was physically with Gordon Gee for this project was when I arrived for my formal interview with him for this research. President Gee was running behind the time of my scheduled interview. The Office of the President had the kindness and courtesy to call and let me know, and even with this warning I ended up sitting in his outer office for roughly a half hour. Indeed, this was expected, knowing I was visiting with a public figure of the most gregarious sort.

Suddenly, a whirlwind came through the door. This, too, was expected, but in a different manner. The younger Gordon Gee in his first presidency always seemed to be accompanied by an entourage. This Gordon Gee of the present was by himself, stooped, and wearing an overcoat that was way too big for his small stature. The coat, though, did match the first cold day of the year in Columbus. On top his head was the most tattered scarlet Ohio State ball cap you could imagine, at a slight angle that was carefree and in effect said, "I'm so busy that I don't have the time to put my hat on correctly."

He saw me sitting there and immediately came to introduce himself and to apologize for running behind. He stepped away to take care of some business with his assistant, and then came back to offer the opportunity of traveling with him to his next meeting so that he could catch up on his schedule and I could see him work a bit, too. While this was a generous offer that I accepted, I also wondered if this gesture might be, at the root, a way of maintaining control while producing additional business theatre for me.

Either way, I became part of the whirlwind.

We moved quickly out through the building where his driver and car were waiting. Rather than a luxury car, a very battered scarlet and gray Ford minivan was there for our journey.

As soon as he sat down, the first thing Gee did was to pull out the cell phone and make a call – not to an advisor, or to the governor, but to his daughter, Rebekah. She was waiting for him at his Columbus home, and following the evening's work, they were leaving the next morning for a brief vacation. The phone conversation mostly consisted of comparing who had the more severe cold.

Then for the next 20 minutes or so, we had a chance to visit prior to our arrival at The Ohio State University African American & African Studies Community Extension Center, located in a historic African American community on Columbus's east side. Once we arrived at the Center everything stopped for Gordon Gee to command the room. He went around greeting friends and introducing himself to the few he did not know, and then immediately and without a formal introduction stepped up the microphone to speak, seeming to assume that the open microphone was waiting specifically for him.

"It's been one heckuva week."

Then, realizing that it was three days after the election of Barack Obama as president, and realizing his audience, he repeated himself with gleeful emphasis.

"It's been one *heckuva* week."

His audience gave a celebratory applause that made it clear they were on the same page. Gee, though an admitted middle-of-the-road Republican who never met a democrat until he went to college (Baroway, 2002), had bonded with his audience. He was theirs, and they were his.

Gee spoke briefly, but rather than heading straight out the door as I expected, he left the microphone and immediately went to visit in greater detail with some of those in attendance. He took a tour of the Center. All in all, his stay was more than merely that of a dignitary coming to bless the proceedings. It seemed to be perceived as the visit of a leader who sincerely cared

about their project. He stayed at the event longer than many traveling leaders would choose to do. Balancing the timing perfectly, he still did not linger. As we left, it seemed the audience was pleased with the visit and especially happy that he stayed as long as he did.

Soon we were back in the beat-up minivan, returning to campus. This time, he did call one of his advisors to discuss the Trustees' meeting and to visit about how the issues surrounding his salary were perceived. He had already asked me for my opinion regarding the Trustees' meeting and my perception of how the conversation went about his salary. And then just as suddenly as the tour began, he dropped me off near the university library and he and his driver went to another part of campus for an event at the Wexner Center for the Arts where Gee was to speak at the opening of an Andy Warhol exhibit.

My time with Gordon Gee had passed, and despite being a doctoral student from another university, Gee made sure to present a personal touch to our time together as best he could. While the comments I gathered about his leadership were quite varied, one constant was that everyone agreed Gee worked to make things personal. For example, when I visited with Jim Phelan, Distinguished University Professor of English, about Gordon Gee, he talked about the way in which Gee communicated with those within the Ohio State community. Phelan said he had confidence in being able to send an email and getting "a personal response from Gee. The responses are very brief, very short but you know he's making the effort, finding the time, making the touch." Phelan continued to be amazed at how often "Gordon was able to give personal touches such as handwritten thank you notes." There were several themes that came through during conversations with the informants highlighted below. Certainly personalization, hard work, energy, embodying the institution, and a heightened sense of awareness were mentioned, all being part of the overall discourse of Gordon Gee. But what seemed to be the

Gordon Gee text of a presidency was the attention to detail, both publicly and privately, that made everyone feel they knew the leader.

Other Perspectives on Gordon Gee

As described in Chapter Three, I asked six purposefully selected individuals to give their thoughts on the story of Ohio State, the narrative of Gordon Gee, how he fit as president, and how he used the stories of the university and his own history to shape and advance an agenda in an effort to provide perspectives to help shape my understanding of what Gee told me directly about his presidency. Their answers first and foremost represented their perspective on the issues. But when taken hand-in-hand with their positional perspective, meaning what was it they said considering what they did for a living, there was additional light to be shed on the focus of this research. Oft-repeated themes of the conversations with the informants included the sincerity of Gee's leadership, his ability to personalize the institution, and his skills in embodying the institution.

Eloise Stuhr felt that there is a total sincerity to President Gee. "He is an unusual person in that he throws himself totally into the role." James Phelan focused this a bit more as he said "there is always a sincerity in the sense of his commitment to the place and his commitment to the narrative". Roger Addleman was perhaps a little less sure. "I don't want to call him an actor but I mean he is". Addleman qualified that thought by adding "he's very good at putting forth the sincere sincerity needed when he's talking to donors". Ultimately, Addleman rationalized that, as president, Gordon Gee embodies the university. "He embodies what the issues are and he expresses sincerity and warmth. That's one of the things with Ohio State, (because of) the size of us, I think that's one of the things (for which) we need him so badly."

My interview with Undergraduate Student Government president Peter Koltak began with Koltak's earliest memories of Gordon Gee date back to Gee's first presidency, when Koltak was roughly 10 years old and he "saw him in the paper, saw the bow tie" and remembered how he was a noticeable person. Even as a 10-year-old, Koltak thought of this distinctive character as being synonymous with Ohio State.

When asked about the story of Ohio State, Koltak responded by saying that he very much saw Ohio State's story as one that "centered around opportunity." He also saw size and an urban environment as parts of the saga; in fact, as a student he was drawn from the nearby suburban environment of Upper Arlington to Ohio State's urban setting. But hand-in-hand with opportunity, Koltak spoke of the size of the university population that could be the reason for much of the opportunity being present that might not be elsewhere.

Koltak chose between Ohio State and American University as an undergrad. When he spoke of community, Koltak said that "there was a definite sense of community at American U., but it really didn't seem to be about the university itself," implying that the students and faculty were too focused on the political environment of Washington, DC. Comparing American University to Ohio State, Koltak said,

> The people who end up at Ohio State are largely there for the Ohio State community. There is an energy associated with the university and you know it's best demonstrated maybe in athletics, but it shows up everywhere. We always joke that you can go walk pretty much anywhere in the world and yell 'O-H' and someone is going to yell 'I-O' back to you."

Koltak said the media coverage of Gee's recruitment by the Board of Trustees first created excitement for the students regarding the possibility of his return to Ohio State, and the pursuit of Gee was definitely attention-grabbing,

> You'd get reports that (trustees Les) Wexner and (Alex) Shumate are flying down there (Nashville) this weekend, but he says he's not coming, and everyone's playing coy, and it was this huge deal.

Koltak said that when Gee was named president the second time, the students had become aware of him, and that while some were indifferent eventually everyone "got sucked in." As he spoke of Gee's relationship with the students, Koltak said Gee goes out of his way to show up at student events, and a frenzy of sorts was created when word started to travel:

> 'Hey, Gee was at this party. He showed up here. He was at this event.' And then suddenly everyone's Facebook picture is with Dr. Gee. And it builds and builds and builds until now he is a superstar again.

Koltak talked of Gee's seemingly inexhaustible energy, and described working the freshman move-in with him. Koltak said they worked together that day for three hours, and by the end of that he was exhausted, but Gee just moved on to his next commitment.

Koltak stated that there are probably four people who represent Ohio State to the rest of the community and are seen as embodying the institution: Jim Tressel (current football coach), Woody Hayes (past football coach), Archie Griffin (aforementioned football hero and president of the Alumni Association), and Gee. Koltak added,

> I think it'd be funny if you put Coach Tressel and Dr. Gee in a room. I don't know who would get the bigger response but I would be willing to bet that there's a very good chance it would be Dr. Gee.

When asked how much the president matters to the average student, Koltak said that, even for him as the president of student government, "what the university president is doing doesn't matter" in his everyday life. But what did matter, he said, was the "big tone that the president sets. It's the willingness to engage with students" and how presidents handle the big decisions.

Koltak talked about previous university presidents and said that all, Gee included, will have their pet projects. When prompted to compare the two Gordon Gees at Ohio State, Koltak said he could not do that, but that he does know that Ohio State 1990 and Ohio State 2008 are dramatically different institutions.

I visited with Archie Griffin, one of the individuals who Koltak felt embodied Ohio State, in significant part because of his accomplishments on the football field as a collegian. Now in his mid-to-late 50s, Griffin is the president and chief executive officer of The Ohio State University Alumni Association.

Griffin's perspective of the university is one that can sit comfortably with both academics and athletics, and he noted with particular pride that the university excels in both of the aforementioned realms. Griffin described Ohio State as being the story of "unending improvement, and trying to be the best you can possibly be." Griffin worked at trying to build parallels with the above comment, and compared the two presidential terms of Gordon Gee, saying that Gee is back, in part, to make the university the best it can be.

As Griffin talked about Gordon Gee's return, he described it as "kinda like rockstar kind of stuff." The students on campus were young children when Gee was at Ohio State the first time, but they very much want to embrace the more legendary parts of Gee's leadership persona, including the time and commitment he gave to students and their organizations during his first tenure at Ohio State. Beyond his popularity with the students, Griffin felt a good point about

Gee's return was that it was as much as possible like hiring both an internal candidate and somebody from the outside as well, as Gee had at least a working knowledge of the university coming in. Everyone was aware of the changes that took place in the decade he was away, but there was an acknowledgement that it was the same place, the values were the same, and that Gee would fit well in many ways because he worked so well the first time.

Although not directly involved with fundraising at Ohio State, Griffin in his position works to engage alumni so that, among other items, fundraising efforts can be more effective. As university president, Gordon Gee is involved in many of these efforts. Griffin said that he felt the university's alumni appreciate Gee's aggressive nature, and that they appreciate knowing he will "do a heck of a job promoting the university." When it comes to fundraising for Ohio State, Griffin said that he felt "donors give to the university first because of what the university stands for, but Gordon Gee's personality brings just a little extra."

Griffin noted many things that emphasized the egalitarian nature of Ohio State. He felt that "we pride ourselves in trying to make sure that student-athletes have as normal of a student experience" as possible, and that there are no special athletic dormitories. He also talked about the vocational nature of Ohio State, noting how students (athletes and non-athletes alike) are there to get a job, though "you don't say it in that way." I pushed Griffin about whether his perspectives were mainstream, and he said,

> You know, my opinion is my opinion, but the fact is that I've been here for so long and that I love this university. I was born at University Hospital. So, yeah, my opinions may be a bit biased but I think they are mainstream."

He said he believed that "most people have a real good feeling about Ohio State." As for Gordon Gee, Griffin felt Gee is great for the university, and that the president was concentrating on moving the university from "excellence to imminence."

Roger Addleman was the director of communications for The Ohio State University Foundation and the Office of University Development. When asked about the narrative of the institution, Addleman showed a bit of skepticism: "Do you want the canned (version)? Or you don't want the canned?" Ultimately, Addleman chose to go by the book. He discussed the trinity of teaching, research, and public service and the role of the university vis-à-vis the State of Ohio. He also discussed the historic land grant mission, and how that does (and does not) affect the future of the institution. This being said he offered that,

> We're becoming more private, more of the private model when it comes to admitting students and whatnot and the caliber of their education, and the quality of their education.

Through my conversation with Addleman, it became apparent that he saw the unofficial narrative of the university to have been the ongoing reconciliation with the two Gee presidencies and, in many ways, with each President Gee. Addleman implied that this should be self-evident as 10 years had passed between the respective tenures and that the university was different. Plus, the man himself had aged, both literally and figuratively. "He can't throw himself against a Velcro board for the students to excite them," said Addleman, referring back to antics from the first Gee presidency.

Gee's role, Addleman said, would be to embody what the university was all about, and as president he had to be able to interact "with the students, the community, the faculty, the staff, and the patients." Addleman said that Gee very much wanted to weave everything together into a much stronger, united university:

> The university needs that uniter, the person that is going to be able to take on the rogue units or rogue areas. We don't want it to be the football team. We don't want it to be just the medical center. Ohio State needs somebody that can embody what the university is all about. Gordon serves as a symbol of the university even more so today.

He added that Gee's personal story "will be allowed to grow and flourish even more so than it did when he was (at Ohio State) the first time," reasoning that after what seems in consensus to have been a difficult presidency, the university would very much need a strong personality.

Addleman also identified the restructuring of the Board of Trustees as an ongoing, unofficial narrative. The board had moved from a structure of appointees with limited, single terms by the governor, to a revised structure that allowed renewable terms. With this new format, a handful of long-serving individuals were able to consolidate their power; whereas in the past once the term was over, the individual was permanently retired from the leadership of the university. This increase in centralized power would likely have an effect on the leadership discourse of the presidency.

Addleman also envisioned a time when research and the medical sciences would assume a larger role than in the past. "I think that's going to really drive the overall success and reputation of the university," he emphasized. Likewise, Addleman pointed to the quality of undergraduate education as a point of focus, as the metrics of incoming students had increased significantly in recent years. While he did not want to slight Gee's immediate predecessors and their effectiveness at fundraising, Addleman said that Gee's involvement and ability in this realm has increased tremendously compared to the past two presidents. He also added that "Gee is just such a sharp fast study, and he has the personality that can walk into a room and immediately talk to every individual in that room." Addleman steadfastly believes that Gee consciously

utilizes his positional power, and has the appropriate sincerity when talking with constituents. In many ways, he has come back with "the guns blazing, with the standpoint of 'I'm back. Let's get moving again.'"

When asked about the sincerity of Gee's leadership, Addleman exclaimed, "I don't want to call him an actor, but I mean he is." Further describing Gee's talents as a fundraiser, Addleman also said that Gee is "very good at putting forth the sincere sincerity needed when he's talking to donors."

"He embodies the university . . . that's one of the things we need him so badly for."

For Aaron McKain, a doctoral student in Rhetoric, his first few years as a graduate student were ones where he was not aware of any larger narratives. He was simply a grad student working toward his goal. He and his wife came to Ohio State from the University of Nebraska, selecting the university without visiting it. The key for them was a place that had Law and English for Aaron, and landscape architecture for his wife,

> We didn't know anything about it, and really I was struck by how anonymous it kind of was. Because you're a grad student, you just sort of pull up one day and you walk into a building and then you just sort of never leave that building.

To McKain his undergraduate alma mater, the University of Nebraska, seemed to have a much stronger sense of identity that Ohio State, but with half the students. "You know, this massive football team and very sort of populist admissions standards and that sort of thing," said McKain.

McKain eventually joined Gordon Gee's speechwriting team after Gee had approached McKain's advisor, James Phelan, looking for students who might serve such a role. Since that point, McKain admitted to becoming much more aware of issues such as grand narratives while doing this work. After this experience, he felt that even the undergraduates could "spit back at

you about what this place stands for". When asked about how Gee's personal narrative matches the university's story, McKain said that he did not know and "from that perspective you don't really hear a lot of people seeing a disconnect between his message and his prior stints or his own life history, maybe because people aren't interested with it." Continuing the discussion on narrative, McKain said,

> If you think about a place like Ohio State, the main organizing issue discourse is the football team, but in a weird way even that is avoidable. I sort of joke that I've only been to one Ohio State game in my entire life, for being here for seven years. But really, living four blocks off campus, you can even ignore that elephant in the room. What's interesting about universities is that you can put your head down and not be inculcated in any of the organizational discourses. What's interesting to me is no matter who the president is, and I think this is true at Nebraska and true at Ohio State, football seems like the easy organizational discourse on the sort of sophisticated macro level of how we pitch things. You can't help but notice even the innocuous ways professors or instructors try to connect with the students through football references.

McKain said that in his experience, the students did not always buy into the narrative simply because there are so many other things going on in their lives. "They just often didn't have that kind of unified sense. Here are all these college students, and they're just like you would find at a liberal arts college."

As McKain has had contact with the alumni body, he has developed the opinion that football seemed like a generational thing, and was more important to the alumni than the mainstream student. But he also said that football could be used as a rallying cry to organize students and get them "on board to buy into whatever." It was a discourse that was used to unite

the student body, and it "harkened back to this kind of 1950s college campus . . . sort of thing." He added that football created a sense of community, and it was really simple to step into, and that it might have been a more robust community on its own than what actually existed at the university overall. "The sports and football, it's not so much the students. It's the people, the spectators, and it's a very, very powerful force no matter what state you're working in."

McKain continued that football can be an extraordinary and important part of a larger identity, and he spoke of his time growing up in Nebraska where "you are taught that we are the winningest team in football and we are these benevolent people with this weird Father Flannigan figure (Tom Osborne) as coach." When the Nebraska football team later had a few seasons of losing records,

> It was if there had been a coup or the president had been shot. People were using words like 'takeover'. The stands emptied out, the people stood up and put their backs to the field. It was like a palace revolution. You really thought no elected official was safe at that moment until they fixed this.

McKain considered himself a fortunate and privileged graduate student, and not just because of his role with the President's Office, but because he and another PhD student were allowed to redesign and develop the curricula for all of the English 110 classes, which had roughly 6,000 students in any given year. He felt that most of his institutional perspective came from that, as he actually got to see "how sausage is made." McKain said that he learned how partnerships with book companies can drive the curriculum, and he learned how money flowed in the university and who was in charge of the decisions, and how important the money decisions are to the future of the university.

McKain's experience at a similar university, Nebraska, and his role working with the president as a speechwriter gave him a unique experience at Ohio State. His faculty advisor, Jim Phelan, was able to connect him with the president's office because of the relationships he himself had built over his long service at Ohio State.

Jim Phelan is a Distinguished University Professor and was the chair of Ohio State's Department of English from 1994-2002, serving in this role during a portion of Gordon Gee's first term as president and providing a bridge between Gee's first and second tenure. Phelan's expertise in narrative provided a specific and schooled perspective on the stories of Ohio State and how Gee used them to communicate and to provide identity.

When I asked about a grand narrative at Ohio State, Phelan replied, "there was indeed an effort to construct one, and Gordon Gee was certainly out front in doing so." He noted that the most frequent narrative he saw at Ohio State was best described as an aspirational narrative. He noted that in the language of business literature, this narrative involved the journey from "good" to "great," and at least in his world as a senior professor this played a larger role than the other less formal narratives of Ohio State such as "big" or "football." Phelan also discussed some challenges of the ongoing narrative, such as important aspects of the land grant mission and affordability, while justifying that the institution no longer features comparatively open admissions at the undergraduate level:

> If you go more in the trenches you get lots of different kinds of narratives. Some are: 'It's too big, it's too impersonal.' Some are: 'It's great and it offers you all the advantages of a private liberal arts elite college and all the advantages of a major public research university and everything between.'

I asked Phelan for his thoughts about Gee's personal story, and whether it conflicts with the institutional narrative. Phelan felt that Gee works very hard to intertwine his personal narrative with that of the university. At this particular time, Phelan considered the intersection "coming home, but coming home sort of wiser" as the unfolding saga of how Gee himself would conclude an extraordinarily successful career. The narrative of President Gee in 2008, according to Phelan, was much different than the one present 15 years earlier. While there was continuity with certain facets and skills of the leader at the two points in time, Gee was older, wiser, and more willing to be a strong leader, utilizing what he may feel is a mandate from the trustees. Phelan added that Gee was happy to talk about his "former self," meaning his previous term as president at Ohio State, but seemed to skip over the other leaders who were in place during the interim.

Regarding Gee's return, Phelan mentioned that there had been roughly a 50% turnover in faculty since Gee left in 1997. The faculty who were on campus during Gee's first tenure, according to Phelan, were open to his return; however, the attitude from the new faculty seemed to be, "Well, let's see how he does." Phelan noted there was always sincerity in Gee's sense of commitment to the university and specifically to the larger narrative. University fundraisers typically ask for a significant role for the university president in fundraising strategy. With this in mind, I asked if he felt donors gave more to Gordon Gee specifically, or to the university. Phelan said, "It is a combination. Rhetoricians would call this metonomy or synecdoche to describe the relationship between the individual and the institution." Phelan added that as with any leader, there were some questions to which President Gee might not have given a straight answer, for a variety of reasons. In these cases, Phelan felt Gee was still very much a poker player trying to figure out which cards to play.

When Phelan looked at the personality and fit of President Gee, he was intrigued that while it has been nearly 30 years since Gee was an everyday member of a university faculty (and that was for a comparatively short time period), he was very good at understanding the demands on faculty life. His philosophical grounding was that of the professor. Phelan felt Gee passed the test of "is he going to allow me to do the work I want." In Gee's second tenure, Phelan said that Gee was going out of his way to reduce bureaucracy and paperwork, noting this would be a way to make life easier for the professoriate. Phelan also added that Gee and the provost, Joe Alutto, were working very hard to implement new administrative strategies, giving the impression of a certain nimbleness, which was heretofore unheard of at Ohio State. They have been trying to lead the whole university, and not just parts at a time.

In concluding our conversation about Gee, Phelan noted that, "his energy is the most remarkable thing about Gee. That hasn't changed in 15 years, except maybe he's a little more stooped."

Ohio State and Organizational Saga

The concept of organizational saga was important to this study as it competes, compliments, and combines as a variable within the discourses that coalesce to determine the text of leadership fit. The following, drawn from unobtrusive data, begin to reveal the DNA of the organization in question.

One of the most elementary observations regarding The Ohio State University is that it is a very big place. Polls commissioned by Ohio State's Office of University Communications verify that Ohioans equate very big with very good (Baroway, 2002). This, of course, was convenient for Ohio State. Looking at the numbers from Fall 2010, available on their website:

- Total university enrollment is 64,077 with the Columbus campus accounting for more than 56,000 of those students.
- Total acreage of the university is 15,905, though only 1,764 compose the High Street campus.
- There are 909 buildings, with 454 of those in Columbus.
- A headcount of employees (FTE and beyond) is 42,370.
- There are an estimated 12,000 courses offered for students, undergrad and graduate combined.
- The budget, featuring income from all sources, is $4.82 billion.

There were outstanding academic programs at Ohio State. Studies in geodesy and linguistics, among others, are internationally recognized, and programs at the Wexner Center for the Arts reached out into the community to spread intellectual wealth and diversity to those beyond the campus boundaries. The Wexner Center itself was a brilliant work of postmodern architecture designed by Peter Eisenman and occupies a prime location at the historic front gates of the campus, serving as a bridge between the university and the community, and between the past and the future. The building itself echoes the much-beloved armory that stood on the site until destroyed by a fire in the early 1960s. The appearance alone adds to the community and highlights the historic saga of Ohio State.

Intercollegiate athletics, and especially football, are a large part of the culture at Ohio State. Even though by any measure Ohio State has a full and broad athletic department, with a significant slate of men's and women's sports, revenue producing sports and those deemed as Olympic (rather than the more deflating "non-revenue"), it was football that built the Ohio State brand and helped create the story of the university. On the playing field, seven student-athletes

have been awarded the Heisman Trophy, emblematic of college football's player of each year. The names of renowned players were too numerous to mention for this study, and their successes on the field, individually and as a team, have made football a leading story of The Ohio State University. Athletics at Ohio State was often the first focal point of the university by the general public.

In my interview with him, Aaron McKain spoke of football being a sort of default narrative for the institution, describing it as the easiest organizational discourse within which to pitch ideas and tell stories. Each home football game during the fall is a Scarlet and Gray community event. Hundreds of thousands flock to campus (many never make it to the stadium) to celebrate the football team, the university, and the glory of Ohio. And even beyond alumni, Ohio State football entertains the city and state; it belongs to everyone (Ware, 1990). During the first Gordon Gee presidency at Ohio State, there was a real love-hate relationship with football (Baroway, 2002), and President Gee had a constant struggle with its role at Ohio State. "Other values have to be considered . . . win at all costs is not the nature of this university" (Baroway, 2002, p.150).

But this did not mean that Gee could not have fun with the subject. Presidential aide Chip Elam recalled Gee's hospital visit to the then-offensive coordinator Eliot Uzelak, who was always criticized by the media and fans for his conservative play calling. Uzelak was recovering from coronary bypass surgery and sleeping when Gee arrived. "Throw the ball," the president stage-whispered as a subliminal suggestion, sending the attending physicians into convulsions (Baroway, 2002, p.228).

Despite his own struggle with football's place among the university's values, Gee did have supporters from those inside the football machine. John Cooper was the head football coach for the entire run of Gordon Gee's first presidency at Ohio State. Cooper said,

> What I like and admired most about him is that he worked as hard as I did to try to make us successful. He helped us do anything we asked. He'd call the recruits back and he would come over and talk to them at the ballgames. I never saw anyone with more energy or more enthusiasm to help a coach be successful than Dr. Gee. (Baroway, 2002, p.151)

Gee also worked very hard to make sure that football did not overshadow the university. To the media, he would proudly say, "The New York Times, Los Angeles Times, and Sports Illustrated . . . are not running stories which say . . . Ohio State . . .is masquerading as a university . . . Once and for all, Ohio State has to shed its image as a football school and has to assume what it is – a great university. And by God that what's going to happen (Baroway, p. 150).

With the historic and dramatic Ohio Stadium, beloved green spaces such as the Oval, and with full-color autumns welcoming the students back every fall, the Ohio State campus is a bucolic setting that in appearance represents to many what university life is about. It should be an ideal place to build a great university with relative ease. Because of its sheer size and long history as an elite public university, Ohio State has had significant influence in our country over time. With all this said, a primary question for any leader at Ohio State, and for many other large public research universities is how to grow a university when what gets primarily noticed is football. Perhaps George Cross, the one-time president of the University of Oklahoma, put it best when he had as his goal "to build a university the football team can be proud of" (Berkow,

1989). Gee chose to use the discourse of intercollegiate athletics to advance the rest of the university:

> The thing that came through loud and clear to me from the start was the fact that athletics was a very important driving engine as a touch point for the university. And so if I was going to improve physics, chemistry, history, business, I could not be viewed as anti-athletics, number one. And number two, then we had to develop a strategy to use athletics as a vehicle to tell the story of the university. Number three was the fact that for whatever blessings occurred during my time at Ohio State, our athletic department was totally self-sustaining; in fact, I charge the athletic department overhead and put $2.5 million right off the top of the athletic department into the library. (Zahniser, 2003)

Gee acknowledged that some might view his use of the football program to raise money as somewhat hypocritical, given his oft-stated disdain for Ohio State's reputation as a football powerhouse and not an academic one. Gee rationalized it this way:

> In order to come and sit with me at a football game, they (donors) have to listen to me talk about academics. And you know what? It works. I can't get 96,000 people to come to a chemistry lecture. But if I can get them here (to Ohio Stadium) I can talk to them about the wonderful things we're doing all over this university. (Marrison, 1996)

At many large universities, athletics is a 500-pound gorilla that demands constant attention and often puts the president's job at risk. It is part of the organizational discourse at Ohio State, and can make the balancing act necessary to maintain harmony quite challenging. Accepting football, and using it to advance the academic goals, is a strategy that Gee found effective in achieving and maintaining harmony.

Presenting an image of Ohio State to prospective students and alumni

An institutional discourse can be found in a variety of promotional documents. In days past the undergraduate viewbook, a primary student recruitment tool, was one of the best places to see the strategies deployed that define a university. Now, of course, there is the Internet. Traveling to the undergraduate admissions page on the Ohio State website (Unknown, 2008b) for a view of the university, a prospective student immediately sees historic Orton Hall, home of the geoscience library and faculty offices. As I surfed though the website, this image of Orton Hall very quickly yielded to a photo of a student of color. Among the messages communicated here are that Ohio State is stately and significant, and that students of color are welcome and valued. These messages have changed little in recent history, though both readers and designers are now likely more cognizant of the value and existence of the messages, and suspicious if they are absent. The Internet-based admissions recruiting site is less static than the traditional viewbook, and allows for more personality of both the institution and the individuals within the institution to show through assorted blogs, videos, and slide shows.

Within this website put forth by the undergraduate admissions office, there was little doubt the slide shows did indeed lead with football and the gameday experience. This is likely not by chance, but rather as a result of studies and surveys that showed football to be of significant interest to prospective undergraduate students. Here, through an official vehicle of the university, the discourse of big football continued. The slideshows designed to attract incoming undergraduate students feature four collections of images: Football Saturday at Ohio Stadium, Ohio State Traditions, Student Involvement Fair, and Whole You: Fitness at Ohio State. The Student Involvement Fair was a video, while the other three are slide shows. The first two, Football Saturday and Ohio State Traditions, both led with the gameday experience. It

seems obvious that a decision was made to lead with football as one of the chief reasons you should be a student at Ohio State, and it was cast as inextricable part of undergraduate life. Certainly in these shots, the team was always winning and everyone was having fun. This can be seen as a Potemkin Village, where the students are never shown the hollow interior (Sperber, 2000).

The traditional printed version of the viewbook, still available at the time I was collecting data for this study, appeared much more balanced. Scenes of the students outdoors and scenes of the campus in general dominated (Unknown, 2008c). Because of the pervasiveness of the medium with the specific audience, the Web version likely would receive many, many more click-throughs than are available in individually printed copies of the viewbook. These messages in the viewbook and the undergraduate admissions website were probably based on what university leaders felt was valued by the targeted audience. To surf through the graduate student equivalent website was like looking at another university entirely. Most graduate students probably agree that their perspective of the university would be somewhat different than the undergraduate experience. As Aaron McKain mentioned, buying into the narrative of football may be optional as there are simply too many other things going on in students' lives, especially at a place as big and as culturally diverse as Ohio State.

Regardless of whether or not one chooses to buy into the football narrative, there will certainly be plenty of opportunity to do so. The pattern continues elsewhere in the university. A glance at Ohio State's most recent fundraising publication at the time, *Giving Update*, revealed a cover collage of six photos, two of which were taken directly from the gameday experience (Unknown, 2009e). This might reflect Aaron McKain's earlier comment that football seemed to have a generational aspect.

Another important primary source used to review the organizational discourse was the designated image leader of the football program, the annual football media guide. This is where the athletic department formally defined itself through the sport to the media. In reviewing the media guide, I had the feeling that its primary use was no longer for media, but rather for prospective players. While it might be easy to claim that the university, or at least the football program, likes to emphasize "the people. the tradition. the excellence" (non-capitalization of the sentences is as reflected in the cover design of the media guide), there were other purposes met by the commitment of one page per player and coach.

The unintentional, secondary messages are as important as any sent within this publication, at least to an academic researcher rather than to a prospective football player. After reading the media guide, I came away with the feeling that mentioning academic success at all was a victory for someone within the institution, especially when more space is given to the media exposure of the football program, Pro Day, and the fans that attend the game (the Best Damn Fans in the Land). A more subtle message, but crucial certainly, included the double page spread committed to The Ohio State University Board of Trustees biographies, which led me to note that the ratio of biographies per page for trustees compared to pages per player was 8 to 1. In reading this publication, one could receive the message that the university existed for football first and foremost and that the rest of university had ceased to exist, while without irony the publications produced by the academic side of the university all seemed to highlight football.

Using the Discourse of the University

Gee continues to attend hundreds of events each year, and was regularly featured in magazine, newspaper, radio, and television ads. He has re-established his habit of visiting all 88

counties of Ohio each summer, placing a high value on connecting with the people of the state (Pyle, 2008).

When he compared his new assignment to his previous time at Ohio State, Gee declared that "this university since 1997 (when he left) has moved from good to excellent" (Gee, 2007b). He also acknowledged he has a rare chance "to correct all my mistakes" (Pyle, 2008). During his first term, Gee said that he did not spend enough money on buildings in need of repair or enough attention to how the university affected the larger community. He vowed to be a better leader and to help Columbus' economy expand (Pyle, 2008), noting that he felt responsible for Ohio State's success or failure (Pyle, 2008) "The tone of the university starts with me. Winning a football game doesn't start with the coaches or the team, it starts with me. Winning a Nobel Prize doesn't start with faculty members, it starts with me (Pyle, 2008)."

As Roger Addleman mentioned to me, Gee's role as president is to embody the very nature and meaning of the institution. Part of what has made Gordon Gee so interesting to me, and what makes him a subject worth extended study, is that he can compare himself to his own first term at Ohio State and vow to do a better job. Most do not have the opportunity. Continuing, his acknowledgement that the tone of the university starts with him is a way of saying his leadership discourse must be healthy for the success of the entire institution.

Chapter 5

Interpretations

My personal interest in moving forward with this study has been threefold. I have been interested, since my first reading of his work in 1986, in Clark's description of organizational saga. With saga being such a force in the past and future of institutions, I wondered if it could be utilized by leaders as they envisioned and developed strategy and whether there were additional forces that served to modify or complicate saga. I have also been intrigued by how some leaders are charged again and again with leading different organizations, seemingly regardless of their experiences of success and failure. Finally, and somewhat related, I have also been intrigued how some people are offered the opportunity to lead again and again while other seemingly qualified leaders never get the chance. These drivers came together for me in a manner that was unique when Gordon Gee was asked to serve as president of The Ohio State University for a second time. This second appointment sent so many signals on so many levels to the university's various publics that it begged for in-depth study. No leader's performance is ever all good or all bad; however, seldom does a leader get a request to lead such a large and complex institution after having left it of his or her own accord a decade earlier.

With these factors coming together in a timely manner for my own doctoral study, I was able to explore the following research question: How is an individual leader's discourse shaped by the organization's saga, the personal history of the leader, and the power and influence of the leader's position?

The president of The Ohio State University, Gordon Gee, was to be the primary subject of the study, and I examined the intersection of his big "D" discourse (Gee, 2005a) and the

organizational saga of Ohio State via observation, in-person interviews, documents produced and distributed by Ohio State, and discourse analyses. As I reviewed the data gathered from the interviews, it became apparent there was also a residual professional discourse created in the complex relationship between individuals within organizations and the relationship between organizations and the individuals who belong to those organizations (Cherryholmes, 1988a).

The data showed Gee used the hegemony of the presidency to take advantage of the opportunities given him through platforms such as speeches to faculty for the advancement of certain ideals and programs. Consequently, I brought professional discourse to the equation, as well. I believe the combination of individual discourse, organizational discourse, and professional discourse is the equation that enables the text of leadership and, especially, the university presidency.

The Interplay of the Discourses

Often leaders, particularly leaders of large, public organizations, find they lead very public lives. The case of Gordon Gee suggests that work and family enable and influence each other, and that these discourses, too, overlap in leadership (Ford et al., 2008a). Additionally, I would suggest that the interplay of the personal (or private and non-public) discourse and the individual discourse help define the negotiation of the harmony of the individual, professional, and organizational discourses. In discourse theory, language is seen as constitutive of reality (de Graaf, 2001). Defining discourse as a linguistic practice puts into play sets of rule and procedures for the formation of objects, speakers, and thematics (Shapiro, 1988). Discourses, then, can produce organizations and organizations can produce discourse (de Graaf, 2001). Discourses and discursive practices are relative to time and place (Cherryholmes, 1988a), and to

individuals. To answer the dissertation's research question, I focused on how the leader, Gordon Gee, used the organizational saga of Ohio State along with his own personal history and the power of the presidency of The Ohio State University. I concentrated on the early days of each of his last four presidencies. It is in this honeymoon period that visions are laid out, daily practices are established, and credibility is built. I posit the seeds for success or failure are sewn quite early in a leader's tenure.

The discourses of leadership are larger than any one individual, and are based in metanarratives formed over the ages in the practice and study of leadership (Western, 2008a). I agree that discourses are rooted in metanarratives and that this grounding simply cannot be discarded. My interpretation differs, though, as I see discourses of leadership influenced more from an individual base than merely from the larger cultural discourse. Certainly, discourses overlap, and an individual discourse is influenced by time, place, experience, and interaction with other discourses. The personal, or non-public discourse, of a leader becomes part of the construction of public, individual discourse. How a leader utilizes his or her own discourse, and negotiates with the discourse(s) of the organization they are leading, and utilize professional discourse (similar to Western's (2008a) discourses of leadership) is a concept distinctive to time, place, individual, and organization. I call this distinct and varying equation leadership discourse. Each equation is unique. For "fit" to occur, the discourses must be in harmony. Disharmony creates disarray, likely for both the organization and the individual.

Harmony of Discourses – The Triangle of Leadership Discourse

In response to my research question, I propose a model illustrating a *Triangle of Leadership Discourse* that emerged from this study of Gordon Gee and his presidencies. Here is a diagram that illustrates the Triangle:

Figure 1. Triangle of Leadership Discourse.

As the arrows indicate, each discourse interacts with and affects the others. Discourses influence discourses. As there are multiple and varying elements in this equation, complexity is a given. The leader must negotiate his or her own discursive fit in the position and in the organization, in effect achieving integration, or harmony, to lead the collective of vast and untold other discourses. The negotiation between the three discourses on the corners of the model form the necessary harmony constituting leadership discourse.

Negotiating Discourses

Gordon Gee suggested that leaders have to change to fit the university. This approach is illustrative of the individual discourse negotiating with the organization discourse. Leaders must change in order to align with organizations, and organizations must change in order to align with the leader's strategic design or operational style (Dym & Hutson, 2005) for there to be success in

achieving a productive leadership discourse. Person-organization fit (P-O fit or I-O – individual – fit) is generally defined as the compatibility between individuals and organizations (Kristof, 1996), and positive I-O fit leads to greater commitment in both directions (Valentine et al., 2002). Another perspective is that organizations have different life-stages, and that I-O fit can be different for each stage of maturation (Dym & Hutson, 2005).

The idea of the Triangle of Leadership Discourse and its relation to leadership fit emerged from the data in this study as it became apparent that Gordon Gee's success in each of the presidencies I studied was at least in part dependent on his being in harmony across the three discourses represented in the model. This model may be best illustrated by the difference in Gordon Gee (different age, different experiences) that let him be deemed qualified to lead two different maturational versions of the institution, Ohio State. The two Ohio State presidencies are a reminder that the Triangle of Leadership Discourse is highly situational as well as something that is continually negotiated.

The Triangle of Leadership Discourse was also illustrated by Gee's short tenure at Brown University, when harmony disappeared in The Triangle. His personal history discourse showed instability with the challenges of his spouse's academic credentials, and Brown University's organizational discourse was interpreted as being inappropriately challenged by the perception that Gee worked around faculty governance. This disharmony, in effect, voided Gee's permission to lead the organization. Brown University is also a good example that shows negotiation is constant, and part of that negotiation involves the input of the leader and changes in the external environment as discourses are influenced, and as they evolve. Negotiation takes places as the leader begins to enact change and proceed with a vision. Harmony between the discourses is always in flux.

I would posit that, with the probable exception of Brown University, Gee has been a good fit for each of his presidencies according to the culture of the university as represented in the organizational discourse and perhaps the institution's distinctive needs of the time. The harmony of the discourse allows fit, and fit is what gives permission and thus clearance to lead. The idea of harmony also seems to prevent the lone warrior who leads an organization in a mythical manner (Heifetz, 1994). Adaptive work, as implied by the Triangle of Leadership Discourse, is crucial to make sure change is not brought too fast, nor the status quo challenged too strongly (Currie & Lockett, 2007).

In my conversation with President Gee, he discounted the idea of a pre-ordained fit saying that "you have to reinvent yourself to the institution you're serving" implying that fit would not be a constant. As evidenced by my interpretation/rationalization, and others' perspectives included in this study, of Gordon Gee's alignment with all but Brown University, I would offer, that he has fit nearly everyplace he has worked. His individual discourse, in particular, builds upon itself with each successive presidency and adds credibility and attractiveness to organizations shopping for a new leader. Discourse is multi-faceted, and leaders adopt personas necessary for the situation, as long as those personas are negotiated to a harmonious point with competing discourses. The fit for Gordon Gee has been for different reasons at different times, as perhaps best illustrated by his two tenures a decade apart at Ohio State. Gee's instinct in "reinventing himself" implies that individual discourse is the discourse that we are most able to shape.

Individual Discourse

Gee has said "one of the challenges I constantly face when I'm sitting in this (the president's) chair is that I wear bow ties, I wear suspenders, and I'm a very affable, very amusing person. And initially, I've always had the challenge of hearing "Well, this guy is kind of interesting and quirky, but is he serious?" (Zahniser, 2003).

Each person develops personal values as a continuously growing residue of his or her total experience, characteristically in a rank order from high positive value, through a neutral area, to high negative value (Woodruff, 1942). Very complex patterns exist among the many values in an individual's pattern, and among those values and the almost unlimited possibilities presented by the constantly changing panorama of situations (Woodruff, 1942). Personal values are aimed at supporting the individual's well-being rather than that of the group or the society (Sagie & Elizur, 1996). Value patterns seem to agree with the vocational choices and other activities of individuals (Woodruff, 1942). Remembering that discourses contain both facts and values (de Graaf, 2001), and that discourse models are simulations we run in our minds to help interpret (Gee, 2005f), individual discourse is in many ways a three-dimensional profile that is a starting point for the construction of the Triangle of Leadership Discourse, and is where the negotiation toward harmony begins.

Gordon Gee's individual discourse is rooted in a personal discourse based in his upbringing in Vernal, Utah, in his family life with his daughter, his late wife, and his ex-wife. The six presidencies in his career show the professional discourse overlapping and building upon the individual discourse. Ultimately, individual discourse is bridged to the organization by professional discourse.

Professional Discourse

I define professional discourse as the message and actions relayed by an organizational member and, especially, by an organizational leader. People accept, internalize, and act according to shared ideas they believe are true and valid (Cherryholmes, 1988a). Power becomes the avenue through which discourse travels. Leadership and power, then, is a relationship between leaders and followers (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Within professional discourse, power is a relationship whose strength and domain will vary with different contexts (Nye, 2008). The relationships have certain asymmetries, perhaps based on social, political, or material issues, and the result is that some are indulged and rewarded while others are negatively sanctioned and deprived. These relationships help leaders define their position in an organization vis-à-vis other discourses. As an example, a president's leadership discourse is altered when working with trustees, as shown in this document during the public theater surrounding Gee's compensation. Negotiating this context required the president to assume a quiet and almost submissive role in the setting of the board of trustees meeting.

Director of Development Communication Roger Addleman very much wanted Ohio Sate's organizational discourse to be about teaching, research, and public service. Yet at the time of my data collection, Addleman believed the discourse seemed to be as much about comparing Gee's new presidency with his previous time at Ohio State. From Addleman's perspective, the story surrounding this professional discourse often took precedence over the organizational discourse and the individual discourse again, showing that the negotiation of the discourses as harmony was envisioned in this context early in the new presidency.

In constructing and reiterating certain selected images, phrases, and stories, the dominant class (in this case, a university president) can insist that a selected set of concepts make up social

reality (Amey & Twombly, 1992). This is aptly illustrated through the early-term speeches of Gee's presidencies that are analyzed in this study. Likely, Gee is augmenting and completing the text of a presidency. Through his big D discourse and through his small d discourse (Gee, 2005f), the cycles of reproduction in relations of leadership and power are perpetuated (Dworin & Bomer, 2008). The analyzed speeches in this study show patterns that ground Gee's approach to leading a university, and to negotiating that leadership with faculty governance. He provides what he hopes are visionary statements, but within those statements, he leaves plenty of room for faculty to interpret and lead the governance process. President Gee does indeed keep reproducing this power through his early-term approach to faculty governance, and through the application of his personal values (his insistence on prioritizing public service at private universities, as an example) to the Triangle of Leadership Discourse as he goes beyond his 30th consecutive year as a university president, and now through his sixth separate tenure in such a position.

Some of the text of the university presidency overlaps into the discourse of his position in addition to being part of his own personal history. A key item mentioned in my conversation with Eloise Stuhr was her belief that Gordon Gee never forgot he was the president of the university. But when asked how Gee managed to be effective at several different institutions, Stuhr fell back onto the basics, in many ways trying to answer the question herself, or perhaps even to convince herself of the answer. "He's smart, he's a good study, and he has positive attributes that allow him to become part of the institutional legend and substance. When you think of Brown, maybe they were less likely to want it to be about him that it didn't work quite as well."

Organizational Discourse

Several of the participants talked specifically of the organizational discourse of Ohio State under Gordon Gee's leadership as president. Jim Phelan (University Distinguished Professor of English) focused on the aspirational narrative of the institution. Archie Griffin described Ohio State as a place where you can be the best you can possibly be. Intercollegiate athletics, and football in particular, strove for recognition within the discourses of Ohio State. These discourses were all at least somewhat valid, especially from the individuals' own perspectives.

As a leader, Gordon Gee worked to achieve harmony between the discourses. He made his peace with the football discourse (Baroway, 2002), using it to advance other issues in the university by forcing the game day event to include conversations with donors focusing on the academic side of institutional life, and by using the halftime media opportunities to look away from the athletic arena. As Gee pointed out, he could not get 96,000 people to a chemistry lecture (Marrison, 1996), so the key became making the best of this audience that gathered for another purpose.

Clark (1970b) implied that saga, or organizational discourse as I have labeled it, is deeply rooted and in some ways fixed. He discussed identifying components of an organizational saga, saying that they can be manipulated and ultimately maintained to ensure the saga. Continuing, he stated that saga can transform, to some degree, institutional missions and that mission in effect becomes saga by telling what an organization has been, is, and will be (Clark, 1970b), ultimately illustrating the more contemporary concept of reflexivity. It may be harder to negotiate fit and harmony with organizational discourse than any other aspect of the Triangle of Leadership Discourse, because of these very roots. Conversely, the loosely-coupled nature of the

university (Weick, 1976), combined with the multiplicity and fluidity of its cultures and communities, does provide some room for negotiation.

Clark (1970b) is accurate that organizational discourse is deeply rooted; however, this study would seem to indicate that in a large, complex organization such as a research university there are innumerable discourses and even more interpretations of the discourses. These discourses are evolving, variable, and dependent on specific places and points in time. I posit that one's interpretation of organizational discourse is dependent on one's relationship with the university. Reflexively, this has an effect on the reality of the organizational discourse as discourses are fundamentally interpretive, and in many ways represents the professional discourse portion of the Triangle of Leadership Discourse. Within the organization, which begins to define one's relationship with the university, one's view of saga seems to be contingent on one's professional responsibilities. Being within the institution, one becomes part of the construct of the organizational discourse. With so many battling and conflicting forces within a research university environment, organizational discourse is tremendously complex.

Within the academic environment, Birnbaum (1988c) suggests that a major function of the energy of university administrators is to prevent the organization's culture from falling apart. Culture, like other aspects of organizations and all other systems, constantly loses energy and moves toward entropy and disorder (Birnbaum, 1988c) if it is not regularly cultivated. Leadership positions conclude; however, the specific details of the end are unknown. What is known is that the leader's tenure will come to an end, and the leader is in a constant race to advance change while maintaining the harmony of the discourses. For the university presidency, this is evidenced in the speeches of the early presidency, and is guided by the successful negotiation of the Triangle of Leadership Discourse.

The Four Speeches

The four speeches of Gordon Gee analyzed in this research provide an excellent illustration of an individual discourse evolving over time and merging with a professional discourse that is maturing and learning from experience. A discourse analysis is based on the details of a speech (and when viewed in person, the gaze and gesture and action) that are arguably deemed relevant in the context where the speech was used and that are relevant to the arguments the analysis is attempting to make (Gee, 2011).

Viewing these speeches chronologically, I believe that the first three show a leader who is endeavoring to show that he belongs, not just as a leader of the institution, but also as a peer of his audience, the university faculty. The fourth, in many ways, completes the cycle of maturing and belonging. This phenomenon of a leader emphasizing that he or she is amongst peers might be unique to a speech in a university setting. The discourse here may be determined less by the will of an individual leader than by the pervasiveness of particular social constructions (Fairclough, 1995). As Gordon Gee's academic career featured a very short period where he was a faculty member without an administrative appointment, I posit that he often makes an effort (consciously or unconsciously) to show that as a president he deserves to be seen as a peer of the faculty.

Additionally, this first speech to the faculty is where the standard text of the presidency intentionally merges with the symbolic, which is represented by how the president proposes faculty governance. This is a significant preview, in fact the first salvo, of the ongoing negotiation of the discourses. But in many ways, the leader's power in the academic setting begins in a somewhat precarious state. While there is a honeymoon period that gives a "let's see how he does" perspective as Jim Phelan suggested while referencing other faculty in his

interview, there is also a self-initiated reduction in power brought about by positioning to an audience of which the leader desires to be a peer. Thus almost immediately, a destabilizing postmodern vertigo (Bove, 2009) is created by the collision of discourses of the various groups of which the leader belongs or desires to belong. Essentially, the leader is embracing metanarratives and building metanarratives simultaneously while being read as the Other by faculty who have the aforementioned "let's see how he does" perspective.

The richness of the alliteration (as an example, in the second paragraph of the first Ohio State speech with "continuity and creativity, through vitality and vision", and the same tool of alliteration was used in the next paragraph with the "continuing dash – no, more correctly – that continuing drive for distinction") and the significant number of intellectual allusions are indicative of a request for permission to both be admitted as a peer and to show worthiness of leadership potential within the academy. The language transmits the professional discourse. In the first Ohio State speech, as an example, Gee specifically references popular culture (Linus and Charlie Brown) along with the timeless works of Greek literature. He also more subtly begins a phase of the speech in the same manner that T.S. Eliot began *The Lovesong of J. Alfred Prufrock*. This could be unintentional, it could be something that an English major/speech writer slipped in the narrative, or it could be very much a second level message designed to show a belonging and an understanding via a less overt avenue.

Continuing his speech, that seems to both demonstrate leadership and to seek belonging, Gee asks "to begin a dialogue". With similar references in other speeches reviewed in this dissertation, wanting to begin a dialogue shows both a leadership style proffered by Gee as well as respect for the traditions of faculty governance and leading a group of peers.

Gee also signals a belief in the university as a force for social change. While typically a cornerstone value of higher education (Kerr, 1982), the presence of this ideal of social change also appeared in the other speeches reviewed in this study. Most interestingly, the proposition of social leadership in the speeches at Brown and Vanderbilt seemed to present a prospective dimension for these universities beyond what might normally be proposed based on the standard text of an elite private university.

Looking at the substantive mention of coming change, Gee identifies five priorities that would guide his initial work at Ohio State during his first tenure:

1) Reduce bureaucracy through reorganization.
2) Seize important new interdisciplinary academic opportunities.
3) Develop a strong sense of community.
4) Enhance the undergraduate environment, and
5) Recommit ourselves to diversity.

While these are likely articulated to show vision, they are also designed to be an easy embrace for the audience. For a speech early in a presidency, it could be described as vision, with safety.

Gee also works very hard to cloak himself in the Scarlet and Grey traditions of Ohio State in this speech. This signals recognition that he as the leader is in a special and distinctive place, and simultaneously indicates to the audience that their career and their work is focused on a institution worthy of special note and distinction. Recognizing the organizational discourse of Ohio State, Gee says,

> This is a university with spirit, a breathing in of traditions which results in a breathing out of energy and pride. It is a spirit drawn from sources like "The Best Damn Band in the Land", the Farm Science Review, and the Wexner Center.

Mentioning these items allows Gee to recognize the role of athletics in the university without specifically mentioning sport by focusing on the marching band that really has no role outside the football field. Speaking of the history and significance of agriculture at the university, Gee recognizes another strong power base at the institution. Mentioning the Wexner Center he recognizes both the arts and the university's most significant donor (Leslie Wexner) while also acknowledging the role of the community external to the university. These are not the only indicators of saga in the speech, but perhaps are strategically significant, and were likely chosen both for the significance in the historical saga of Ohio State and the diversity of the intended audience receiving the message. This reliance on history and culture to signify belonging and understanding would also be a key part of the message conveyed in the excerpt of the Brown University speech delivered by Gee.

Gee's speech at Brown, being part of a presidential inaugural, is different than the other three reviewed in this study. Perhaps more than the other speeches reviewed here, which were not inaugural speeches, Gee works hard to envelop himself in the history of the university. This might be because Brown has so much more history, being roughly 100 years older than the other two universities in question, or it could indicate that Gee is more cognizant about his place at this university being so different from any other where he has served. It is interesting to see the reference to Henry Merritt Wriston, an early president of Brown, and his inaugural when he is to have said "by this ceremony of adoption . . . I have entered into your heritage." If only it were so easy to become part of the university. Gee would ultimately learn through his short tenure at Brown that rejection was sometimes easier than adoption.

Throughout this speech, Gee works to point out the differences and the distinction of Brown University, citing the early role of women in the institution to the innovative curricula,

for example. In the speech, Gee proposes that Brown see itself as a model for American higher education, in many ways thrusting his own beliefs, fostered in public higher education, of a university being one with society, and of a university being a force for change in society.

Given the timing of this speech a few months after his arrival on campus, Gee had the benefit of at least some time on campus and many, many conversations with trustees and other leaders, and he presumably had a team of speechwriters and advisors helping him craft this presentation. Even with the limited text available to review, one perhaps can see the self-conscious nature of the leader in this particular situation and also see a desire of the leader to achieve fit in a situation where it might be out of reach. It is also clear that Gordon Gee values a university that is engaged with society. Whether this is in Brown's DNA is a topic for another study.

With the Vanderbilt speech, Gee once again begins by endeavoring to show that he belongs as a member of the faculty. But this time he also leads with a one-liner, "I haven't heard such a round of applause from a faculty group since I announced to the Brown faculty I was leaving" that acknowledges the separation which was highly publicized, and also shows his relief to be away from a troubled tenure and moving toward a fresh start. On Gee's part, this is an excellent power move, as he leads with the idea and promptly gets it out of the way. By addressing it right away, he owns the issue and avoids it becoming an unspoken and potentially cancerous issue to his newly-birthed presidency.

Gee positions himself in this speech by talking about his values but also going against a fairly sacrosanct archetype of Clark Kerr. At this point in time, Kerr is likely well-known as the former president of The University of California who was fired by Governor Ronald Reagan, who has become a standard-bearer for leadership and values in public higher education. With

this reference, Gee in effect says he knows who the model is, but he will be doing things in a manner that is a bit different. This may be a very truthful foreshadowing of his approach to the chancellorship of Vanderbilt. With this being his fifth such position, he is comfortable in his own presidential skin despite his experience at Brown, and he also knows how he will differ from the archetype.

This introductory speech at Vanderbilt contains more detail than Gee's previous introductory speeches, perhaps because it comes in his seventh month on the job. He knows the university well enough at this point to feel comfortable criticizing ETOB budgeting, a heretofore prized part of the Vanderbilt culture, and to envision a time when Vanderbilt sets the benchmark, rather than measuring itself against others. This speech is cheerleading, certainly, in a manner that provides a comforting vision for the faculty audience to digest. The pattern continues with Gee stating his five goals for the university during his chancellorship:

1. We must renew our commitment to the undergraduate experience at Vanderbilt (page 10).
2. We must reinvent graduate education at Vanderbilt (page 12).
3. We must reintegrate professional education with the intellectual life of the University (page 13).
4. We must reexamine and restructure economic models (page 13).
5. We must renew Vanderbilt's covenant with the community (page 14).

Four of the five items here (undergraduate experience, graduate education, professional education, budgeting) are easy to agree with. The fifth, again something that Gee brings with him from the public sector, is a significant valuing of the university's relationship outside the academy's gates. In closing his comments about serving the community, he offers a definition of

leadership as “engaging people intellectually, empowering them and enabling them to make a difference in their own lives and the lives of others.” This is an interesting remark and action for a leader, as it is his attempt to define leadership and thus, the terms on which he, and to some extent, Vanderbilt, will be judged.

By many different measures and from a variety of expectations, Gordon Gee's first speech to the faculty senate at Ohio State upon his return in 2007 should be different than the other three analyzed in this study. He is returning as president to a university he led a decade prior, and he is also a much more experienced leader in his early 60's than in his mid 40's. But time did not stop its march. Gee is very much aware that Ohio State is a different university than the one he left in 1997, and that he is a very different leader.

Rather than working to show he is part of the faculty, Gee leads with the assumption that he belongs, which is different in tone than the initial speech given in his first tenure at Ohio State. He has been in the position before, and at the university before, and presumes a certain level of acceptance from the start. He talks of being on an extended sabbatical, using terminology familiar with his faculty audience, and has familiarity with the institution that a newcomer would not. With Gee not being completely new, neither is his speech. He uses many of the tools he used in the past, including stating a desire to enter in a long, rich conversation with the faculty, and he seemed automatically to reference the Ohio State alma mater theme of “Time and Change” in his speech as he did with his first such speech some 17 years earlier. This time, it rang more true.

Gee's 2007 speech was much more business-like, and much less full of academic and intellectual references than the earlier speeches of a younger president held. It is almost as if he

is eager to get right to business. As in his other speeches, Gee lays out a set of strategic priorities for his time leading the university. For this Ohio State tenure, Gee identified the following:

1. Forge one Ohio State University (page 5).
2. Put students first (page 8).
3. Focus on faculty success (page 10).
4. Recast our research agenda (page 12).
5. Commit to our communities and revitalize our covenants with them (page 14).
6. Simplify university systems and structures (page 15).

As in the other similar speeches made by Gee, the list is comfortably generic and easy to grasp by faculty. Compared to lists in previously reviewed speeches in this study, the distinctive item is the one he leads with: Forge one Ohio State University. The importance and significance of this goal was reflected in the interviews with Phelan and Addleman, showing that Gee recognized an issue needing significant attention.

To me, the most interesting part of this speech is the section where Gee declares that he believes what he says. This really speaks to a larger narrative of leadership where the leader is insincere about the path forged (Henry, 1957), and thus, Gee seems to feel the need to say he really, really means it. While this is certainly a commentary on the state of leadership generally, it is also likely in place due to Gee's peripatetic career. This is a steadying of the aforementioned postmodern vertigo.

These four speeches taken as the discourse of Gordon Gee unfolding over nearly two decades show the standard text of the university presidency, the maturation of the leader, and the distinctive values of Gordon Gee himself as opposed to the values of the academy (Bornstein, 2003a, 2003c). The standard text of the presidency that produces legitimacy, I posit, is

evidenced and assisted by the use of simple strategic priorities that give the possibility of accountability while giving faculty governance plenty of room to create their own signature version of the goal (Bensimon, 1991). As an example, something like "putting students first" ultimately can result in a redesign of the undergraduate curriculum and a greater attention to co-curricular aspects of the educational experience.

The maturation of Gordon Gee as a university president is illustrated by the evolution of his speeches from being thick with academic and intellectual references earlier in his career, compared to the more business-like tone, comparatively free of academic and scholarly allusions, adopted in the latter Ohio State speech. While there are likely modifying variables present, such as his familiarity with Ohio State the second time around, I would position this evolution as being the result of his comfort, his confidence, his understanding of, and perhaps his lack of patience with, the necessary rituals and rhetoric of the academic experience. These items are part and parcel of the maturation of Gee as a leader moving from one Ohio State term to the other, and also as he moved from one presidency to the next throughout his career. His confidence, built from both success and (success with) failure seem to give him more comfort in having his own approach to the text of the presidency, upsetting the apple cart ever so slightly as if to place his own signature on his example of the art of leadership.

The distinctive values of Gordon Gee are perhaps most present in his speeches at Brown and Vanderbilt, two distinguished private institutions. Here, Gee puts forth the charge to be proactive in building relationships with communities both at hand and at large. Admittedly, Gee emphasized the roles of Brown and Vanderbilt in the global community much more than the local, and this is likely indicative of grand and non-local aspirations. But given the expected metanarratives of these private universities where exclusivity is an unwritten guide (Roberts,

Wallace, Wiley, & Birnbach, 1980), this commitment to community is one not expected to be found in an address to faculty at universities like Brown and Vanderbilt. The commitment is surely rooted in Gordon Gee's discourse and value structure. It could also be part of his instinct to slightly upset the text of the presidency heretofore known at these private institutions.

I posit that these speeches given early in Gee's presidencies show the text of leadership as a combination of the discourse of the professional leadership position merged with the individual discourse of the individual leader and the discourse of the organization. Also present in this equation is the delivery of the speech and the charisma of the leader, which are not easily analyzed from printed speeches as opposed to video or audio recordings of the deliverance itself. These personalized variables could be labeled as the success or failure of exercising the power of the leadership professional discourse. This tripartite combination is what will determine the fit, and thus a great deal of the success, of the presidency.

Across the four speeches, Gee worked very hard to bring the organizational discourse of the institution into play. But at the same time, he seems to problematize the text standard text just a bit. At Brown and Vanderbilt, this would be evidenced with his push for public service. With his most recent service at Ohio State, the same instinct is shown by working to emphasize one cohesive university at a place where size heretofore seemed to demand divisiveness. Perhaps this was most noticeable in the Brown speech, where the history of presidential leadership, the university's leadership in academic matters, and the personal nature of the institution indicative of its comparatively small size were emphasized throughout. With the three speeches to the faculty governance bodies, there was guidance in the form of larger visionary statements (put students first, as an example) but care to leave plenty of room for the faculty to think deeply and act upon the specifics of what this would mean. This pattern balanced the concept of a leader

providing vision while giving the distinctive governance process of academe room to move forward. The last speech, the second from Ohio State, to me was perhaps the most interesting because Gee had forsaken the theater of intellectual allusions and just demanded that everything move forward with urgency. In many ways, this indicates he felt that via his own professional discourse, he had banked credibility through his maturity and experience. Likewise, the organizational discourse may have featured a situation demanding of a no-nonsense approach to leading the university at this particular point in time.

It is apparent that Gee has learned lessons as he has gone forward in his career, lessons about what can make a leader effective and what can take away from the leader's effectiveness. He learned from his experience as president of West Virginia University, where he asked for resignation letters from the entire central administration, that being presidential did not mandate entering with guns blazing (Baroway, 2002). Conversely, "one of the things I have learned," says Gee "was that a mistake you make as a university president is to come in and say 'I'm going to look and listen for six months or a year'. The faculty expects you to lead; the students expect you to lead; the alumni expect you to have a point a view" (Zahniser, 2003). The two examples represented by these comments may indicate Gee's realization that negotiation of the Triangle is constant. The definition of negotiation seems to indicate a moderation of possibilities, showing that he is sincere in taking account of all the forces and players – all the discourses – affecting the negotiation of the Triangle.

Implications

I return to the research question of this study: how is an individual leader's discourse shaped by the organization's saga, the personal history of the leader, and the power and influence

of the leader's position? To add depth to my understanding of Gordan Gee beyond what my interview with him provided, I observed Gordon Gee in the public theatre of a board of trustees meeting as well as his appearance as a dignitary to recognize a place where the university and the community intersect, I completed a number of interviews about him with members of the university community, and I accessed studies and interviews of President Gee done by others as well as media commentary about him and his leadership. I conducted discourse analyses on speeches delivered to the faculty early in each of his last four presidencies.

A key finding of this study with utility for practice and perhaps for theory building is the development of a Triangle for Leadership Discourse model. This model demonstrates the interplay of individual, professional, and organizational discourses and helps show the complexities inherent in leading any formal organization. Discourses of leadership are not typically studied in tandem, and at least as evidenced by the life of Gordon Gee, perhaps should be. When doing so, more nuanced understandings of how and why an individual is able to lead, and often asked to lead repeatedly, become more clear. Potential future research could test the Triangle to see the extent to which it represents leadership discourse at other levels than the university presidency and perhaps how it represents leadership discourses at the presidential/CEO level in other organizations such as nonprofit and governmental agencies.

In a more practical way, the Triangle of Leadership Discourse can help individuals determine where they might fit as they look to move to new professional opportunities by analyzing their own professional discourse to see if it is consistent with the discourse of the institution, and to see whether their professional discourse would merge or contrast with the institution's discourse. It can also help an institution determine who might be the best candidate for a leadership position if an expectation for the individual is to personify, or "become" the

university. Key items to look at include core values, academic history, institutional type and size, and the regional backgrounds and academic history of those already in place in the university at issue. Additionally, for a prospective university president, a history of working with a similar governance structure can be advantageous, as harmony with the organizational discourse seems to be less pliable than other discourses in the model. Such analysis, though, should be undertaken with the understanding of both candidates and hiring institutions that an individual's discourse is an evolving variable, just as are the discourses of the organization and of the targeted position, though these perhaps to lesser degrees. The discourse of leadership is shaped by these three discourses and when successfully navigated on a continuing and regular basis, the Triangle Discourse of Leadership may become the construct of the license to lead.

The Triangle of Leadership Discourse is entirely situational, and constantly variable. It will evolve as the president begins to influence the institution and as the leader matures. That leadership discourse is forever a variable in need of negotiation is not necessarily comforting to a governing body such as a board of trustees looking to find leadership to ensure long-term stability for their organization. I posit the harmony of the Triangle is fragile and fleeting, and the art of leadership is significantly directed toward maintaining and massaging this harmony. When the harmony disappears, it leaves quickly and is difficult to reboot. This implies that cultivating leadership discourse should be something of which both the individual and the organization, and perhaps especially the trustees charged with oversight of the organization, should be cognizant; the harmony of discourse should not be left up to the forces of fate but requires the on-going influence of multiple players including, but not just, the president.

The 10-year gap between Gordon Gee's tenures at Ohio State shows that rebooting harmony of the Triangle is not impossible, but that a significant amount of time away between

the previous tenure and the proposed new tenure make the idea of a second presidency more viable. Organizations would seem to have selective short and long-term memories, as they try and achieve harmony. The long-term memory of Gee's services seems to frame the idea that he represented the university in a way that fit the organization's discourse. The short-term memory selectively disregards the hurt of the previous separation and avoids remembering that the harmony of leadership discourse was upset. Another possibility would be that disharmony may be a matter of degrees, rather than all or nothing. Gee's comments regarding his burnout when he left Ohio State for Brown also show that disruption in the harmony of the Triangle can occur from the individual's side as well as from the organization's. The willingness of the trustees to revisit the situation shows selectivity in the institutional memory, at minimum, and also indicates the organizational situation has evolved from Gee's previous tenure. But there clearly is a fiduciary responsibility for the Board of Trustees (Bastedo, 2005). With this in mind, it would appear their decision to rehire Gee indicates the belief that Gee was the right leader, once again, for the institution at this point in its evolution. As indicated earlier, Gee is a different leader now, and Ohio State is a different institution now. But once again, they are right for each other.

There is room for further research by focusing on additional individual leaders to see the extent to which personal, professional, and organizational discourses align. Gordon Gee may be a case where there is an unusual amount of data because of his lengthy career, and most individuals are not twice president of the same institution. Even with a focus remaining solely on Gordon Gee, it would be interesting to bring his two other presidencies at West Virginia and Colorado into the study simply showing a longer period of evolution for the leader. For example, following with the model of the Triangle of Leadership Discourse, when and how did

Gordon Gee find disharmony? Was it a violation of commonly-held values? Does the stability of the harmony decrease with the passage of time?

Data gathered for this study (speeches, interviews with those familiar with the leader, observations, organizational archives) should be at least sufficiently available to conduct similar research on other presidents and academic leaders. There can be further light shed on each of the three areas that make up the Triangle: organizational discourse, professional discourse, and individual discourse. Researchers could look in depth at each of these discourses by singularly probing both qualitatively and quantitatively. Also, the idea of the Triangle of Leadership Discourse could benefit from further exploration of the concept of "fit", or "harmony", as I describe it. Does the harmony become more fragile or increasingly stable over time? Why does one grow "out of harmony"? Can harmony be developed and enhanced over time? Are there degrees of harmony, or is it something that either exists or does not exist? How does significant organizational change affect harmony? And would the type of organizational change matter? Would significant resource constraint affect the Triangle in similar ways or in a different manner than the rapid turnover of membership among trustees, as an example?

It would also be interesting to see whether this Triangle, or variations of it, could be useful in different sectors. An example comes from the *Wall Street Transcript*, where William Razzouk, CEO of PlanetRx.com described his company as having a "unique combination of commerce, content, and community (which) gives us a license to lead the online healthcare industry (Unknown, 2000)." Is the triangle he describes unique to pharmaceuticals or to Internet-based businesses? Would it be valid throughout the commercial sector, especially with an assumption that many corporate roles have seemingly much less intrusive histories?

In the broadest sense, this study illustrates that leadership matters, but that it is very much dependent on the discourse of the leader (individual discourse), how the leader exercises the power and responsibility of the position (professional discourse), and the saga of the organization (organizational discourse). Some leadership skills may be part of a personal history and environment, and some may be acquired through traditional leadership teachings. Leaders frame understandings for others, and help define and negotiate culture to communicate important items, such as culture, that direct the organization toward envisioned goals. Leadership is a complex and fragile ideal, and the harmony of discourses connects the leader to the fabric of the organization.

Conclusions

The career of Gordon Gee has plenty of fodder for discussion, well beyond the early aspects of the four presidencies I explored. The four presidencies (Ohio State, Brown, Vanderbilt, and Ohio State) were selected because of the symmetry of returning to Ohio State with a ten-year space of time passing between tenures. My primary strategy for study was to focus on the first speech made to the faculty governance body of the university. The contrasts of how Gee begins service as a university president in his mid-40s, compared to returning to the same institution in his early 60s provide extraordinary and fascinating data for study.

The end result showing the constant negotiation of discourses, I believe, will be of value to both individuals and organizations. For me, the dissertation has brought a new and deepened interest in both interpersonal and organizational communication, especially where discourses are concerned.

It has been interesting to note how my changing impression of Gordon Gee evolved during the course of this study. There can be no doubt that I differed with his direction during my time serving indirectly under his leadership. Perhaps that was fueled by disagreements with decisions, perhaps it was fueled by my belief that there were others out there more appropriate for the position, perhaps it was discomfort with his personal style, or perhaps it was just sheer envy on my part. Clearly, though, I was in the minority at Ohio State. But now, moving forward 15 years or so, a different Mike Rishell is examining a different Gordon Gee via a different avenue, through a scholarly tome. This time, I genuinely enjoyed my time with him and our conversation, and I came away with an unswerving conviction that he is the right person for Ohio State at the right time.

APPENDICES

Appendix i

Time and Change: An Address by President E. Gordon Gee
to the University Senate: Saturday, October 13, 1990

"Time and Change"

An Address by President E. Gordon Gee

to the University Senate

Saturday, October 13, 1990

I come before you today at a time unique in the history of The Ohio State University, as only its eleventh president, to speak to you of tradition, of commitment, of focus, and of change.

Today, October 13, 1990, is Ohio State's time. It is our time — to build on the University's rich traditions, and to assure its place in the future through continuity and creativity, through vitality and vision.

We are compelled to move this University forward by much more than simply a change in presidents. Events compel us. Societal necessities compel us. The University, with its myriad strengths, compels us and challenges us to do more, to be more, to become more.

The compelling nature of Ohio State's future is what drew me to it. I was interested in Ohio State because of its high caliber; I came here because I know it can be even greater than it is. I came here because I want to be part of that continuing dash — no, more correctly — that continuing drive for distinction.

I am reminded of a Charles Schulz cartoon in which Linus is explaining to Charlie Brown why he is so down-in-the-dumps. "Everyone's so upset because I didn't make the honor roll," he says. "My mother's upset, my father's upset, my teacher's upset, the principal's upset . . . Good grief! They all say the same thing . . . they're disappointed because I have such potential." Linus cries out in great wisdom: "There's no heavier burden than a great potential."

Two of the characterizations I heard about Ohio State during the search process were that it was "a sleeping giant," and a university with great potential. I do not wish to preside over a sleeping giant. It was the Greek poet Hesiod who characterized sleep as "the brother of death," regardless of the mass of the sleeper. I also did not want to preside over an institution which merely has potential. Potential means that something or someone has not yet come into being; that things are latent or unrealized and undeveloped. Potential rests in opposition to the actual.

Ohio State is not a university with potential only. It is a university with actual accomplishments, substantial strengths, a time-honored and time-tested tradition, and a future of fulfillment. It is a place of action, a place of hope.

This is an outstanding university because of the contributions of many of you and many who have preceded us. In accepting the presidency of this University, I broke one of the cardinal rules of leadership: do not follow a good act. In fact, I have come to this University at a remarkable time in its history because it has been so well-served by a great president, Ed Jennings. His legacy is a climate of pride and a belief in success that has energized this institution toward a vibrant future.

Let us today, you and I, look toward that future and begin to build that vision of our University which arises out of shared views, tempered by dialogue and discourse. I will present neither a list of bragging points summarizing why we are a great university nor a chronicle of all

that ails us. Rather, my purpose today is to share with you a vision, my vision, of what Ohio State is and what it might become.

Today, we begin a dialogue. I would hope that these Gee-ocentric views would begin a dialogue between us, and discourse among us. I am sure that an analysis of how dim or bright is my vision, or of any blurring in it, will not be restricted to those of you in the College of optometry. University governance, for all its committees and' commissions and complexities, with all its competing interests, is, above all else, a reflection of that principle upon which the University stands: the free and open exchange of ideas. I look forward to that exchange.

In my view, for Ohio state, the time is here and now. We must seize it. For others, the time for greatness is past; the leaves of leadership have fallen. We at Ohio state are of the new higher educational order. Unlike others, we are able to adapt, not merely to be in step with the new paradigm of a major public university for which so many today are calling, but to define that model.

Here, on this campus and on Ohio State's regional campuses — our extended campuses across the state — and in a multiplicity of locales throughout Ohio, the nation, and the world, Ohio State is defining the modern university. While others have been talking and talking about educational needs, societal needs, and the reconciliation and fulfillment of those needs, Ohio State has been tempering and honing its advantages: size, comprehensiveness, and, above all else, its spirit.

This University is a university with spirit, a breathing in of traditions which results in a breathing out of energy and pride. It is a spirit drawn from sources like "The Best Damn Band in the Land," the Farm Science Review, and the Wexner Center. It is a spirit which I recognized in the members of the Board of Trustees, as these talented and committed individuals spoke to me of their passion for and loyalty to our University. It is a spirit which pervades the University; it infects our current and former students, our faculty and staff, and our many, many dedicated alumni and friends. It is a spirit upon which we should predicate our aspirations for continued educational greatness.

Everywhere I go — and, as you know, I have been around and about a bit in the past forty or so days of my presidency — I am surrounded by, or infused with, the Ohio state tradition. The land-grant tradition. The tradition of a caring staff. A tradition of being the biggest, a tradition of wanting to be the best. A tradition of a distinguished faculty. A tradition of opportunity for all.

I value these traditions, rooted in the past. But, it is now time for new traditions, rooted in the past but nurtured in the future. This is the time for us — in this room and across the University — to accept the challenge of change.

To change constructively, a person or an institution must not go gently into it. We must challenge old assumptions. We must not resort to a protective coating of cliches such as "because that's the way we have always done it" or "we do not do it that way at Ohio State." We must respect our traditions and keep them rich. But, we cannot afford to let them limit our future.

As I look across this University's past, across the plethora of its current possibilities, and to its future, I see a number of distinguishing characteristics which both define its strengths and pose our challenges.

Clearly, The Ohio State University is characterized by its enormous size. Almost any way you count it, we can conjure up mind-boggling statistics about Ohio state: we serve 30,000 meals a day in our dining commons, sell 36,000 parking stickers (for 24,000 spaces), buy nearly 50,000 light bulbs and 10,000 flower bulbs a year, schedule 20,000 class sections of 7,000 courses. This University is big, no matter how you count.

More important than being big, we must think big. This must be a University of big, expansive thinking and creative, big ideas. It is time to elevate our intentions and our expectations, to extend our reach, to become, in fact, not only the leading higher education institution of this state, but one of the great universities of our nation.

When this University was founded, Ohio was on this nation's frontier. East of Columbus lay the heart of the American Republic, its commercial and governmental center. West of Columbus were the prairies and mountains where destiny was manifested and the aspirations of the next century were to be defined.

Today, more than 100 years later, the heartland of this nation has matured and in the Midwest one can feel the pulse of our national spirit. Now, here is its source and its sustenance. It now is time for this nation to realize and affirm that the intellectual leadership of this land does not proceed only from the yards and squares of Cambridge, or the street corner soapboxes of Berkeley, but also from this special University and this great state of Ohio.

Ohio State has the nation's biggest campus whose true size can only be measured in the ideas and spirit of its people. Ours is a comprehensive university, with a tradition of quality in undergraduate and graduate education; a tradition of excellent professional preparation and a strong liberal arts curriculum; a tradition of research, scholarship and creative endeavor. These are our cornerstones.

Obvious as these cornerstones are, it is useful, even obligatory, to articulate them all at once, in a unity, in order to provide a sense of their balance and to help us maintain our perspective. Colleges and universities throughout this nation are suffering a crisis of identity too often produced by their failing to recognize the importance of teaching and research, or by failing to acknowledge the legitimate obligation on the part of public institutions to provide public service.

As we struggle to balance these sometimes competing demands within the institution, I want to applaud the leadership that has been taken by this faculty in defining a new general education curriculum, and encourage the continued commitment to its implementation. Our colleagues around the nation are watching our progress; they are following our lead.

Further, I am impressed by the high-caliber professional and graduate programs that we offer on a common central campus. Whether examinations of ethics in law and medicine, enhanced nutrition as part of veterinary care, ophthalmology and optometry, or foreign languages and business, there is now more than ever a need for collegiality between the core disciplines and the professional preparation programs.

As we continue to struggle with the balance between undergraduate and graduate education, between the physical sciences and humanities, between training for the professions and liberal education, we must also examine the three-part mission of teaching, research, and service which we share with all landgrant institutions and, in fact, with all of the major universities of our day.

I have said on numerous occasions that "publish or perish" is not a complete enough statement. Publishing is not enough. Around here, it must be "publish, teach, and serve -- or perish."

Clearly, we must recommit ourselves to outstanding teaching, to the vital creative and interpretive work conducted in classrooms, studios, and libraries. Our students deserve nothing less from us. We must assure that the reward structure acknowledges effective teaching. And, perhaps more importantly, we must communicate to the people of this state that we have become one of this nation's major research universities, and that we have done it DQt at the expense of undergraduate teaching, but rather because of it.

To assure themselves of outstanding teaching, students must demand that we, their faculty, engage in research. As we stay current in our fields and, more than that, as we define the future of our disciplines, our students must have the benefit of an energetic and timely presentation of important material. And we, as faculty, must have the advantage of our students' curiosity to invigorate our work. Teaching and research truly are the two planes that come together to form the creative edge of the future.

In an interview with The New York Times, A. Bartlett Giamatti, one of the finest teachers and scholars in higher education, spoke of "that wonderful leisurely capacity, which was very intense, of going to the library with a problem and beginning to track it down, to hunt it, stalk it wherever it took you, and then go grab it." This is the vitality that research imparts to teaching. If teaching and research are two planes whose intersection creates the edge of the future, that edge will have structural integrity only if those planes are equally strong, equally recognized as part of the University's intent.

As part of our teaching, research, and service missions, we must impart knowledge to others giving it utility. Universities represent the new economic order for this country. If we are to sustain our will and ability to control our destiny and compete in a global marketplace, this nation must look to university researchers for the innovations and inventions required and for the human resources to guide our future. Ohio State has a unique and important role to play in strengthening Ohio's economy through teaching, research, and service.

Basic university research fuels the future of this state, nation, and world. More than an economic imperative, our research activity also has a social, cultural, ethical, and moral content to it as well. As we look around at the critical issues of the day -- at racism, homelessness, world hunger, infant mortality, crime, and substance abuse, I cannot help but think that many of the solutions can come from right here, within our University.

Just as I believe that answers can and will be found for various cancers in our James Cancer Hospital and Research Institute, so too do I believe that the riddles of illiteracy can be solved in our College of Education, the problems of dysfunctional families can be addressed in our colleges of Human Ecology and Social Work, issues of hunger confronted in our College of Agriculture, the brutality of human labor eased by the College of Engineering, and issues of racism dealt with in our College of Social and Behavioral Sciences .

None of these issues will be addressed by these academic units alone . Social problems know not of administrative convenience or of departmental turf . Such problems will be conquered through the interdisciplinary efforts of scientists and artists, educators and nurses, engineers and humanists, philosophers and historians.

Together, this academic community can be a tremendous force for social change. We must continue to lend a helping hand to the people of Ohio, forming with them a partnership for progress. We must vigorously pursue intellectual challenges and search for truth for its own sake, while at the same time, extending our knowledge to benefit humankind. Only then are we fulfilling our mission.

The service mission of a university takes many forms. How shall we define service? As attending faculty meetings or giving your time — including early Saturday mornings — to university governance functions? Is it professional association involvements? Yes, these things are part of the definition. But, the role of a public university in public service is much more. It is involving ourselves productively in the institution of the family and the primary and secondary schools, in developing civic values and virtues. In a word, we must be a beacon on the hill for courage and commitment during a time of change and ambiguity in our national and global life.

Such service is fundamental to our academic tradition, not a distraction. Certainly, it is the overriding mission of our hospitals, our clinics, our cooperative extension service. But so too the rest of us must get involved. We must develop ways to recognize service by and for students, service to the disciplines, to the university and to the community at large.

Our comprehensive nature, our size, and our three-part mission, while serving as sources of great strength defining this University, also, at times, are sources of strain. The very programs and successes we celebrate and those to which we aspire suggest that we must continue to generate more resources. This University has been enormously successful in private fund raising. The recent campaign has become a standard against which other public institutions are measuring their goals.

The support provided by our many loyal alumni and friends has made a difference in the departments, the colleges, and for our students. But it is not enough. We have just begun to match our ambition with our ability to identify new resources. Yes, there will always be a campaign, for there always will be unmet challenges and opportunities for greatness.

This University appreciates the support we receive from the leadership of this state. As I have met many members of the Ohio General Assembly, I have noted their interest in and commitment to higher education and, in particular, this University. Now more than ever, we must remind the citizemry and their elected officials of the important role this University plays in the future of our state.

One of Ohio State's most beloved former presidents, and the one who served it the longest (at least, so far) is William Oxley Thompson . He eloquently expressed in 1923 the message that we must repeat today: "The greatest trust of civilization and of the passing generations is not the preservation of the status quo. More than we appreciate, this country is committed to the development of a superior citizen. Let the American people clearly see that our program of education is the hope of the millions, and no sacrifice is too great . . . for a program of education that gives life its significance." We must echo President Thompson's words with vigor: support for higher education, support for The Ohio state University, is nothing less than an investment in the future of this nation.

Within, and occasionally beyond the resources we have had, Ohio State has grown in the number of activities it undertakes. We have in many ways begun living at the margins, needing to generate more and more resources — internally and externally — to support an array of

programs and services. We have, I fear, over-extended ourselves and are trying to do too many things.

Candor dictates that I tell you that The Ohio State University can no longer do all the things it is doing nor can it do them in the same way. To be all things in a climate of scarce resources translates into doing almost nothing well. If our goal is to reach the median, we have no goal at all. If we are going to distinguish ourselves, we must focus on our strengths.

There are some things we simply can no longer do. We must stretch the chain of programs that is Ohio state and test the relative strength of all its links. Then, we must focus our energies and our resources on the things that we are doing well, and do those even better. We must also decide what new things we should be doing to assure the academic future of this University and we should invest in those. We must no longer do things we do not do well or that no longer serve the needs of this institution and its constituencies.

Quite predictably, some of you are concerned about how these activities will be identified. I do not know what they are . . . yet. But you do. Therefore, a universitywide planning process must be put in place to help us focus our attention and send us off in appropriate directions.

This institution has engaged in planning in the past. In fact, I have been advised by some to assure you: "Read my lips . No new planning." Regardless of your interpretation of that last line, in light of the new federal budget, I would be negligent in my responsibilities if I did not call for a universitywide planning mechanism.

Each department and college has been developing plans that are important to setting priorities and allocating resources. Building from these plans and putting them into context, however, we must have a universitywide vision, a shared perspective of our future as a community of scholars. Under the direction of the Provost, I am instituting a universitywide planning process to develop our strategic vision and focus our commitment.

One commitment that needs no arbitration is, I believe, the commitment to bring to Ohio State the best and brightest minds in Ohio. Through selective admissions and through what must be a more vigorous, even aggressive recruitment process, we must attract more of Ohio's high ability students to this University. We also must ask ourselves whether we are trying to educate too many students. I do not know the answer, but the question must be asked.

I am dismayed by the number of valedictorians who are not coming to Ohio's flagship, but who instead are leaving this state in search of the quality education they can receive here. We should expect Ohio State to be the university of choice for Ohio's most able high school graduates. However, we cannot sit back and wait for these students to fall upon our doorstep. A multifaceted program of undergraduate student recruitment must be put into motion immediately if we are to become the institution we want to be in this decade and beyond.

In this we have waited almost too long. Our students are the catalyst for creativity in our laboratories, libraries, and classrooms. Unless we are challenged by this important part of our community of scholars, we will never achieve our goals as an institution.

For the students who do enroll here, we must offer better service by adapting to the changing circumstances of their lives. This was evident to me when I visited Ohio State at Mansfield and at Marion. Particularly on our extended campuses, we are fortunate to enroll

students whose life experiences enrich the classroom even as they dictate another model for attending the university.

The new majority of working and returning students — with families, single parents, full and part-time employed — must be accommodated, for example by flexible service hours. We must measure our systems and processes against the diversity of students we are enrolling.

I fear that most systems now in place make certain assumptions about the nature of our typical student that simply are not true. As a clear example, the system of administering student financial aid must be re-examined in light of the needs of our students and our institutional goals. We must not lose fine students for the lack of financial aid, or the absence of a form, or because a box was left empty. The processes of the University must be timely and responsive to the needs of our students.

Another question that must be asked is whether Ohio State is best served by the quarter system. As I take on University traditions, let me add to the field of battle this matter of the academic calendar. Perhaps it is time the flagship rejoined the flotilla. I look forward to the discussions this subject will generate.

I have spoken of several areas of concern, including the quality of our programs and the quality of our students. Let me focus on another. The bureaucracy in any university is expansive, entrenched, and pervasive. Our size and complexity compound the basest tendencies to bureaucratize all University functions. However, Ohio State will not solve its problems by creating new bureaucracies. Rather, we must streamline the administrative structures and become leaner — but certainly not meaner.

The Ohio State University is blessed with many able people, loyal to our purposes and dedicated to quality. It is my observation, however, that too often we replicate responsibilities. We must make certain that the right people — the people who know what needs to be done — are actually making the decisions and are being held responsible for them. Too often, we have fallen into the trap of "auditors auditing auditors," with the persons most qualified to make decisions, instead, needing to ask others if they can move forward. We must simplify, and delegate freedom and accountability to the most appropriate levels in order to reduce complexity and make the university less of a bureaucracy.

I am not suggesting that fewer people will be doing more things. More correctly, fewer people will be doing fewer things. We will more productively use the exceptional human resources of this University.

With these concerns at our center, we must now seek solutions. Let me share with you this morning some of the initiatives and expectations I see in the months ahead.

First, let me begin by announcing my plans to reorganize the central administrative structure of the University and reduce, to the extent possible, the bureaucracy that too much describes our University .

There is a tendency — even an expectation — that a new president will reorganize the staff. As Horace Walpole said, "It was easier to conquer it, than to know what to do with it!" However, the steps I am announcing are not simply an exercise in presidential prerogative. Rather, they represent my considered belief that they will improve this University and enhance our ability to effectively meet our shared goals.

I want everyone to know that we are fortunate to have one of the finest chief academic officers in this country. I am delighted that Dr. Fred Hutchinson and I are working so closely together. To signal the primacy of academic affairs within the University, I am announcing that Dr. Hutchins on, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, will become Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

As you know, I already have begun the search for the Vice President for Research. Graduate Studies, which formerly reported both to the research area and to academic affairs, will report only to the Office of Academic Affairs. The Office of the Vice President for Research must sharpen its focus on serving as an advocate and a catalyst for research needs across the institution. This office will make connections between our researchers and the national and international research communities. We must and will increase our research productivity with the assistance of this important office. I envision this University among the top five public universities and the top ten of all universities in its research productivity. We must accept no less.

I am pleased to announce that Madison Scott, one of this University's great citizens, has accepted an enlarged responsibility that will enable us to strengthen the communication between the University's senior officers and the Board of Trustees. He will serve as Secretary to the Board of Trustees, Secretary of the University, and Executive Assistant to the President. The important work of the Office of Personnel Services previously assigned to Mr. Scott will now report to the Vice President for Business and Administration.

In order to signal strong commitment to students, I am today eliminating the position of Vice Provost for Student Affairs and announcing the position of Vice President for Student Affairs. Furthermore, I am calling for a review and reorganization of this important area, as we work to promote a higher quality of life for all of our students. Because the academic and co-curricular must of necessity be closely aligned, this position will report to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. Dr. Russell Spillman has graciously agreed to assume this new post on an acting basis while we undertake a national search.

To better coordinate our efforts in behalf of all minorities in our community and to better manage our valuable human resources, I am expanding the role of the Executive Officer for Human Relations to become the Executive Officer for Human Relations and Minority Affairs. We will conduct an immediate national search. I want human issues always to be at the top of my agenda and, for that reason, this senior officer will report directly to the president. This position will complement the existing offices and organization for minorities. Dr. Sue Blanshan will continue in her present capacity until the new officer is appointed.

I was pleased to announce not long ago a term appointment for Dr. Donald Glower as Vice President for Communications and Development. We will examine this office carefully, as its functions are of primary importance to this University. The reorganization of these activities demands our thoughtful attention, and I appreciate Dr. Glower's willingness to lead us through the process.

Those of you keeping score will note that I have not yet mentioned the offices of Health Services, Business and Administration, Finance, and Agricultural Affairs. I am asking each of these Vice Presidents to begin a thorough review and to suggest strategies that will contribute to untangling the bureaucratic maze of this University.

With the exception of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Health Services, national searches will begin soon for the senior posts I have just announced or in which we have acting leadership. In the meantime, I want it made clear that with the capable persons now in acting roles, we will not defer our agendas while this reorganization proceeds. Rather we will escalate our activities, generating the creativity and responsiveness required for success. And, yes, once the senior administration is reorganized, I will then ask the appropriate questions and develop approaches to reorganization in other parts of the institution.

While I have first shared with you my intentions for reorganization, I now want to turn my attention to what truly is the heart of this institution, the academy.

The second initiative I am calling for today is a set of academic ventures — and adventures — that will bear fruit for this University, for Ohio, and for our nation. I am proposing that we move forward with a number of interdisciplinary academic activities which take advantage of the particular strengths of this institution. They will create opportunities for cooperation and collaborations that will expand and redefine our academic boundaries.

These academic initiatives are suggested because they will stand to re-establish the notion that the University is not a series of departments and colleges tied together by a common bond — our telephone system. Rather, we are first a university that is a place, as Masefield said: "Where seekers and learners alike, banded together in the search for knowledge, will honor thought in all its finer ways." We are not an aggregation of solitary scholars, but a society with unique resources which we can bring to bear, in varying configurations, on the problems of the day. I have identified a few areas which will allow us to fulfill our promise and exploit the uncommon and remarkable resources of Ohio State.

It is time for a comprehensive initiative in science and mathematics education. American students increasingly are technologically illiterate and are poorly prepared for a future in which the fundamental skills of mathematics and science will be required to be competitive. With a strong tradition at Ohio State in mathematics and science education and the keen interest of our faculty, including our Nobel laureate, Ken Wilson, we can and must assume national leadership in addressing the alarming drop in the number of scientists and the declining number of science and mathematics teachers for this nation's schools.

Such an initiative must be innovative and include both a focus on teacher training and efforts to stimulate K-12 education and college work in science and mathematics. We must recover those students who are turned off to these disciplines early in their schooling by creating new teaching techniques. Working with our colleagues around the state in higher education and in the wider educational community, Ohio state can contribute to the improvement of Ohio's, and this nation's, mathematics and science education programs at every level with this campus-wide initiative.

Even as it is time for new directions in science and math, I am also calling for renewed efforts to recapture the arts. It is imperative that the future leaders of this nation not only be informed, but also inspired, sensible and sensitive. The arts play a critical role in the vibrancy of an academic environment and the enlightenment of an educated person.

"Beauty is truth, truth beauty — that is all ye know on earth and all ye need to know." Keats, of course. Lines from *Ode On a Grecian Urn* we all learned somewhere in freshman

English. Let us teach our youth its meaning as well as its lines. Let us give our young people an ache for the truth of beauty.

Let us make the arts part of the fabric of the institution and give each of our graduates, as educated women and men, exposure to many forms of artistic expression. The continued development of the Wexner Center as an arts center of international renown provides an extraordinary opportunity for this University to enrich the educational experience. Whether walking through or around a "deconstructionist" sidewalk shelter or attending a recital, we are engaged and stimulated by an environment that celebrates the arts.

The College of the Arts faculty is doing an extraordinary job of seizing the moment and creating collaborations — computers and dance notation; animation and computer modeling; multicultural education through Columbus' Martin Luther King Center Institute for the Arts; historic costumes in the College of Human Ecology as an exhibition at the Wexner Center. Collaborations with other creative entities across the country, such as the Wexner and the Walker, the Department of Art History and the Columbus Museum of Art, and the College of the Arts with the Getty Institute provide possibilities that are endless and implications exciting for our community.

Although I believe we must move forward aggressively with unique opportunities in science and math education and in the arts, there are a number of other academic programs that should also be considered. Included among these are the expansion of our biotechnology activities, concern for global change and the environment, materials research, and initiatives for citizenship.

The land-grant tradition, so well exemplified by Ohio State's role in agricultural research and extension, gives us the historical foundation on which to build a premier program in plant biotechnology, linking a variety of researchers around the campus. This program is well under way and, working with others in the state, it will provide Ohio with the scientific base for a new era in agriculture and other industries.

Ohio State also will play an important role in research and education on global change and the environment. The other day I saw a bumper sticker bearing the recycling symbol. Below it was the line: "Back By Popular Demand." Yes, Saddam Hussein has brought back to us a sharp awareness of our reliance upon at least one limited natural resource. People tell me that over the last few years, the climate has truly changed in Central Ohio. (Perhaps I should put away my skis.) Regardless, a survey of faculty is currently under-way to identify the extent of interest in global change. More than 100 faculty members have expressed their interest in this important area.

Faculty from several departments are already working with the Byrd Polar Research Center, the Center for Mapping, and the Ohio Supercomputer Center in the area of global modeling. Combining our unparalleled expertise in polar regions with the computing powers of the Cray supercomputer, we can better understand the dynamics of global change. I expect that we will have many new initiatives in this critical area.

Our faculty has joined together across colleges and departments to focus their expertise on the area of materials. From luncheon seminars to joint projects, the intellectual and scientific energy freely crosses disciplinary boundaries. More than 80 faculty are currently involved in this effort. Materials and many other areas increasingly demand interdisciplinary perspectives which,

in turn, strengthen individual disciplines. Materials research is particularly applicable to Ohio as it impacts the historic industries on which this state's economy was built.

Schopenhauer commented that the limits of one's mind become the limits of one's world. Universities carry the enormous responsibility of creating a responsible citizenry which can effectively face the challenges of the 21st century. It is, in fact, the motto of the University: Disciplina in Civitatem Education for citizenship.

It is my belief that there is an increasing malaise in the American spirit as we face the facts of a post-industrial society in which we no longer control our own destinies. Universities represent the vehicle through which civic values and virtues are developed and reaffirmed in a changing world.

It is time for an interdisciplinary initiative on leadership and citizenship. We must address a growing cynicism on the part of the public and increasing disengagement from public affairs. In public policy, business, and political science, we have at this University the expertise for an initiative that will address education for citizenship, that will put our motto into practice. I applaud the recent activities by our Undergraduate Student Government in registering students to vote. But I challenge all of us to take a broader responsibility for preparing our graduates for active participation in the democratic process. We can take the lead in strengthening Ohio's — and indeed the nation's — future.

I mention these few areas of interdisciplinary concentration the environment, citizenship, the arts, science and mathematics, biotechnology -- not to limit your thinking, but rather to engage your imagination and stimulate your creativity. These, of course, represent unique University initiatives. They do not preclude the many discrete and important departmental and college programs now being developed or under consideration. The complexity and strength of this University allow us to seek academic distinction at many levels while carefully pruning our overextended aspirations.

The third initiative we must undertake, and that must consume us, is recreating a true sense of academic community. We say that a university is a community of scholars. But what of this sense of community — a shared sense of cultural purpose, membership, and status. Does it extend to all constituencies? We must share more than a common signature on a paycheck, crowded sidewalks at twelve minutes to the hour, and standing in lines. We must share responsibility for one another and this University in such a way that, as Bertrand Russell said, if we wish to be happy ourselves, we must see that others also are happy.

Can this be accomplished in an institution of this size? Yes, I think so. Perhaps we must alter our perspective. I have heard students say that once they are here and begin to make friends, they think of campus as their town, not just their university. In the best sense of the American town — the town hall, the town meeting, people who work together both in crisis and to fulfill their aspirations we must work to make Ohio State a true community.

Where such a sense of community flourishes, there is no room for intolerance, for acts of hate, for violence or discrimination. From the small acts of kindness shown to one another -- such as the "Just Say Hi" campaign started by Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity and the African American Heritage committee — to faculty firesides and picnics, we must exude a spirit of caring for our students and for each other .

While ours is a big campus, we must never forget the value and dignity of each individual who is part of our University family. Where diversity exists, it must also be celebrated. This must be a community characterized by civility, not hatred, by compassion, not bureaucracy.

I am issuing a call for a universitywide commitment to community. I know that our students, faculty, and staff members can be creative in developing programs and activities that will empower all members of our University family and which will nurture the sense of belonging that is so important if we are to reach our goals both individually and as an institution. In a nation torn by strife in lands far away and in the privacy of its homes, we must create and sustain a more humane, ethical environment in which to study, work, and live.

Building on this sense of community, I am advancing as a fourth initiative, the enhancement of the undergraduate environment. The campus should be a place where students and faculty come together in more than the classroom, to explore our world and its challenges with a shared sense of excitement. As one student suggested to me, the University must be a nurturing habitat for new ideas.

Through innovations in teaching, through undergraduate research opportunities, and through complementary out-of-class experiences, we must develop more programs and activities that attend to the moral, social, physical, and intellectual development of our undergraduate students. To the extent that we have not fully developed the undergraduate experience, we have diminished the academic environment for all members of this community — faculty, staff, graduate and professional students as well as undergraduates. The character and quality of the undergraduate life to a great degree set the tone for the institution. I want this to be a vital, energetic, and inquisitive place where students are not only trained, but truly educated.

I am happy to note that it is a student initiative that brings United States Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy to campus for a lecture next week, and students are asking for more such lectures. The exceptional program of recreation and intramural sports now available to students should be complemented with other experiences that enrich the spirit and enhance social and moral development. Ohio State's strong traditions of spirit and pride surrounding intercollegiate athletics must be captured and extended to other areas of campus life. Today, I call for creativity in building an undergraduate experience of quality for our students.

This University has made a good start toward enhancing our community by recruiting students, faculty, and staff members from a diversity of backgrounds. As a fifth initiative, I affirm the commitment of this president, and reaffirm the dedication of this University to diversity and to opportunity. It is time to put new life into our obligations and opportunities with unfailing energy.

Clearly, we must move forward with the Action Plans already in place and under development. The Young Scholars Program is a model for the nation. It must and will continue, as one part of our efforts to expand and extend the opportunities for higher education to Ohio's young people. We must continue to encourage department chairs, directors, and deans to bring women and minorities into their ranks in greater numbers.

We know, however, that an emphasis on recruitment must be accompanied by an aggressive program for retention. Simply to bring persons of color, women, and other underrepresented groups into the institution as students, faculty, or staff, without a true commitment to making them part of this community is a prescription for failure.

The lack of retention among minority and women faculty members, reported last spring by a committee of this Senate, is a cause for serious concern. So, too, are the rates of graduation for minority students and access to the full range of opportunities for employment and advancement by staff women. We must rethink our criteria for success in affirmative action, and examine our progress longer term. Incentives must be adjusted to reward not simply recruitment, but retention.

Women in the academic community face a particular set of obstacles, and we must eliminate these barriers where we can. I will convene a Commission on Women to study University policies, practices, and patterns that are harmful to equity for women. In particular, I am aware of serious concerns regarding sexual harassment, the retention problems just mentioned, and the need for adequate support for research by and about women. On these and other issues, I will look for this group to recommend a number of ways we can creatively and aggressively enhance this community for women.

One area in which I will move immediately is equity in salary across the University. I am today announcing a salary equity study of all faculty, looking at gender and ethnic groups. This review will examine not only patterns of inequity, but also case-by-case injustices that must be redressed.

Regrettably, there often is systemic inability to recognize that female career paths and patterns — including those of women of color — are different. I am anxiously awaiting the report to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs on stopping the tenure clock when life choices suggest it is necessary.

I also am calling for an equity review of all athletic programs. We must be committed in more than words to equal opportunities for women and minority students, staff, and coaches. The matter of equity in athletics is not simply a matter of law. It is a moral and ethical issue. We take great pride in the accomplishments of all of our student athletes and their coaches. I want to be certain that we are doing more than applauding for the achievements of women in our sports programs.

We have come a long way since James Michener in his 1976 essay "Women in sports" wrote of "one Ohio institution where a woman could not use the handball courts unless a man signed up for her." I trust this was not at The Ohio State University. I want to be certain that when we speak of equity in our sports programs, our actions undeniably substantiate our words.

Salary equity studies will be extended to all administrative and professional and classified staff members over the coming months. In this and other ways, we must wake up to the complex demands on some members of our community and ensure access and opportunity for all.

Clearly, the nature of our work force is changing to include more single-parent families; dual career families; women, especially women with young children; and persons with responsibilities for dependent care of the elderly, the disabled, and the young. Family-supportive policies are necessary for today's — and tomorrow's — workers . I will consider with great interest the report of the spousal equivalency benefits committee and the forthcoming report on dependent care policies.

Let me affirm to all of you that in terms of access and opportunity for minorities and women, what we have at Ohio State is a good beginning. We must recommit to our values. By

fully applying our energies, we will strengthen our achievements and improve the quality of experience for all persons in our University community.

I have mentioned five University-focused initiatives this morning: reduce bureaucracy through reorganization; seize important new interdisciplinary academic opportunities; develop a strong sense of community; enhance the undergraduate environment; and recommit ourselves to diversity. These are only a beginning and certainly are not intended to put a limit on our thinking. I expect our dialogue to generate many exciting opportunities for this University.

An initiative is just what it says — in the Latin. It is a beginning, a first step. The initiatives which I have put forth today are only the first of the first steps. Through discussion, I look to our mutually developing more objectives and the second and third steps beyond the first.

Further, just past an initiative there must be energy, enterprise, and determination. There must be the determination on our part to make our aspirations reality, while not letting them limit the scope and extent of our ongoing thinking. And, there must be the energy and enterprise to effect them. We have that energy and that enterprise.

My expectations are very high. They will remain high. I expect you to monitor my progress and to measure me by a high standard for performance and for commitment. I, in turn, will measure you by the same. We cannot expect from each other anything but a commitment to quality, to the best in any endeavor we undertake on behalf of this University.

If we do that, if we fulfill the promise of the first steps, and the second, and the third, and the steps without limit, what will The Ohio State University look like ten years hence, when the first digit in the calendar changes for the first time since shortly before William the Conqueror's victory over the Saxons at the Battle of Hastings? This being our time, what will change show?

When I look at the auguries, I see a University in the year 2000 which is truly a community of scholars and which, from the very derivation of the word, is one in quality. I see a community of caring people whose compassion, one for the other, allows them to become one. I see a University where teaching and research strengthen each other rather than compete. I see a University that is the first choice of all the best young scholars in the state. I see an Ohio State which is a leader, not a follower; an exemplar, an example for others in higher education. I see a University that is governed by trust and mutual respect rather than bureaucracy and red tape. I see a focused, committed, responsible, productive University: focused internationally, committed to being without peer, responsive to social needs and conditions, and productive in research.

This is what I see; this is what I hope for; this I know we will achieve.

When we walk across the Oval on an autumn afternoon ten years from now, those who people it, in myriad array, will even more reflect the diversity of society and the vitality of the University. The air will be filled with energy and excitement, and we will walk in an environment of educational excellence. The best descriptors will be those which Masefield used at Sheffield in 1946 — "There are few earthly things more beautiful" and "few earthly things more splendid than a university" this University.

This, then, is what Ohio State will be: splendid in substance, beautiful in form; an institution whose traditions, the legacy of generations past, will propel it boldly and confidently into the generations future.

From the sound of the Orton chimes to the utterances of a faculty meeting debate, I hear this university as a symphony of sound. To achieve the symphonic, one must first experience the cacophonous — especially in a university. It is my hope, however, that we will become like a chorus, harmonious, not discordant . I hope we can begin singing in the same hymnal, and that the melody will be of a University confident enough at this time to change.

Thank you.

Appendix ii

The New University
by E. Gordon Gee

The New University

By E. Gordon Gee

Standing on this campus, surrounded by these centuries-old buildings - their cornerstones laid when my hometown was still an unclaimed patch of wilderness - I am exhilarated by the convergence of history and potential. And I am inspired by the greatness of the charge of leading this most venerable institution into the future.

Today I remember my small hometown in Utah, high in the Rocky Mountains, where the wind blew across the fields at harvest time, bending the crop low. I remember wondering what was waiting beyond those mountains and those valleys and where the roads would lead. Time has answered that question for me, as it will for all of you. I can say from experience, what awaits you may be in a dream or a wish. It may be something unanticipated. It may require perseverance, patience, and prayer, and perhaps a portion of luck. But it is there. It will come, and when it does, you will feel as grateful and as blessed as I do.

The words of Henry Merritt Wriston, Brown's eleventh president, have a particular resonance for me today. In 1937, when he was inaugurated, he said to the Brown community: "I speak to you no longer as an alien and a stranger. By this ceremony of adoption, just now completed, I have entered into your heritage, and have become one of the co-heirs of your traditions and achievements, a joint tenant of your properties and purposes, a coworker in the fulfillment of your duties and obligations, a fellow exponent of your ideals."

Now our paths have crossed on this Green, and Wriston's voice echoes through these buildings and halls. If I could hold a conversation with the past, I would tell Henry Wriston that we have much in common. He would say that he was from Wyoming, neither a Baptist nor a Brown alumnus. I would say that I am a Mormon from Utah, and that now, sixty-one years after him, and like others before me, I too have entered into the heritage of this University.

I would ask him what he believes is expected of me. He would, no doubt, say as he once said, "The President is expected to be an educator; to have been at some time a scholar; to have judgment about finance; to know something about construction, maintenance, and labor policy; to speak virtually continuously in words that charm and never offend; to take bold positions with which no one will disagree; to consult everyone and follow all proffered advice; and do everything through committees but with great speed and without error."

I would thank him and say, "Good advice, Henry." Then I would ask him what it was that he sought to accomplish as president.

He might tell me that he sought to awaken a decent pride in this university, and rebuild Brown's sense of community. And I would respond that I would work to broaden that pride beyond the Van Wickie Gates. I would tell him that my charge is to continue to give this private institution a worldview, a world voice, and a public purpose. I would tell him that the times demand that we become not simply a collection of intellectuals, but a community of scholars who acknowledge the contributions of all members of this community. I would say that each of us has a responsibility to teach, to learn, to serve - to become true citizens of this University.

I would tell President Wriston that, within the community, our obligation is to the wild and vast experience of learning, wherever it takes us, to opening ourselves to a kaleidoscope of ideas and

concepts, to seeing past the obvious, to looking at the stars and gaining perspective in powers of ten, from the tiniest workings of the smallest cell to the broadest reaches of the distant universe. I would tell him that putting a premium on intellect and creating an ever changing, ever renewable, student based, scholar-driven community is not only my task, but my solemn duty.

Today is not a time to focus only on the present. Today is a time to reflect on where this University has been, the course it has followed, the choices it has made, and then establish a clear vision of the sea ahead. This institution, firmly planted in the rich and proud traditions of its past, old and honored, rising from its roots as a small New England Baptist university, must have a wide view of the world as it settles into its third century.

From the day James Manning landed in Newport in 1763 with a plan for a liberal institution of learning, to the day in 1765 when he was sworn in as its first president, Brown has prevailed. From the seven students in the class of 1769 to the 1,492 seniors, the 436 grad students, and the eighty-one medical students who graduate this month, Brown has prevailed. From 1864, when Anna Weeden and Mary Wooley became the first women to graduate, to Sarah Elizabeth Doyle and the unique coalition of women's clubs that eventually formed Pembroke, to Margaret Stillwell, who, in 1909, was the first woman to be a full professor - Brown has prevailed. From Manning, to Wayland, to Faunce, Wriston, Swearer, and Gregorian, this University has grown and prospered through revolution and wars, and it will prosper and grow in the new century.

Our only risk is complacency. Our only mistake would be to creep timidly into the future, frozen by tradition, reluctant to change, unwilling to seize opportunity, divided by our diversity rather than united in our common interests. This is a time to take risks, be bold, move from strength, and resist the temptation to be drawn into the safety of the mainstream. For Brown's greatest strength and achievement has been its willingness to embrace change.

There are those who have criticized our adventurous spirit. But today they look to Brown to learn the secrets of our success. Our innovative, flexible curriculum is the jewel of our university-college. No one has more cause for celebration and optimism than the men and women of Brown, past and present, here and remembered, for we are different. We have always been unique. We have always traveled to a beat of our own, and we are the drummers at the center of what will continue to be an extraordinary educational journey.

Make no mistake. The journey ahead will be difficult at times. It will test our resolve, our intellect, and our courage. It will require continual change and constant renewal. We must continue to challenge old assumptions. We must respect tradition, without limiting our future as a new community of learning and service.

William James wrote, "We patch and tinker more than we renew." I want us to do more than patch and tinker. I want us to focus our collective vision on continual revival, through debate and discussion, so that we may establish a learning community with the same flexibility and adaptability that we bring, as scientists and scholars, to our intellectual activity.

In this world of instant communication, when information is measured in gigabytes, we cannot wait. Think about this: When the class of 1948 arrived here, the first transistor had just been created, the world was still at war, the first atomic bomb was about to be dropped, the long-playing record had not been invented, and Orville Wright was alive. In their junior year, the G.!. Bill had passed, the Veterans College was formed, and 486 returning veterans lived in "Brown Town" near Marvel Gymnasium in old Navy barracks brought here from Newport.

Now, the class of 1998 enters a world in which new technology and intense research, unimaginable fifty — even ten — years ago, will take us to places we may prefer not to go, and to others that may unravel the deepest mysteries of science, the universe, and the very fabric of human life as we know it. It may raise new and more profound ethical, economic, philosophical, religious, and political questions than we have ever before confronted - questions that will require institutions of higher education, researchers and scholars, to make difficult choices and look beyond obvious traditional solutions. What we do - what we discover - will affect not only the nature of our communities, but how we live and, perhaps most profoundly, how we define life.

But in a technological world, where access to information translates into skill, and skill translates into a career, we must hold to the simple notion that education is not a bottom-line idea. At Brown, teaching is not for profit. It is for life. Teaching is for understanding, for creative, informed thought. Above all else, our greatest challenge at every institution of higher education, from the smallest community college to the largest university, is to resist the temptation and the trend to train students for specific careers instead of teaching them to think about the vast range of intellectual possibilities. At Brown, our tradition is teaching, learning, and a liberal education. And that tradition will keep us in the vanguard of the most desirable institutions of higher education in the world.

We are small. And we can use our size and flexibility to reinvent the American university. We have an opportunity to become a unique model, a learning community of the twenty-first century, a place where free, open, rational, logical debate takes precedence over the single-minded cynicism of fashionable ideas. Our new learning community demands total participation and a commitment to service at every level. It demands resolve. It demands passionate deliberation and resourceful solutions. It begs for camaraderie and cries out for tolerance, respect, dignity, civility, and honor. It diminishes politics and enhances research and enlightenment. It rewards justice, perseverance, and compassion. It creates harmony and nurtures creativity. It expects logic and perspective to rule over emotion and parochialism. It requires compromise and abhors mediocrity. It is the center of enlightened intellectual life. It is a place to live and to learn and to teach and to serve.

We must encourage speaking out, not fear that in doing so we may offend someone or some group. We must encourage rational, logical debate. If we are unable to have free and open discussions without fear of retribution or being labeled, then we will have failed not just as a university but as good, decent, rational human beings.

Recently, a young woman from the class of 1983, Lane Wallace, of Corona, California, wrote to me. These are her words: "The greatest gift Brown has to offer is a commitment to put people ahead of things. I remember very few actual facts or details from any class I took at Brown, and I could not tell you if any of my professors were tops in their fields. But I can tell you which ones cared enough to take time to talk to or influence their students. My values, career ambitions, and worldview were greatly influenced by the individuals I got to know at Brown - people whose different backgrounds and life experiences touched me and opened doors, perspectives, questions; and a realization that the world in which I grew up was not the only one that existed.

"What changed my life was the philosophy Brown imparted: To learn for the joy of it, not just the grade — and to pursue what you loved or thought mattered in life, not just what society seemed to expect or a job that would pay a lot of money."

We have a moral obligation to preserve this philosophy of learning. In the short time since I arrived here, I have learned that Brown may be traditional in its values, but it is a dynamic, vibrant, and modern community of higher education because of the way we teach. We are not only faculty centered, but centered around a partnership between faculty and students. Our students are teachers, and our teachers are students.

The class of 1973 was the first class to benefit from the experience of this partnership, this collaborative learning process formerly known as the New Curriculum. The class of 1973 understands firsthand that the way we teach at Brown is the truest, most direct, most powerful method of moving a student from being trained and informed to being truly educated. Let me take this opportunity to say to each member of the faculty: to have taught at Brown in this curriculum is to have moved students' minds, to have challenged their intellects as well as their imaginations. It is to have opened a universe of ideas and widened their perspectives to see every flickering element and understand how it relates to a particular discipline. You have moved a generation of graduates beyond learning to knowledge and understanding. The scholar-teachers of Brown have made us what we are today and will be at the center of this learning community's future.

But what does that future hold?

The future of Brown demands that our leadership, along with every member of this community, come together to address the range of complex, troublesome issues we face: How do we balance the needs of an undergraduate liberal-arts institution with a graduate and research university? How do we attract the best faculty and students? How do we limit administrative costs? How do we motivate every member of the Brown community to take an active role in its future? How do we balance fundraising and financial pressures with continued academic excellence? How do we balance research and scholarship with our commitment to becoming a private university with a public purpose?

The truth is that in the future Brown will be the model as higher education radically reconfigures itself to promote true, engaged learning and thinking. No institution can afford to rely on the hierarchy separating departments and programs as well as academic and nonacademic cultures. The new university, like Brown, must be a borderless intellectual center, promoting community over isolation and dedicated to sharing objectives over guarding individual concerns. The new university must be a superdisciplinary learning community, based on the moral imperative of our experience, our creativity, our imagination and boldness, and our willingness to take risks. If we continue to do these things, we will have fulfilled our mission. We will have set the standard for the new university in the next century.

As I stand before you this morning, speaking about the future, I stand on the shoulders of great women and men who had a worldview. At an old and glorious institution like Brown, when we speak about the future, we also honor our past. To quote President Wriston again: "I have often thought that no student can walk the paths of the College Green for four years - if he has any sensitivity at all — without learning something from the appearance, something from the atmosphere that its buildings breathe, something from the way history looks down upon [us]."

So many paths have crossed on this Green. They came as young men and women and went on to greatness, and if you listen closely, you can still hear their voices: the muffled laughter of frightened soldiers outside University Hall, talking of revolution in 1777; the trembling voice of a wounded French officer looking out at the Green from his bed when University Hall had

become a hospital in 1780; the excitement in the voice of a young Nicholas Brown Jr. receiving his diploma in the first post-Revolutionary Commencement in 1786. The voices of the twenty Brown students who died in the Civil War still echo here.

We can hear Margaret Stillwell recounting her experience as a young faculty member at the turn of the century. She said: "I, as a woman, had invaded a world they had pre-empted for themselves. In some instances this antagonism was subtle and hidden like a snake in the grass. In others it was blatant and rude." We can hear the visionary voice of John Hope, one of Brown's early African American graduates and a leader in higher education who went on to become president of Morehouse College. Just over one hundred years ago, at his commencement, John Hope remarked: "To have been at Brown University is to have drunk in the unpretentious, unobtrusive, yet all pervading idea of liberty and brotherhood; and to have acquired a breadth of culture which means the erasure of all lines, be they of race, or sect, or class, and recognizes no claim other than that which highest manhood makes." Perhaps that echo is not from the distant past at all.

Let me close with this thought. In the learning community that I see, neither the true scholar nor the true educator is found only in the classroom. I see a community in which everyone is a learner and everyone is a scholar. I see a community in which scholars can be discovered everywhere on this campus. The true scholar is the one who explains. The true scholar is of service. The true scholar is not isolated in the singular pursuit of knowledge. The true scholar unravels mysteries, finds new answers, reveals profound old truths, and then shares them with the community at large. The true scholar is a free thinker with a sense of responsibility.

We might ask, as we leave this campus, some of us for the last time, how many scholars have we met in our years at Brown? How many have shown us facts in the face of fads and fashions? How many have revealed to us truths hidden by our emotions or our prejudices? How many have thought beyond the obvious, past the traditional, and into the soul of the matter? How many have, through logic and a keen awareness of the human mind, eased tensions and ended hostility? Our task is to be a genuine community of scholars.

Emerson said that the true scholar is one who "raises himself from private considerations and lives and breathes on public and illustrious thoughts. He is the world's eye. He is the world's heart."

Brown is a place where together we see with the world's eye, and together we understand with the world's heart. I am blessed to be in this place.

Appendix iii

Gee outlines challenges facing faculty, University
by E. Gordon Gee

Gee outlines challenges facing faculty, University

Thank you very much, Ken. I appreciate all of you being here, and I appreciate the judicious nature of your business before the Senate.

I also want to thank the Blair Quartet, too, for their work and for their impressive performance, and I am glad that this assembly was able to serve as a showcase for them necessarily so because they are faculty. Today is, of course, about celebrating your work as a faculty. It is your day.

I want to thank all of you for making Constance and me feel so welcome to be here. I also want to give special thanks to my predecessors, Chancellors Wyatt and Heard, without whose efforts I would not have the opportunity to talk to you today, and for them I am grateful.

I have had the great good fortune of getting to know many of you over the past seven months. For those of you with whom I am not yet acquainted, I hope that this is the beginning of a long relationship and the introduction of a conversation which will take place over many years. I have much to say to you this afternoon. I know that we will have much to say to each other over those years.

I want to introduce several people to you today. The first is my spouse, Constance Gee. I introduce her to you not only as my partner but also as new faculty. She is an Associate Professor at Peabody College. Now, she is important to me, not just for the obvious reasons, but also for my position here, for my duties as a Chancellor. She is herself a teacher and a scholar, and through her I get to experience, to be reminded every day, what faculty life is like, through her, I remember what demands are on you as well as what rewards come to you. Through her I am reminded always of the pressures of teaching and research that rest on all of you. Constance, you are here. Will you please stand and be recognized by your colleagues?

I want to introduce to you as well David Williams, who will serve as vice chancellor, general counsel and secretary of the University. I introduce him to you today in his other capacity, as Professor of Law, and as a new faculty member at Vanderbilt. David, will you please stand and be recognized?

[Applause]

I haven't heard such a round of applause from a faculty group since I announced to the Brown faculty I was leaving.

I also have been privileged to meet with many of Vanderbilt's new faculty.

I met with them over lunch last Friday at the Wyatt Center, but I know all of you have not yet had a chance to greet them. New members of the faculty, please stand to be recognized. Will they all please stand to be recognized? Welcome, your new colleagues and I salute you.

Ladies and gentlemen, today, I am here to celebrate who you are, and what you have accomplished, and what we have accomplished and what we will accomplish together. This assembly is a celebration that will begin our ongoing conversation.

Before I start, let me note that this is only the third time in 40 years this faculty has had an opportunity to hear from a new Chancellor. That of course is very averment to me, but I will also say to you that this is a very special moment. And because I have decided not to have an inauguration, all of you have made me feel very welcome as you have Constance, I have much to

say. I will try to say it as expeditiously as I can, but nonetheless, I think you should expect from a new chancellor to hear who I am, what I am, what my values are what my expectations are of myself and of you and our relationship and where I see the future of this University. So sit back and relax and enjoy yourself. If you have to leave, I will not be offended at all.

One of the first mistakes I ever made as a university president was to take the advice of Clark Kerr, former president of the University of California, who stated to me that a university president should not become too involved with the university. That advice is erroneous, and I was wrong to take it. I believe a university president -- a Chancellor, now -- which by the way, is a term that I am still having difficulty coming to terms with--my wife calls me your highness I might note --The University Chancellor must have passion about the University. And I do not want to use language irresponsibly, so let me stress the fact that "passion" at its root means suffering and agony. Not that I am in agony as we speak. But I want to be precise about that fact. If I feel passion for the University, if I feel that passion for the University is a requirement for my work, that means I will be so deeply involved in this school that its successes and misfortunes are my own, that I feel them as deeply as my own. I am inextricably bound to it, as much as if we were strung together by nervous tissue. I have to believe unequivocally in the institution to which I belong, and I want you to know clearly that I do.

The practical demands of that relationship are most of all that I listen to you, and listen carefully. Our relationship requires that we learn from each other, and work in a constant interchange and dialogue with each other.

That is particularly important because I know that in many ways my experience within this institution will differ from your own. Even as Constance is a day-to-day physical reminder to me of the life of a faculty member, I am not she, although she is nothing but frank with me. And even though I stand before you as a member of the faculty, I realize that despite my best efforts to avoid it, I live in rarefied air. I realize that although an administration may exist for decades, senior faculty have invested the totality of their professional lives in Vanderbilt. The chairs we awarded earlier are a sign that honors that investment. I have to listen to you, in order to do what is best for the University, and I will never be able to do that if I live in a castle surrounded by a moat that only a privileged few are allowed to cross. I will not be able to serve this University if I am inaccessible to you. I intend over the course of my time here to carry on a conversation with you.

That conversation will take place in many different forums. It has already begun.

I have met with you individually; I have spoken with you in small groups. This assembly continues those dialogues and encourages more. Everything I say to you this afternoon, every single occasion of our speaking together is a part of that greater conversation. I want you to feel able to debate me, and to disagree with me. I give you permission to do that. I encourage you to do it, and I expect you to do it, and after that dissent I expect us to work together on a common course of action.

I want our time together here to be marked by informed debate and by community responsibility. That means that you are responsible, just as I am responsible, although I take the blame, for what happens at this institution. I believe in faculty governance. Let me just say that again. I believe in faculty governance. I believe in faculty focus. Change in an institution like ours must be centrally driven, but not centralized, and it will never, ever come unless it is faculty-supported and faculty-led. This administration will be neither hard-hearted nor

hardheaded. It will not overlook the quality, excellence, experience, or wisdom of this faculty, but will embrace it. If you have been waiting for a greater chance at involvement, it is here, and your responsibility now is to seize it and to participate fully in it. You have every right to passion and for this University.

Vanderbilt's bylaws require that the University's faculty meet at such times as it may appoint or at the call of the Chancellor so I call you here today so that you may be honored and celebrated. We meet at the beginning of the academic year to be reminded of our purpose as a body, of our duty as teachers and scholars. The Faculty Assembly calls us to examine ourselves professionally. So how do we do that? And, what questions do we ask?

I have observed that at Vanderbilt teaching and research are balanced more accurately than at most schools, which compare to us. Excellence in teaching is even a requirement for tenure, here. Often, however, our teaching duties are viewed as a sacrifice: "How great we would be if only we did not have to teach!" I want to stress to you that in no way are teaching and research antagonistic. Teaching activates research. Research feeds teaching. The two sustain and inform one another. An excellent example of this occurs in the freshman seminars sponsored by the College of Arts and Science. In these seminars, faculty work deeply and attentively with small groups of freshmen on interdisciplinary research topics. These seminars exemplify what a university should always be: a place where teaching is viewed not as a load, but as an opportunity.

It has been said in the past that research is the mind of the University and teaching its heart. One is provoked to ask what this model implies. Are students taught without the full intellectual engagement of the teacher? Is research performed without compassion, or without the aim of service to the community? This model suggests a university divided, not integrated. We must seek for a more holistic approach. Teaching and research are not mutually exclusive; they are mutually inclusive. We must perfect a balance within the University. We have to create an atmosphere in which all faculty members are encouraged to take seriously both their teaching and their research, an atmosphere in which teaching is seen as a form of scholarship. If it proves necessary for us to reshape the reward structure, to redefine what is meritorious scholarship, then that is what we will do.

As we create a vision for Vanderbilt's next era, we must extrapolate what that mission could be, from what is taught at this University. And we must ask ourselves what message we send to the world through our actions. Ladies and gentlemen, a critical question that has been asked me by some of you and that is what is our ethic as an institution? What model do we present to our students? Nothing we do is nonacademic. Let me try to rephrase that in the positive -- Everything, and I believe this deeply, everything we do at this University is academic. The University is an object-lesson for students. It is, or it should be, a Utopian community, based on the most enlightened teaching on social organization and business organization. We must examine whether we are consistent with the humanitarian principles we teach. Do we match them? Do we value lifelong learning enough to show it through our policies, especially those policies that affect support staff? Are we exploitative or humane?

Everything we do is academic. Everyone who works here is engaged in an academic endeavor. I simply would urge you never to utter the word "nonacademic" on this campus, because it does not apply here. We have to treat all who work here as both teachers and leaders, no matter what they do. The staff that supports us, without whom we could not accomplish our

work, and the students, for whom our work is done, are our partners in this academic effort. The gardeners who mow the lawns and trim the bushes and maintain the trees do all that work so that you will have a beautiful landscape in which to think high thoughts. The secretaries who send your faxes do so that you will have more time for your intellectual pursuits. So many people work in so many ways to allow this University to perform its function.

An academic community clearly will not be one unless we value all of its members and unless we understand that respect for the individual is the only way to earn respect for the University and for its intellectual values. What is the purpose of learning humanities, if one's basic humanity is compromised? What is the purpose of studying ethics if one cannot expand those ethics into an imaginative and generous sympathy with other individuals? What is the use of studying novels, if one cannot apply one's learned experience of imaginary lives to her understanding of the lives of the real people around her? What is the use of theories of empowerment or diversity or multiculturalism if we cannot act on them in our own community? We must extend the theoretical into the practical. We can do so much with what we know.

If we can agree on a list of first principles, and then come to discover that we are engaging in actions that are inconsistent with those principles, then we should desist from those actions. If we discover principles that the University is not helping to maintain, develop and extend, then we should broaden the scope of our activities accordingly.

I have listened carefully over the past few months to the concerns you have shared with me about the future of Vanderbilt. Today I am able to share with you my own viewpoint, which has been informed by your work and your views, which have ranged, by the way, from the benign to the revolutionary.

I emphasize your participation so much because a true learning community demands full participation. It requires strategic compromise and cooperation. In our case, it requires that we restructure how we communicate and interact, how we conduct business and how we collaborate with each other. We cannot succeed in this partnership unless we are responsive to each other. We have to leave our individual preconceptions and predilections at the gates, and see ourselves as contributing parts of a greater whole, if we want to maintain our standard of excellence. We must rise above our individual and departmental concerns, and put our interest in Vanderbilt's future ahead of our own interests. Rather, we have to make it our own interest. I want us to sound to the wider world like a chorus, rather than a cacophony.

I want us to sound to each other like a chorus, rather than a cacophony. I want us to share the joy in achievements everywhere in the University. Any achievement without the joy of relationship is empty indeed.

What I am describing is a difficult balance to achieve. It demands of us that we unite under one shared sensibility. I will not be fearful of encouraging a moral climate that elicits a respect for the human spirit, for honor, for law, for the pursuit of knowledge and the life of learning, and for the human capacity of self-transcendence.

I cannot avoid advocating those values for fear of offending someone. There is a greater danger in having no motivating value, in being nebulous. The danger lies in having no direction or nothing to get our minds around as members of this community.

It is imperative that we work together in a spirit of cooperation and resolve. We must have unifying ideas, and an identity with each other. We will learn to celebrate our successes and

our victories together, and we will get over backbiting and assigning blame. We will learn to treat one another with dignity and civility and common sense.

This commitment to a unified vision, a vision of unity for the whole University, should never prohibit a commitment to diversity and pluralism, alternative views and dissent. If we are unable to have free and open discussions, free and open debates, then we have no right to call ourselves a University. However, we need to develop a way to celebrate and encourage pluralism and the alternative view without losing our focus.

I realize that at the moment we have almost too much fragmentation on this campus, with academic departments and colleges divided from one another. This is a negative pluralism: a pluralism of parallel lines that never meet, parallel universes that never intersect. Our colleges often exist so independently of one another that they are not even bothered by one another, and that is no community. There is no unity in that model, but simply a habit of being left alone and leaving others alone. It is a vertical model, in which each substantive area works exclusively with itself.

This fragmentation can easily occur at a private research university like ours, where faculty are deeply committed to and passionate about their disciplines. The price of such a concentration, however, can be that we end up limited, limited in what we are able to see, and in the ways we are able to think about the very subjects we love so much.

I am reminded of a documentary I saw once about zebras, which showed a herd of Grevy's zebras (the largest species of zebra) intersecting and mixing with a herd of a smaller species of zebra. Not once did the two herds acknowledge each other. Even though they were all zebras, they were of different species and so of no importance to one another. It was as if the two types of zebra did not even see each other. Well, our colleges and departments and divisions are too often like these herds of zebra: coexisting, but never interacting, with faculty members from different colleges passing one another on the quadrangles as if they existed on separate planes. This, by the way, is not always by choice, I know, but we have to remind ourselves that we are all colleagues, that our colleagues are not only those faculty in our own department but faculty across the University.

This fragmentation, this disconnect, this Balkanization, has been brought about in part by our financial models, but again we have to interrogate our own motives and ask ourselves how often we hide behind Every-Tub-on-its-Own-Bottom, and let it serve as an excuse for our failure to accomplish a goal. How far have we internalized ETOB, how much have we made it part of our fundamental thought structure?

We have to learn to think universally, and not parochially. We have to be the University; we have to be the University, all of us. We must use a horizontal model, rather than a vertical one. We have to accelerate the integration of departments across the intellectual life of this University.

We are favored with such a remarkable geography. I think of it as an intellectual sociology. So much is jammed onto this campus, this wonderfully complex organism. Today, Constance and I walked, within 10 minutes, we walked from arts and science buildings, past the Law School, past the Divinity School, past the Owen School of Management, past the School of Nursing, past the School of Engineering, all the way to this remarkable Medical Center.

We are at this University afforded such unique opportunities for intellectual synergy because of this. Our campus is a great intellectual laboratory. We have to take advantage of such interconnectedness. We can be symbiotic. But we are often kept from each other -- and why is that? Why do we not function more as the marvelous unit that we could be?

We must support more fully efforts like the University Chaplain's Mentoring Program, which assigns senior faculty as mentors to junior faculty of another discipline. The Chaplain's Office also sponsors a Monday Lunch Group that helps bring faculty from disparate disciplines together into common conversations. Such work deals directly with community-building. It enriches scholarly discourse by making scholars aware of other work that may support or refine their own, and which they would never meet if they remained exclusively within their own departments.

Interdisciplinary centers like the Robert Penn Warren Center for the Humanities could be expanded to serve and represent a variety of colleges. Administration should encourage such groups and such efforts, be they as informal as a brown-bag lunch, or as institutionalized as the Robert Penn Warren Center. We could institute a system of reward and recognition for scholars who bridge disciplines.

I do believe that Vanderbilt is often encumbered by past success and the sometimes ponderous weight of tradition on this campus. That has to do with economic tradition as well as social and intellectual tradition. The comfort of tradition is a catalyst for nothing, and we need to reclaim a sense of urgency, to stop reacting. We must create a new tradition, a tradition of change, a tradition that values change as important.

We have to liberate energies that have been imprisoned by our motives, procedures, habits and thoughts. Universities are places of energy, but not of energy expended to maintain the status quo. We have to open up possibilities for change.

I will respect the traditions of this University, but I will also harness and nurture new ideas and new traditions. Vanderbilt has great strengths that must be sustained, but the same time we must identify new opportunities and move swiftly to place Vanderbilt at the forefront of intellectual life in this country. We must have a bold and clear understanding of what our future encompasses.

I know that each of you wonders, of course, what will come of the rhetoric of change: the reviews, the plans, the ideas. Each action we take will be performed lovingly, and out of respect for our academic and institutional heritage, but it is time for us to look ahead, and begin to consolidate, reconfigure and prepare for the future while respecting the past and furthering Vanderbilt's mission. We will be taking actions that transform. We must develop vision in order to do this. We must have the courage to make strategic choices.

We must learn to grow by substitution, rather than accretion. Last year, the "Lehrer News Hour" featured a story on some automobile designers that had completely redesigned the way an automobile works. Not just the exterior of the car, but its inner mechanics. The interior design was so simple -- a cylinder around a cylinder, and the car was moved by their spinning. Under the hood was clean and white, with only two large parts, spinning. The car could drive forever on very little fuel. One of the designers pointed out that there was no reason for this car not to be put into production, that it was so much cleaner and safer and more efficient than the cars we use, which can break in a thousand different ways. The crux of the feature was that if cars were

redesigned today, with our present technology, there is no way any engineer would ever build an engine that looks or functions like the monster that powers our present automobiles. That engine has developed by accretion, by problem-solving along the way. If someone were asked to identify the basic function of a car, he would say, "To help us move from place to place swiftly and safely." He would not say, "To burn a lot of petrol." Why not use the model which allows the function to be accomplished with the most grace?

We have to realize that academic priorities should be the creative driving force of our identity, and the organization of the University should reflect those priorities. It should be clearer than it is, and simpler than it is, and its structure should more accurately reflect its function.

I have had almost seven months to gain a great sense of this University, of where we are and where we must now concentrate on going. I have come here and I have observed, and it is now time to move ahead. I am profoundly committed to the University, and that commitment allows me to say what I will say now.

We have every right to celebrate ourselves. We are justified in celebrating our achievements. I do not think that we do enough of that at this school. I do not think Vanderbilt realizes what a force it is, of positive change in the world, of intellectual service and community service (and do not think those are exclusive of one another by the way). We are better than we know we are, let me say that again, we are better than we know we are. Perhaps that is what keeps us going, that sense of second-best, of cultural hybridity, of inferiority. We tend to be driven by a negative elitism: if we are so good, then why are we here?

We have to stop using other institutions as our benchmarks, and set our own benchmark, in terms of where we are going. We have earned that right. We are a power everywhere on this campus. We have to claim all of our accomplishments as Vanderbilt's accomplishments, and realize what they mean: that they are remarkable accomplishments indeed, and that they belong to all of us, whether the signs outside our own buildings are brown or blue.

Let me just say, that I have the opportunity, and I won't go through all of these because of the time constraints, but I've had an opportunity to visit many of the laboratories, the libraries, much of what you are doing it is remarkable what this faculty is accomplishing. The pride and the integrity and the intellectual delivery are amongst the best in the world.

So the question is, how do we make the best better? How do we improve on something wonderful? First of all, by admitting that it is wonderful in the first place, and that its immense wonder has made us greedy for more. We have to arrive at a point at which we can say: we have come this far and done this well on a certain model -- what will allow us to reach even further and even faster?

As I have reviewed a number of issues over the past seven months, I have formulated five strategic goals for change at the University, which I believe are of the highest significance in our efforts to move Vanderbilt into its next stage of existence. The strategic planning process that is already under way is a blueprint for achieving these goals, which will serve as an architecture of change. These goals will drive us into all we are trying to accomplish. For today's presentation, I will call these five goals "challenges." They are challenges for you, for myself and for this University. They are challenges we shall meet in order to become what it is possible for us to be. They will initiate processes that will evolve us.

These are my ideas. This is my vision for what Vanderbilt can be, for what I believe our possibilities are, to which you will contribute through argument and discussion.

The first challenge I want to issue to you is this: we must renew our commitment to the undergraduate experience at Vanderbilt. We have to reaffirm the experience of undergraduates at Vanderbilt by interrogating not only the vitality and vigor of our curriculum but also the quality of our support for students: be it in advising, in the libraries, or more particularly in the facilities that support student life. Is the experience of an undergraduate student at Vanderbilt a total, immersed learning experience? If we are going to maintain a standard of excellence in an increasingly technocratic, globalized society, we have to do it by making Vanderbilt a dynamic, student-based learning community. We must be advocates for our students.

We have to ensure that our students do not believe that education stops as soon as they are out of class. Education is a continuum; it does not come in blocks of K through 12 then undergraduate and then graduate, and then learning stops; it is K through life.

The way we can convince students that this is so is by creating an exhilarating learning experience here that extends beyond formal classes. We must create an environment with lures that curiosity cannot resist, that are subtly driven to enhance and underline what a student is learning in her classes. This stimulus is not a distraction from her proper studies, but bolsters them. By creating an atmosphere that is intellectually exhilarating, we will foster in students a greater commitment to their studies, and will get them in the habit of pursuing learning their whole lives long. We will create a taste for learning, a hunger for it -- may I even suggest an addiction to it?

Students should be able to integrate their entire educational experience. They should be able to perceive it as relevant in the world and informed by the world. This is the only way they will be adequately prepared to lead within their communities, and in their society. We must coordinate and integrate academic and student services in a way that recognizes the complexity of undergraduate experience.

I want to congratulate efforts such as Project Dialogue and the McGill Weekly Seminars, which achieve that integration, which bring intellectual debate and discussion into our students' very residences. The Provost's Office is currently identifying elements in residential-college systems which bear emulating here at Vanderbilt. We must maintain and ensure excellent learning and living spaces and services which facilitate interaction among faculty, students and staff, and which serve the academic, social and recreational needs of all students.

And I do mean all students. There is a lack of diversity on this campus, one that is either ignored or resented or lamented. It is one that particularly for economic reasons has been difficult to overcome.

But I want to emphasize that diversity travels deeper than the skin. Diversity shows in thought. Diversity originates in culture, in economic background, and in religious background. We will work specifically to improve minority faculty and student recruitment and retention. We will strive to create a climate within the University that is multiracial, multicultural and multireligious. The only way to prepare our students to lead in the world, I believe, is to give them a place to grow in that reflects a multitude of colors, thinks from a multitude of perspectives and speaks a multitude of tongues.

We do them a disservice if the only differences they encounter occur in the texts they read. And we do ourselves a disservice as faculty if we do not create a student body that is intellectually diverse and therefore stimulating. The quality of a campus' intellectual life consists not only in the teacher's challenging the classroom but also in the classroom's challenging the teacher.

I want to promote a spirit of community that is based on respecting and understanding differences, building on commonalties, and living and learning together productively.

Our mission, must be, over all, the preservation, and transmission of knowledge.

We will have no compromises on this front. A symbiosis must be achieved, then, between teaching and learning. We have a nearly even balance in our student population between undergraduate and graduate students. I want us to be a University College with a capital "C" and a capital "U." We must balance the two.

To this end, I issue the second challenge: we must reinvent graduate education at Vanderbilt. We must ask ourselves how to strengthen our graduate programs.

How do we attract the best graduate students? How do we bring them here, make them want to be here, when we are competing with other schools, when we are competing with corporations that woo them away with real money? What do we have with which to decorate our bower? Can we identify other areas of support for graduate education? Exploring these questions requires a vigorous review of our doctoral programs and fundamental changes in some of those programs.

This exploration requires us to invest further in our faculty and to recruit and support without relent the best graduate students. Ladies and gentlemen, we are in a war for talent, plain and simple: not only for graduate students who will attract the most accomplished faculty, but also for faculty who will attract the most accomplished graduate students. We must focus on improving the quality and effectiveness of our research capacities. Enhancing our graduate program is essential not only to our University's national and international reputation, but also to the basic functioning of this University community. Research and graduate education truly do inform the quality of our teaching and through that, of our undergraduate programs.

We must determine the standards against which support for graduate programs is measured, as well as the process for developing those standards and allocation mechanisms. We must possess the will to make tough and sometimes conflicting choices. We must commit to the proposition that to strengthen graduate education at Vanderbilt will require choices, and that inevitably there will be reallocations that sustain and enhance the quality of the entire University. We may be even required to eliminate and consolidate some programs even as we strengthen others, even as we examine new, less traditional graduate opportunities, such as master's degree programs, and postdoctoral work.

Our University must function as an integrated body. It is imperative that we investigate the contribution of every organ in that body.

So that brings me to my third challenge. We must, therefore, reintegrate professional education with the intellectual life of the University. As you well know, our professional schools are magnificently successful, but we cannot allow them to remain isolated within the University. They are a part of us, and the work they do is to the credit of all of us. They extend the University directly into the outer world through their work and the work of their graduates, and it

is through the professional schools that Vanderbilt's presence is most directly felt within the community.

Because of this engagement, they set high standards for the rest of the University.

They are leaders. Other schools may capitalize upon that leadership by working closely with them. Professional schools can share their resources and their faculty with graduate and undergraduate programs. For example: cross-listing and interdisciplinary work among the Law School, the Philosophy Department and the Department of Medicine could result in exciting new studies of ethics. Cross-disciplinary efforts only enhance the quality of each program involved. Why should undergraduates not have access to all of the best minds at Vanderbilt, regardless of their school affiliation? If we are truly a University College, we must make such movement possible. Drawing from our resources in our professional schools will integrate the University even further, making all schools richer.

It is easy to pay lip service to work across the disciplines, and across the colleges.

So therefore, our fourth challenge, and the one which will enable so many of the others, is for us to reexamine and restructure economic models.

Our budgetary system has made us very successful financially, but we must ask ourselves what barriers it creates to our intellectual life. Does it create, not only sociological divisions between departments that might otherwise be able to work more cooperatively, but an ethical confusion in identifying the mission of this University?

We are too tradition-based in our economic models. We rely too much on the old engine simply because it is what we are used to, even as we swear at it, overheated and steaming on the side of the road. We hide behind an ETOB model, with each division its own financial center -- a highly decentralized budgeting system. We use that as an excuse for our inability to do things: "You can't do that" how many times have I heard this? "You can't do that because the system won't allow it!" There is no system that will not allow us to do something.

We must have an open, transparent, integrated budget/planning process that will build confidence within our University community, that possesses the strengths of ETOB, but does not require as much negotiation, and speeds the distribution of necessary funds.

We have to streamline and improve the effectiveness of University operations (administrative and otherwise), and the first place to do this is within the budget. Our budget must be made more flexible, with intercollege transinstitutional support, with central funding available for investment in academic priorities that transcend school and departmental lines.

ETOB inhibits our sense of purpose. It confuses our mission, when we are preoccupied with cash flow and with who is picking up the check. I will seek your views on redesigning our economic models and on creating new resources and sources of revenue that are consistent with the University's mission.

I have also asked Vice Chancellor for Administration Lauren Brisky to chair an ongoing Vanderbilt Performance Review, which I have affectionately dubbed The Red Tape Reduction Effort. We are seeking to debureaucratize the functioning of the University while we study new economic models.

This investigation has drawn our attention to related issues. We simply cannot continue to raise tuition to ever-higher levels, or to create dollars at the margins, as a substitute for the

comprehensive restructuring of the University's economic models. Our fundraising efforts must be strategic and not sporadic, and should support the academic priorities we determine in advance, and not the other way around. We simply cannot rely on tuition alone or overhead alone or fundraising alone as means of generating new revenue for the University.

As we formulate our mission, we must take into account this fifth challenge: we must renew Vanderbilt's covenant with the community. We are a private University, but we are in Nashville's, in the nation's, and in the world's service. We must rededicate our commitment to those larger communities, and continue to reach out to this wider world, to further our social mission.

We must perform a daily examination of conscience, to ask ourselves, are we making a difference in the world? What are our obligations to the communities that support us?

We have to admit that Vanderbilt is not always particularly known for our emphasis on service to the community. We do serve the community, in so many different ways, but the problem is that for some reason this is not visible from other points of view.

You have heard the phrase, "316 acres surrounded by reality," and the term "Vanderbubble," to describe the state of our interactions with the outside world.

And it is an outside world. One senses this in stepping off of hot, noisy, smelly West End and into our quiet green shades which buffer the noise from the surrounding streets so well. Inside, we are protected, which is good for thought, but bad for the view from West End. The shade and the fences render us at best invisible, at worst elitist and disengaged.

We have to make our good works visible. We have to publicize the good we do. We must promote our positive influence through strategic outreach to local, national and international presences. And we have to examine how we reward service at Vanderbilt.

Could service be honored with tuition relief? Or, with other kinds of distinctions?

What is the role of an institution like Vanderbilt? Why do students come here, when they can get an approximate education at Virginia or North Carolina? The great land-grant institutions were founded under the idea that students would return home after receiving their degrees to make their hometowns better places, to improve life there. While Vanderbilt does not operate under this model, we need to determine exactly what our commitment to the community looks like.

I believe it is this -- that we set standards for the world, that is the role of Vanderbilt-- to set standards for the word for other colleges to follow -- that we train students not simply to go home, but to be leaders, not just empty suits, not just walking jobs with no values. We set standards. We have the responsibility to lead change. Leadership means engaging people intellectually, empowering them and enabling them to make a difference in their own lives and the lives of others. If we could embody the notion of leadership in each individual within the institution, the character, chemistry and commitment of the University would alter substantially.

We must take advantage of our location in Nashville, Tenn. We must leave our isolation and our arrogance -- the "Vanderbubble" -- and be of our community, not just in it. We must become an engaged institution.

So, I will work to ensure that our days of being seen as isolated and arrogant are over.

The future of this University must be one of involvement with public issues and with public dialogue. People will come here because of what we have done to make our community more lively and interesting and creative.

We are obligated to work for the common good. We are obligated to contribute to the cultural resources of this community. We are obligated to bolster its economic vitality. We are obligated to link our intellectual resources and our research capacity to initiatives designed to improve the community's health and well-being.

Peabody students work greatly to improve the quality of local public schools. Doctors and nurses at the Medical Center work around the clock to care for the sick and the injured of our community. The new Ingram Concert Hall at Blair will be made available for public use. We should ask ourselves regularly how we can in the best conscience use the resources with which we are so richly endowed.

And now, to the final question, isn't that a lovely word? Why am I at Vanderbilt, and why are you? Why would we be at a small, elite, private, highly selective institution, when we are not really making a difference in the world? Or are we?

We have a particular role to play, and we need to remember this every day when we wake up. We are great because we are different. We are great because we think about ourselves differently. We have to be confident enough to set our own standards, although those standards should always be of excellence.

Our excellence is evident in our commitment to ethical conduct, in our honesty and in our integrity.

I do not think of Vanderbilt as a corporation. I am not a CEO. I am a teacher, and we are in our own unique business, that although able to benefit from corporate models, defies and transcends those models.

We have so much to achieve together.

I realize that I must earn your trust and support over time. I will be open to you, and candid with you, willing to listen to you and learn from you and, of course, I will take correction from you. I will communicate with you frequently, and I anticipate the same from you. I expect us to work as a team. You will participate in these processes of change. They will not, ladies and gentlemen, they will not come about through great reckonings in little rooms.

They are challenges to you, but to me as well, because you will check me against them, and I will myself every day, to see how well I have done.

So, ladies and gentlemen, we have the talent and the wisdom to experiment, to take calculated risks, to be practical, but also innovative and aware. We have it in our power to become the preeminent learning community of the future, a place where passionate deliberation creates resourceful solutions, where camaraderie nurtures tolerance, where enlightenment and logic minimize politics.

We have it in our power to be a place at the center of a revitalized American intellectualism for decades to come.

Well, I have had much to say this afternoon, and I realize that many of you do not have unlimited time, and that we have run long. I have had microphones set up for you, so that you

could ask me questions, but I know that I need to let you go. So, I will leave the microphones standing and I will leave them open as a symbol that our conversation will continue. I thank you for your presence and your patience. And I thank you for the honor to serve Vanderbilt. Thank you very much.

Gee's five challenges to the Faculty Assembly

1) "We must renew our commitment to the undergraduate experience at Vanderbilt."

2) "We must reinvent graduate education at Vanderbilt."

3) "We must re-integrate professional education with the intellectual life of the University."

4) "Our fourth challenge, and the one which will enable so many of the others, is for us to reexamine and restructure economic models."

5) "We must renew Vanderbilt's covenant with the community."

The Faculty Assembly passed four proposals to change the composition of the Faculty Senate:

1) increase the total number of elected senators from 47 to 48;

2) increase the number of elected senators representing the School of Medicine from 11 to 13;

3) decrease the number of elected senators representing the College of Arts and Science from 16 to 15; and

4) cap the number of elected senators representing any one school or college at no more than one-third of the total number of elected senators. These proposals were put forth by the Senate Affairs Committee and were accepted by the Faculty Senate April 6, 2000. These changes will take effect with the Senate spring 2001 elections.

Appendix iv

It's About Time . . . and Change
by E. Gordon Gee

It Is About Time . . . and Change

On October 4, 2007, President Gee addressed the Faculty Council in Weigel Hall to celebrate Ohio State and outline his goals for the university.

I thank all of you for being here this afternoon.

It has been said that opportunities are never lost. Someone will take the ones you miss. Last July, Ohio State opened its arms to this prodigal son and offered me an opportunity—a treasure—beyond compare. I return to you with gratitude, with hope, with conviction, and with excitement about the days ahead.

As I look out on all your faces, I realize that it is my great good fortune to know many of you already. For those of you with whom I am not yet acquainted, I hope that this will be the beginning of a long, rich conversation that will take place over the coming years.

Many of those I do not know are new members of our faculty. May I ask those of you who are new to the university this year to please stand to be recognized?

Welcome. Your colleagues and I are delighted that you have chosen Ohio State as your professional home.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have much to say to you this afternoon. I am here with one goal: to celebrate this institution. Your accomplishments define it. They will continue to distinguish it. In the next few minutes, I want to talk to you about this university—about its time, and about its change. I want to acknowledge what you and this university have accomplished, and I want to propose what we can accomplish together.

As you know, I have taken a 10-year sabbatical from Ohio State. In that decade, I have learned a thing or two about being a university president. And in my absence, Ohio State has become a more interesting, more admired, more powerful institution. Naturally, I hope my absence is not the reason for those differences!

Here are just a few of the landmarks that suggest the university's spectacular upward trajectory of the last 10 years.

The new freshmen you have just welcomed into your classes are the best-prepared students in Ohio State history. Their average ACT score is 27, compared to 23.9 just 10 years ago.

This year also witnessed a spectacular increase in the number of students who graduated at the top of their high school classes. More than half of our new freshmen—52 percent to be exact—were in the top 10 percent of their graduating classes. Last year, that number was 43 percent. And ten years ago, it was 26 percent—exactly one-half of this year's total.

Our students of color are staying at Ohio State in record numbers. In fact, the retention rate among these students is virtually equal to our retention rate overall.

Our research expenditures have reached an all-time high of $720 million. Ten years ago, it was $289 million, or about a third of today's total. Even so, we have just started. $720 million is but the beginning.

Thanks to the Targeted Investments in Excellence program, Ohio State researchers are defining and driving the solutions to some of the most critical of today's scientific, social, and cultural issues.

And let me say something right here. This is an important program that has my full support. I am convinced that the reputation of this institution will be enhanced because of our Targeted Investments in Excellence initiatives.

In another measure of our reputation, Ohio State now boasts 127 faculty who have been honored as fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, making ours one of the largest contingents of AAAS fellows in the country.

Our presence in the community is felt in myriad ways. As just one example, the expertise of Ohio State faculty and graduate students from the Knowlton School of Architecture is helping communities in coastal Mississippi to rebuild in the wake of Hurricane Katrina.

Closer to home, the African American and African Studies Community Extension Center is Ohio State in our city's Mount Vernon neighborhood.

For that matter, citizens in every Ohio county are helped by University Extension training programs that extend the resources of the university to our rural, suburban, and urban communities.

As you can see from even this partial list of accomplishments, Ohio State has an enduring commitment to quality.

That is why I was able to tell the Board of Trustees last July that the university has moved from good to excellent. That is also why we are ready for the next step: the stride from excellent to eminent, the leap from visible to visionary.

Colleagues, my resolve—and my commitment to you—is that together, we will propel our institution forward, faster, further. Much will happen over the next few years. This university will perforce accomplish and advance. It will create and contribute. With time comes change.

Since being honored with the responsibility of Ohio State's presidency, I have met with faculty leadership, all of our college deans, and many other faculty and staff across the campus. Together, we have talked about the direction we will give to Ohio State over the next several years. We have also talked about how we can achieve that direction and what impact we will expect from altering the status quo.

These issues are fundamental to the 21st-century character of this institution. And, as you see, they all have to do with time and change, the words at the heart of our alma mater, the notions at the very center of our university tradition.

Today, I will talk about making the coming years Ohio State's time, about ensuring that this university—over time and with change—will become not merely excellent but also eminent, not just visible but also visionary.

In the coming months, I invite you to debate me, and to disagree with me. I encourage you to do that. I expect you to do that. And after our discussion, we will work together on a common course of action.

Let me begin that conversation today by laying out my six strategic goals for making this institution the best Ohio State possible. Today, I will give you a 10,000-foot snapshot of these

goals, with the promise that on-the-ground details will come in later conversations. I have thought about these goals a great deal. I truly believe these are the goals that will continue to spur the momentum of the university, so that it distinguishes itself beyond all measure in the years to come.

First, let us forge one Ohio State University. Let us begin to think of ourselves as the university, not a collection of colleges hitched to a heating plant, or a detachment of departments connected by corridors.

I have said in other settings that we are the most massive intellectual platform in America gathered on one campus.

We unite a stellar liberal arts tradition with professional schools that are second to none and health sciences on the frontiers of medical discovery.

Let us capitalize on that big platform, on that one platform, to make one big, bold statement about The Ohio State University: we are a single-minded institution with world-wide reach. As one Ohio State University, we can shine like a beacon across time and space, across time and change.

I want Ohio State to be the university equivalent of the Great Wall of China: visible to the naked eye from outer space. Like that wall, which stretches some 4,000 miles toward the horizon, I want us to conceive of ourselves horizontally. I want us to define ourselves not narrowly but comprehensively. And that calls for thinking that is no longer intramural but trans-institutional.

What do I mean by "trans-institutional"?

What I mean is a different model of organizing ourselves. We all know how universities are configured. Discipline-based departments are collected into the broader disciplinary units we call colleges.

A lot of well-intended lip service has for years been given to interdisciplinarity, and, frankly, Ohio State is ahead of many other institutions in valuing cross-cutting scholarship. Why, though, does Ohio State find it necessary to have so many centers and institutes—15 new ones in just the last 10 years? Is that to overcome the disciplinary barriers we have created? If so, that is unfortunate because I am a believer in centers and institutes. We need to be about removing barriers, not just overcoming them.

For that reason, I am announcing that we will be establishing the Ohio State Ventures Program. I will work with Provost Joe Alutto, Senior Vice President for Research Bob McGrath, our chief financial officer Bill Shkurti, and others to identify a substantial pool of money that will initiate a dramatic change in university-think. The Ohio State Ventures Program will allow us to inaugurate and sustain the university of the future, the trans-institutional Ohio State University.

I want to make it clear that when I talk about being "trans-institutional," I am not talking about spending endless hours restructuring the university. What I am talking about is creating incentives that encourage the emergence of free-standing new structures that cut across boundaries and make departmental and college borders more permeable.

This redefining of ourselves as a trans-institutional university will mean that scholars from different disciplines can work seamlessly—without worrying about overhead costs and which unit gets credit for what they do.

After 28 years as a university president, I have come to realize that universities must become more nimble and must not be restrained by traditional academic labels. Our future is in differentiation, not in someone else's classification.

You may agree or disagree, but I am telling you that if we have the will and the courage to take the lead, Ohio State can launch the university of the future. We can be either the architect of change ... or its victim. Ohio State can be the visionary that values the trans-institutional as the new norm.

We can start that transition by accelerating the integration of research, teaching, and service across the intellectual life of this university. We need to find ways to recognize faculty for their strengths. Not everyone is equally accomplished as a scholar, teacher, and academic servant; and not every faculty member's professional trajectory will follow traditional disciplinary paths. Thus, we cannot have a horizontal university and have a vertical rewards system.

By that I mean that we must value contributions of all kinds. We must ensure, for example, that the university recognizes the philosopher who joins with the engineer who joins with the physician to develop a medical procedure that saves lives—even if their departments struggle with how to acknowledge their contributions.

Now, with the changes I am proposing, I am not advocating that we forsake altogether the traditions that have brought us to where we are today. No. We simply do not want to be stifled by them.

Fortunately, Ohio State's Academic Plan affirms the uncompromising core values of this university. It will therefore serve as our guidepost as we broaden the paths to intellectual cooperation. Since I have been here, many people have asked me if we will continue with the Academic Plan, or whether we will modify it, or maybe even abandon it altogether.

I will tell you today that we will not abandon our Academic Plan, although, in the coming months, we will develop fresh approaches for accomplishing its goals. Those goals are crowned by this overarching one: that Ohio State will be the premier land-grant research university in the nation. To reach that touchstone, we must all work with common purpose, however uncommon our ways of doing so. That is the reason we must act as one Ohio State.

I want to emphasize that a commitment to being one Ohio State University will never prohibit a commitment to diversity and pluralism. If the Great Wall—to resume that metaphor—was built to keep in and keep out, this institution glad heartedly disseminates its expertise, nurtures its accomplished faculty and staff, and eagerly welcomes all qualified students.

And I do mean all students, which brings me to the second strategic goal that I have as your president: put students first.

Teaching and learning are the most important activities that take place at any college or university. Institutions of higher learning are called that for a reason. So, being student-centered is a fundamental priority for Ohio State.

Some of you may remember that in the mid-1990s I chaired the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. The heart of institutional concerns, according to the final reports of the commission, should be the student. Our students, when they leave us, must be prepared to negotiate successfully in a world that will bombard them with more information, more perspectives, more everything than anything we know today. With the instant availability of information on the Internet; with instant message and data management on your Blackberry; and with instant access to just about anybody anywhere anytime on your cell phone, the world is at once more knowable and more difficult to sort out.

To that picture, add all of today's new media like pod casts and YouTube and MySpace, and you have a world that is wired to demand instant assimilation, instant interpretation, and instant decision-making. It is a world that is more global, more interconnected, and more interdependent.

The best way to prepare students to be leaders in such a world is to ensure that our one Ohio State University is based on sharing a passion for learning and ideas, valuing a more civil and democratic future, understanding and respecting differences, recognizing and building on commonalities, and holding sacred the right to stand up for one's own beliefs—and the need to stand up for those of others.

Our one Ohio State University also includes the unequivocal obligation to provide access to a diverse population, including low-income and first-generation students who historically have not had an opportunity to experience the American dream. We will welcome students whose differences expand the intellectual vitality of our campus community, and we will provide them all—undergraduate, graduate, and professional student alike—with unique and compelling educational experiences.

Putting students first means making their learning experiences just as horizontal as the rest of the university. We—and they—must understand education as a continuum, not as K through 12, followed by college and perhaps advanced study, followed by the closing of the books forever. On the contrary! We must believe—and we must convince our students—that learning does not stop as soon as they are out of the classroom or out of school. It is a wonderful life-long love affair. Life-long learning ensures that we make ongoing contributions to our communities and enjoy enduring success in society. Learning is K through life.

The revitalized undergraduate curriculum launched this fall prepares students for life-long learning. But we must build on it. We must plan to align curricular structures institution-wide so as to draw to the fullest on the intellectual synergies inspired by our one Ohio State. And then, our undergraduate and graduate curricula must reinforce each other, irrespective of how they reinforce the budget model or individual faculty agendas.

Our intent—our only intent—must be that our curricula serve our students well. And as that happens, we will attract increasingly well prepared undergraduates and graduate students and the most accomplished faculty to teach them. These faculty, in turn, will help us recruit even more accomplished undergraduates and graduate students.

Our recruitment of exceptional graduate students will also be enhanced by the doctoral education review that is being led by Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School Pat Osmer. Strengthening our doctoral programs is essential to our university's national and international reputation. It is also fundamental to the basic functioning of this university community. Graduate

education and research inform the quality of our teaching and through that, of our undergraduate programs.

So, as you can see, I truly do believe that education is a continuum—and not just for the individual learner, but for the institution as well.

It has been said that research is the mind of the university and teaching its heart. I have also heard it said that research is to teaching as sin is to confession. Without the one, there is not much need for the other. Be that as it may, what do we intend by so rigorously categorizing research, on the one hand, and teaching, on the other? We talk about research opportunities and teaching loads. Think about that.

This kind of rhetoric suggests a university divided, not integrated. Research and teaching are not mutually exclusive; they are mutually inclusive.

To be true to our vision of one Ohio State, we must create a seamless atmosphere in which teaching is seen as a form of scholarship and in which scholarship is understood as a stimulus to teaching. This brings me to the third strategy I want Ohio State to pursue. I want this university to focus on faculty success as never before.

We must do everything we can to retain, attract, and reward world-class teachers and researchers. The previous strategy of putting students first makes it clear why this step is appropriate and necessary. Ohio State's investment in its students is vital to our progress. Just as vital is our investment in you.

There is no doubt that Ohio State is attracting and retaining the best faculty. But in the predatory world of the Academy—and believe me, as one of its chief predators, I know whereof I speak—we have to do still more. We must re-recruit our faculty every day, and then we have to continue to advance the institution by recruiting additional pre-eminent faculty.

I have a personal commitment to recruiting the very best minds. Please count on me to be a full partner in your recruiting efforts. Please call on me to do whatever it takes to help you get the best.

But let me be clear. If we are to be one Ohio State, we must understand that in many areas "best" is not defined by the amount of extramural funding that supports a scholar's work. And so, we have to have reward systems that ensure that we keep the best broadly defined, for we know that your eminence becomes our eminence. Your reputation becomes our reputation. Your success becomes our success.

And with your success comes responsibility. Thus, our focus on faculty success will require a new codicil in the compact between this university and you. Just as Ohio State will do all it can to maximize your professional success, today this institution is calling on you to maximize your contributions to the success of your students, the community, the state, and beyond. I ask this because I believe in you. That means I can ask big things of you—and know that you will far, far exceed expectation.

And let me be quick to acknowledge the considerable contributions of our staff members to the success of each and every one of us. Without their support, we could not accomplish our work. They are full partners in our efforts. Everyone who works here is engaged in our common academic endeavor. It is thanks to our nearly 20,000 staff members working in just as many ways that this university can perform its functions.

Ultimately, then, this university, this one Ohio State, is its people and its programs. In fact, that is why I decided to return to Ohio State—its people and its programs, and the promise they hold for so much more. My aspirations for Ohio State are endless because of my respect for our university family. My expectations of Ohio State are boundless because its programs are prominent in the national arena and on the global stage as well.

As just one example, let me cite the work of our colleagues in the Medical Center. This year, for the 15th consecutive year, U.S. News & World Report recognized Ohio State's Medical Center hospitals among our nation's very best. The magazine cited seven of our medical specialties, including a top-15 ranking for our cancer care and a top-10 ranking for the rehabilitation program. Clearly, Ohio State is poised to be a global leader in the health sciences.

That global aspiration leads me to the fourth strategic goal of my presidency. I want us to recast our research agenda by stimulating new discoveries on the frontiers of research and innovation. We must increase our return on investment in such discoveries. We must promote and sustain external partnerships that have the capacity to transform knowledge and innovation into new technologies and new companies and put them to work for Ohio and its citizens.

Our one Ohio State trans-institutional model in fact encourages partnerships with both public and private entities. And here, let me say that we have no reason to fear partnering with other institutions, for partnerships can lead to exciting new synergies and broader opportunities for all partners.

We must also look with new eyes at how such partnerships can extend our own capacity for innovation. I have already mentioned the Ohio State Ventures Program that will expand research beyond disciplinary tradition, beyond accustomed area and aspect. In addition, I will ask Vice President McGrath to identify still other ways to support projects that might be too daring for external funding.

Let me remind you that innovation takes many forms. Ohio State innovators include the extension faculty member who trains landowners in woodland management, the specialist in consumer behavior who helps businesses market more effectively, and the expert in literacy who helps prepare the next generation of school teachers.

And then there are our colleagues in the liberal arts: the historian who provides us with new understandings of Philip the Second of Spain, the choreographer who devises a new system of dance notation, the political scientist who studies democratization, the poet who causes us to look at familiar phenomena with new eyes.

All of these colleagues play a leading role in keeping Ohio State's crucible of creation bubbling on the front burner of the world. And so, let us celebrate the achievements of our faculty in the languages, fine arts, philosophy, social sciences, and cultural studies. For, in the end, the liberal arts are the defining elements of a university. And their excellence—I would remind you—is not measured by the extramural funding that supports them.

Ohio State is already doing much to encourage discovery and innovation in the laboratory, on our farms and fields, in the economies of the world, and—of course—in the library. I am watching day by day the progress on the renovation of the Thompson Library. This jewel that crowns our Oval will be a model information age facility when it reopens in 2009. It is only fitting that a leading research university like ours have such a library as its geographical and spiritual center.

In today's knowledge society, university-based research has never been more crucial. The public research university has emerged as the nation's primary engine for the production of knowledge. New knowledge enhances economic competitiveness, increases the resources available for addressing the needs of the less-advantaged, and allows for productive careers that support joyous lives. Indeed, the future quality of life in this nation depends on the ability of the research university to remain in the vanguard of development and discovery.

Today, our mission, our imperative to create new knowledge is considered by many to be a sacred social compact. Ohio State must not fail to keep that compact. We must capture the hearts and minds of our fellow Ohioans and demonstrate to them that this university will make a difference in their lives. And then, we must do so. We must not fail to keep our compact with our fellow citizens because all of us have an all-important stake in the future of the state of Ohio and our nation. By the same token, the state cannot be vital and progressive without the leadership of a great university.

That means we must commit to our communities and revitalize our covenants with them. This is the fifth strategic goal I want to talk about today.

We are the nation's largest campus, but we are not a world unto ourselves. We are located in Columbus, in Ohio, in the United States. We are in the service of these larger communities. For that matter, we are in the world's service. Starting today, we must recommit ourselves to those larger constituencies.

Understanding our responsibilities to Ohio taxpayers who want their assets to be used wisely and with a strong sense of stewardship, we must begin to examine our conscience every day and ask ourselves: Are we making a difference in the state and in the world? Are we fulfilling our obligations to the communities that support us? Are we keeping that sacred compact?

Our great land-grant institutions were founded in the finest tradition of American optimism and altruism. An inherent principle of the land-grant institution was that students would return home after receiving their degrees and make their hometowns better places. That is still the idea, only hometowns are now all over the globe. As a land-grant institution, Ohio State must train students not simply to go home, but to go wherever their calling takes them and be leaders, blazing paths that take them beyond the routine, the expected, and the easy.

Through the students it prepares, and through its faculty whose research takes us from middle earth to outer space, the sun never sets on Ohio State, for Ohio State is a truly global university. That means we must act like a global university. We must use our teaching and scholarship to make a difference in the lives of others. That calls on us as never before to internationalize our curriculum; to broaden opportunities for Ohio State students to learn outside our borders; to open our doors still wider to international students and scholars; and to accelerate our efforts to build relationships with institutions throughout the world.

All the goals I have discussed thus far depend on our ability to be agile in action and urgent of purpose. And that brings me to the sixth and final strategic goal I want to discuss today. We must simplify university systems and structures so that they promote our progress.

Let us examine and modify our administrative practices so that The Ohio State University makes the public proud and allows our faculty, staff, and students to thrive. We have to earn their

and your trust through an uncompromising focus on performance, through transparency and accountability.

It is just my fourth official day as your president, but I have already heard from many of you that our internal regulations often make it harder for you to do your work. Now, I fully understand that we have the obligation to protect public dollars and that we have to meet fiduciary requirements to do so. But I am convinced that we can meet all of those requirements and still eliminate impediments to our progress.

I am challenging all of us to find ways to simplify our practices, infuse them with common sense, and thereby enhance our ability to be productive. One way we will do that is by reviewing our current budget system. What kinds of incentives, disincentives, and distortions ensue from that system? I ask this question because I do not know the answers. But we will find them.

Provost Alutto and Senior Vice President for Business and Finance Bill Shkurti have already appointed a special faculty-staff committee to review the university's budget process. The committee will study all aspects of our budget. But for me, the fundamental question is how well the budget model supports and facilitates our academic mission. In other words, is our budgetary process aligned with our aspirations so that—as I said a moment ago—Ohio State can be agile in action and urgent of purpose?

Being agile and urgent means thinking more creatively and sharing services and resources where appropriate. I am calling on our deans and vice presidents to do so.

State officials have said publicly and have told me privately they want to support higher education in Ohio. They have also said that they expect us to streamline services and work collaboratively. As the state's acknowledged flagship institution, we have the resources and the ability and the responsibility to lead our sister institutions in this effort. And we will do that.

Still other new budget and administrative models may well be required in order to provide you with the laboratories, the libraries, the studios, and the research support you need to succeed. These models will include increasing revenues through new partnerships with industry and agriculture; new entrepreneurial initiatives, including the commercialization of some research; and new efforts to reduce costs and focus our investments.

We will also dramatically accelerate our private fund-raising efforts. Our upcoming Capital Campaign of $2.5 billion—or maybe more—will provide the margin of excellence as we pursue the strategic goals I have outlined today.

I am already confident of its success because we are a superb investment—with the promise of powerful returns on that investment as we prepare future leaders for our nation and our world; as we create new knowledge that addresses today's most crucial issues; as we serve society's needs by changing lives around the world.

I hope you have had the opportunity to see Ohio State's new public service announcement that is airing on television. It is being shown, for instance, during every Big Ten football game this fall. You will see it, of course, assuming the cable companies and the Big Ten Network can work out their differences!

The theme of the public service announcement is that Ohio State is the university that changes lives. It shows images of people in locations around the world forming our traditional

and beloved O-H-I-O. It serves as a reminder that, as I said earlier, the sun truly never sets on Ohio State. This institution is everywhere in the world all the time. And with that kind of global presence comes an enormous responsibility because what Ohio State is about, finally, is doing the world's good.

How do we know if we are succeeding in that noble enterprise? How, you may be asking, will our efforts be affected by all the rhetoric of change you have heard from me this afternoon? What will come of the goals I have proposed to forge one Ohio State University, to put students first, to focus on faculty success, to recast our research agenda, to commit to our communities, and to simplify systems and structures?

My answer to your unspoken questions is that I do not believe that this is rhetoric. I do believe in the power of this magnificent place. I do believe that if we accomplish the goals I have outlined, we will harness our assets in an unprecedented way.

And what are our primary assets? First and foremost, there is you—our faculty, our massive intellectual platform. Then, there is our resource base, already considerable and set to grow. There is our configuration, which we will maximize as one Ohio State University. Finally, there is the unparalleled support of those who love this institution. To that, I add the good will of our public officials and the leadership of our own Board of Trustees.

Ladies and gentlemen, with assets like these, we have every reason to be the nation's leading public research university. Indeed, I cannot think of one reason why we should not be that leader.

With that in mind, I invite you to think with me for just a moment. Together, let us imagine a public university that is a community of learning and unencumbered thought, a crucible of basic and applied research and creative expression, an independent source of moral authority, an institution committed to the public good, and an agent of opportunity. Ohio State will be all that and more, if we trust and value ourselves as an institution—and if we tirelessly show the public why we exist, for we belong to the people.

With time comes change. It is Ohio State's time to be the university of the American dream, an institution worthy of public trust, and the front door to Ohio's future.

This is my thinking on my fourth day, but I will return to you later this year and many times in the future to seek your counsel about implementing the six goals I have presented to you. I look forward to starting that conversation today.

I thank you for your presence and your patience. And I thank you for the honor of serving Ohio State.

Appendix v

Research Protocols

Conversation Guidelines for Roger Addleman - A Research Protocol

• If one exists, what is the grand narrative - the organizational saga - of The Ohio State University?

• In what ways do you feel that Gordon Gee's personal story matches this grand narrative? In what ways does it clash?

• Does Gordon Gee take special effort to illustrate parallels between his story and that of the university?

• In university fundraising parlance, it is said that "people give money to people". While there is surely truth here, do you feel donors are investing first in the university or in Dr. Gee's leadership?

• As a staff member, did you feel there was sincerity to Dr. Gee's leadership?

• How could you tell if Dr. Gee's passion or belief is missing in a project?

• How often do you believe that Dr. Gee consciously utilizes positional power?

• Does Dr. Gee consciously deal with residue from the stories of previous leaders? And if so, was it advantageous or limiting?

• When it became apparent that Dr. Gee would return to Ohio State, how did it affect donors? Staff? Students? Faculty?

• As the primary leader of the institution, how much of impact will Dr. Gee have on the narrative of the institution - past, present, and future?

Conversation Guidelines for Gordon Gee - A Research Protocol

• Each of us has personal and professional identities we assume depending on the circumstances. Which identity do you find most often dominant, that of an academic or that of a university president?

• How cognizant are you of the histories and organizational stories within the institutions you lead?

• Do you find that your own personal story and history has better suited some institutions, and less so at others?

• In university fundraising parlance, it is said that "people give money to people". While there is surely truth here, do you feel donors are investing first in your university or in your leadership?

• How does your own personal story help with your leadership challenges? And has that changed from institution to institution?

• When does your own personal story - your background and values -- get in the way?

• How often do you consciously utilize positional power?

• Is there residue from the stories of previous leaders? And is the residue advantageous or limiting?

• As you assumed your first position in your career (law professor, West Virginia) how much did you consider personal fit to be an issue?

• As the primary leader of the institution, how much impact do you have on the narrative of the institution - past, present, and future?

Conversation Guidelines for Archie Griffm - A Research Protocol

• If one exists, what is the grand narrative - the organizational saga - of The Ohio State University?

• In what ways do you feel that Gordon Gee's personal story matches this grand narrative? In what ways does it clash?

• Does Gordon Gee take special effort to illustrate parallels between his story and that of the university?

• In university fundraising parlance, it is said that "people give money to people". While there is surely truth here, do you feel donors are investing first in the university or in Dr. Gee's leadership?

• As the primary leader of the institution, how much of impact does Dr. Gee have on the narrative of the institution - past, present, and future?

• As a former student-athlete, and thinking of current student athletes, what attracts student athletes to Ohio State?

• Is the Ohio State of a student athlete different from that of a traditional student?

• How do you believe faculty look upon student athletes?

• Regarding Gordon Gee, does Gee consciously deal with residue from the stories of previous leaders? And if so, is it advantageous or limiting?

• When it became apparent that Gee would return to Ohio State, how did it affect donors? Staff? Students? Faculty?

• Do you feel that your opinions here are in the mainstream, or rather on the edge because of your unique experiences as a student and as an employee?

Conversation Guidelines for Peter Koltak - A Research Protocol

• If one exists, what is the grand narrative - the organizational saga - of The Ohio State University?

• Do undergraduates have any sort of idea of Gordon Gee's background and his personal story, and whether it does or does not match the aforementioned narrative?

• Does Gordon Gee take special effort to illustrate parallels between his story and that of the university?

• From a student's perspective, how does Gordon Gee embody the university, if at all?

• As the primary leader of the institution, how much of impact does Dr. Gee have on the narrative of the institution - past, present, and future?

• As a prospective graduate student, what was it that drew you to Ohio State? Had you considered the institution as an undergraduate, what do you think would have been the primary draw?

• As an undergraduate student, how much does the president matter?

• How do you believe faculty look upon the university president? What do they see as his role?

• Regarding Gordon Gee, does he consciously deal with residue from the stories of previous leaders? And if so, is it advantageous or limiting?

• When it became apparent that Gee would return to Ohio State, how did it affect the culture of the campus? What did the students know of his previous time at Ohio State?

• Do you feel that your opinions here are in the mainstream, or rather on the edge because of your unique experiences as a student leader?

Conversation Guidelines for Aaron McKain - A Research Protocol

• If one exists, what is the grand narrative - the organizational saga - of The Ohio State University?

• In what ways do you feel that Gordon Gee's personal story matches this grand narrative? In what ways does it clash?

• Does Gordon Gee take special effort to illustrate parallels between his story and that of the university?

• From a student's perspective, how does Gordon Gee embody the university, if at all?

• As the primary leader of the institution, how much of impact does Dr. Gee have on the narrative of the institution - past, present, and future?

• As a prospective graduate student, what was it that drew you to Ohio State? Had you considered the institution as an undergraduate, what do you think would have been the primary draw?

• As a graduate student, how much does the president matter?

• How do you believe faculty look upon the university president? What do they see as his role?

• Regarding Gordon Gee, does Gee consciously deal with residue from the stories of previous leaders? And if so, is it advantageous or limiting?

• When it became apparent that Gee would return to Ohio State, how did it affect the culture of the campus?

• Do you feel that your opinions here are in the mainstream, or rather on the edge because of your unique experiences as a student and as an employee?

Conversation Guidelines for Jim Phelan A Research Protocol

• If one exists, what is the grand narrative - the organizational saga - of The Ohio State University?

• In what ways do you feel that Gordon Gee's personal story matches this grand narrative? In what ways does it clash?

• Does Gordon Gee take special effort to illustrate parallels between his story and that of the university?

• In university fundraising parlance, it is said that "people give money to people". While there is surely truth here, do you feel donors are investing first in the university or in Dr. Gee' s leadership?

• As a faculty member, do you feel is genuineness Dr. Gee's leadership?

• How could you tell if Dr. Gee's passion or belief is present or absent in a project?

• How often do you believe that Gee consciously utilizes positional power?

• Does Gee consciously deal with residue from the stories of previous leaders? And if so, is it advantageous or limiting?

• When it became apparent that Gee would return to Ohio State, how did it affect donors? Staff? Students? Faculty?

• As the primary leader of the institution, how much of impact does Dr. Gee have on the narrative of the institution - past, present, and future?

• Do you feel that your opinions here are in the mainstream of faculty perspective, or rather on the edge?

Conversation Guidelines for Eloise Stuhr - A Research Protocol

• If one exists, what is the grand narrative - the organizational saga - of Vanderbilt University?

• In what ways do you feel that Gordon Gee's personal story matched this grand narrative? In what ways did it clash?

• Did Gordon Gee take special effort to illustrate parallels between his story and that of the university?

• In university fundraising parlance, it is said that "people give money to people". While there is surely truth here, do you feel donors are investing first in the university or in his leadership?

• As a staff member, did you feel there was genuineness to Dr. Gee's leadership?

• How could you tell if Dr. Gee's passion or belief was present or absent in a project?

• How often do you believe that Dr. Gee consciously utilized positional power?

• Did Dr. Gee consciously deal with residue from the stories of previous leaders? And if so, was it advantageous or limiting?

• When Dr. Gee's option to return to Ohio State first became apparent, how did it affect donors? Staff? Students?

• As the primary leader of the institution, how much impact did Dr. Gee have on the narrative of the institution - past, present, and future?

REFERENCES

References

Angelo, J. M. (2006). Vanderbilt creates website to defend Gordon Gee. *University Business*.

Anward, J. (1997). Parameters of institutional discourse. In B.-L. Gunnarsson, P. Linell & B. Nordberg (Eds.), *The construction of professional discourse* (pp. 127-150). New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Baldridge, J. V., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G. P., & Riley, G. L. (1977). Alternative models of governance in higher education. In J. V. Baldridge & G. L. Riley (Eds.), *Governing academic organizations* (pp. 2-25). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Barnett, J. H., & Karson, M. J. (1987). Personal values and business decisions: an exploratory investigation. *Journal of Business Ethics, 6*(371-382).

Baroway, M. S. (2002). *The Gee years, 1990-1997*.Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.

Barthes, R. (1977). *Image-Music-Text* (S. Heath, Trans.). New York: Hill and Wang.

Bastedo, Michael N. 2005. "The Making of an Activist Governing Board." *Review of Higher Education* 28: 551-570.

Benoit, W. L., & Smythe, M. J. (2003). Rhetorical theory as message reception: A cognitive response approach to rhetorical theory and criticism. *Communication Studies* (Spring 2003).

Berkow, I. (1989). Sports of the times; The grapes of wrath at Oklahoma. *The New York Times*.

Birnbaum, R. (1988b). Problems of governance, management, and leadership. In *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership* (pp. 3-29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1988c). Making decisions and making sense: The administrator's role. In *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership* (pp. 56-82). San Franscisco: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1988d). The collegial institution: Sharing power and values in a community of equals. In *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership* (pp. 85-104). San Franscisco: Jossey-Bass

.

Birnbaum, R. (1988f). Effective administration and leadership in the cybernetic institution. In *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership* (pp. 201-230). San Franscisco: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (2002). The president as story-teller: Resorting the narrative of higher education. *Presidency, 5*(3), 32-39.

Blader, S. L. (2007). Let's not forget the "me" in "team:" Investigating the interface of individual and collective identity. In C. A. Bartel, S. L. Blader & A. Wrzesniewski (Eds.), *Identity and the modern organization* (pp. 61-84). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). Reframing leadership. In *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (pp. 294-317). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bornstein, R. (2003a). Preface. In R. Bornstein (Ed.), *Legitimacy in the academic presidency: From entrance to exit* (pp. xi-xvii). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Bornstein, R. (2003c). Theories of legitimacy. In *Legitimacy in the academic presidency: From entrance to exit* (pp. 20-24). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Bornstein, R. (2003d). Factors in presidential legitimacy. In *Legitimacy in the academic presidency: From entrance to exit* (pp. 25-42). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Boulus, M. A. (2003). *Challenges and implications: Declining state support of Michigan public higher education*.Lansing, MI: Presidents Council, State Universities of Michigan.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*.Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bracher, M. (1994). Introduction. In M. Bracher, M. W. Alcorn, R. J. Corthell & F. Massardier-Kenney (Eds.), *Lacanian theory of discourse: Subject, structure, and society* (pp. 1-16). New York: New York University Press.

Brown, J. S., Denning, S., Groh, K., & Prusack, L. (2005). Storytelling in organizations. In *Storytelling in organizations: Why storytelling is transforming 21st century organizations and management* (pp. 15-48). Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Burroughs, W. S. (1998). *Electronic Revolution*:Expanded Media.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter*.New York: Routledge.

Calkins, T. (2005). Introduction: The challenge of branding. In A. M. Tybout & T. Calkins (Eds.), *Kellogg on branding: The marketing faculty of the Kellogg School of Management*.Hoboken, New Jersey: John C. Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Carbaugh, D. (1999). Positioning as display of cultural identity. In R. Harre & L. van Langenhove (Eds.), *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action* (pp. 160-177). Oxford, Oxfordshire, England: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd.

Chaffee, E. E., & Tierney, W. G. (1988b). *Collegiate culture and leadership strategies*.New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Chaffee, E. E., & Tierney, W. G. (1988d). The search for dynamic equilibrium in organizational culture. In *Collegiate culture and leadership studies* (pp. 18-30). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Chaffee, E. E., & Tierney, W. G. (1988e). The challenge to leadership. In *Collegiate culture and leadership strategies* (pp. 177-192). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988a). Rethinking educational discourses -- practices. In C. H. Cherryholmes (Ed.), *Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education* (pp. 1-15). New York: Teachers College Press.

Church, M. (2009). Gordon Gee - answers to speech questions. In M. W. Rishell (Ed.).Columbus, OH.

Clark, B. R. (1970a). Introduction. In *The distinctive college: Antioch, Reed, & Swarthmore* (pp. 3-12). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Clark, B. R. (1970b). The making of an organizational saga. In B. R. Clark (Ed.), *The distinctive college: Antioch, Reed, & Swarthmore* (pp. 233-262). Chicago: Aldine Publishing.

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

Clark, B. R. (1998). The problem of university transformation. In B. R. Clark (Ed.), *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation* (pp. 127-148). Oxford, Oxfordshire, UK: Elsevier Science Ltd.

Clausen, D. M. (1997). Universitiy presidential searches: Exercises in secrecy or shared governance. *Academe, 83*(5), 20-29.

Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1986). *Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president*.Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). Qualitative procedures. In J. W. Creswell (Ed.), *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (Second ed., pp. 179-206). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

D., B. (2008). *So sorry Dr. Gee and family*, from http://catch-the-bus.blogspot.com/2008/07/so-sorry-dr-gee-and-family.html

de Graaf, G. (2001). Discourse theory and business ethics: The case of bankers' conceptualizations of customers. *Journal of Business Ethics, 31*(4), 299-319.

Deal, T. E. (1999). Eight roles of symbolic leaders. In T. E. Deal (Ed.), *Shaping school culture: The heart of leadership* (pp. 85-100). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982a). Strong cultures: The new "old rule" for business success. In T. E. Deal & A. A. Kennedy (Eds.), *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life* (pp. 3-20). Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982b). Communications: Working the cultural network. In T. E. Deal & A. A. Kennedy (Eds.), *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life* (pp. 85-103). Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1998). Exercising cultural leadership: The personal challenge. In T. E. Deal & A. A. Kennedy (Eds.), *The new corporate cultures: Revitalizing the workplace after downsizing, mergers, and reengineering* (pp. 191-212). Reading, Massachusetts: Perseus Books.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1999a). Introduction. In T. E. Deal & A. A. Kennedy (Eds.), *The new corporate cultures: Revitalizing the workplace after downsizing, mergers, and reengineering* (pp. 1-20). Reading, Massachusetts: Perseus Books.

Decker, T. (2008). Details emerge in investigation of Gee family tragedy. *The Columbus Dispatch*.

Denning, S. (2007). Cultivating narrative intelligence. In S. Denning (Ed.), *The secret language of leadership: How leaders inspire action through narrative* (pp. 92-115). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (First ed., pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology*.Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Derrida, J. (1979). Signature Event Context. *Glyph, 1*, 172-197.

Derrida, J. (1998). *Monolingualism of the Other or, The Prostheses of Origin*.Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Duderstadt, J. J. (2000). Service to society. In J. J. Duderstadt (Ed.), *A university for the 21st century.* (pp. 132-146). Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Duncan, W. (2006). WSJ: Vandy making sure Gee isn't puffing away millions. *Nashville Post*.

Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39*, 239-263.

Dworin, J. E., & Bomer, R. (2008). What we all (supposedly) know about the poor: A critical discourse analysis of Ruby Payne's "Framework". *English Education, 40*(2), 101-121.

Dym, B., & Hutson, H. (2005). Goodness of fit. In B. Dym & H. Hutson (Eds.), *Leadership in Non-Profit Organizations* (Vol. 67-91). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*.London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2004). Semiotic aspects of social transformation and learning. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 225-236). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fairclough, N. (2005). Discourse analysis in organizational studies: the case for critical realism. *Organization Studies, 26*(6), 915-939.

Felluga, D. (2003). *Modules on Foucault: On power*. Retrieved May 11, 2008

Fiedler, F. E. (1970). Personality, motivational systems, and behavior of high and low LPC persons. *Technical Report, 70*(12).

Fisher, J. L. (1984b). Power. In *Power of the presidency* (pp. 27-55). New York: Macmillan.

Fisher, J. L. (1984c). The charismatic presidency. In *Power of the presidency* (pp. 57-71). New York: Macmillan.

Fisher, J. L. (1984d). Power off campus: The president and persons of influence. In *Power of the presidency* (pp. 121-133). New York: Macmillan.

Fisher, J. L., & Koch, J. V. (2004). A review of relevant work. In J. L. Fisher & J. V. Koch (Eds.), *The entrepreneurial college president*.Westport, CT: American Council on Education and Praeger Publishers.

Ford, J., Harding, N., & Learmonth, M. (2008a). *Leadership as identity: Constructions and deconstructions*.London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ford, J., Harding, N., & Learmonth, M. (2008b). Leadership as performative: Or how the words 'leader' and 'leadership' do things. In *Leadership as identity: Constructions and deconstructions* (pp. 32-50). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ford, J., Harding, N., & Learmonth, M. (2008c). Queer(y)ing Leadership. In *Leadership as identity: Constructions and deconstructions* (pp. 91-115). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. (1984). The order of discourse. In M. Shapiro (Ed.), *Language and politics* (pp. 108-138). Oxford: Blackwell.

Fowler, R. (1981). *Literature as social discourse: The practice of linguistic criticism*.London: Batsford Academic.

French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power*.Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, 1959.

Galinsky, A., Magee, J. C., Inesi, M. E., & Gruenfeld, D. (2006). Power and perspectives not taken. *Psychological Science, 17*(12), 1068-1074.

Galts, C. (1998, March/April). The political truth. *Brown Alumni Magazine*.

Gee, E. D. (1992). *The light around the dark*.New York: National League for Nursing Press.

Gee, E. G. (2007). *It is about time. and change*. Retrieved December 26, 2008, from http://president.osu.edu/speeches/fac_100407.php

Gee, E. G. (2007b, July 12). *Remarks to the Board of Trustees.* Paper presented at the The Ohio State University Board of Trustees Meeting, Columbus, OH.

Gee, J. P. (1996). Introduction. In J. P. Gee (Ed.), *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis, Inc.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. London: The Falmer Press.

Gee, J. P. (2005a). Introduction. In J. P. Gee (Ed.), *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed., pp. 1-9). New York: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2005b). Tools of inquiry and discourses. In J. P. Gee (Ed.), *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed., pp. 20-34). New York: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2005c). Situated meanings and discourse models. In J. P. Gee (Ed.), *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed., pp. 53-70). New York: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2005d). Preface. In J. P. Gee (Ed.), *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed., pp. xi-xii). New York: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2005e). Social languages, conversations, and intertextuality. In J. P. Gee (Ed.), *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed., pp. 35-52). New York: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2005f). Discourse models. In J. P. Gee (Ed.), *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed., pp. 71-93). New York: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: A tool kit*.New York: Routledge.

Gillette, R. (2007). President Gee talks about his plans for the university. *onCampus,* p. September 27.

Gioia, D. A. (1998). From individual to organizational identity. In D. A. Whetten & P. C. Godfrey (Eds.), *Identity in Organizations: Building Theory Through Conversations*.Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Gioia, D. A., & Schultz, M. (1995). *Adaptive instability: The inter-relationship of identity and image.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, Academy of Management, Vancouver, BC.

Gioia, D. A., Schultz, M., & Corley, K. G. (2000). Organizational identity, image, and adaptive instability. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 63-81.

Gray, K. L. (2007a). He's back: After turning down Ohio State at least once, E. Gordon Gee, one of the school's most popular presidents, has agreed to leave Vanderbilt and return to Columbus. *The Columbus Dispatch*.

Grzywacz, J. G., & Butler, A. B. (2005). The impact of job characteristics on work-to-family facilitation: Testing a theory and distinguishing a construct. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*(2), 97-109.

Hall, D. T., & Richter, J. (1989). Balancing work life and home life: What can organizations do to help? *Academy of Management EXECUTIVE, 2*(3), 213-223.

Hall, S. (1982). The rediscovery of ideology: the return of the repressed in media studies. In M. Gurevitch, M. Curran & J. Woollacott (Eds.), *Culture, society, and the media* (pp. 56-90). London: Methuen.

Harju, K. (2003). Protext: The Morphoses of identity, heterogeneity and synolon. In S. Linstead (Ed.), *Text / Work: Representing organization and organizing representation* (pp. 163-179). London: Routledge.

Harre, R., & van Langenhove, L. (1999). The dynamics of social episodes. In R. Harre & L. van Langenhove (Eds.), *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action* (pp. 1-13). Oxford, Oxfordshire, England: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd.

Hemingway, C. A., & Maclagan, P. W. (2004). Managers' personal values as drivers of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics, 50*, 33-44.

Hillman, A. J., Nicholson, G., & Shropshire, C. (2008). Directors' multiple idetitites, identification, and board monitoring and resource provision. *Organization Science, 19*(3), 441-456.

Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1988). *Social semiotics*.Cambridge: Polity Press.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2002). Active interviewing. In D. Weinberg (Ed.), *Qualitative research methods*.Walden, MA: Blackwell.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2003). Active interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Postmodern interviewing* (pp. 67-80). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Inayatullah, S. (1998). Causal layered analysis: Poststructuralism as method. *Futures, 30*(8), 815-829.

Jaworski, A., & Coupland, N. (1999). Introduction: Perspectives on discourse analysis. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 1-44). London: Routledge.

Joyce, W., Slocum Jr., J. W., & Von Glinow, M. A. (1982). Person-situation interaction: Competing models of fit. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour, 3*(4), 265-280.

Katz, D. (1973). Patterns of Leadership. In J. N. Knutson (Ed.), *Handbook of political psychology*.San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kauffman, J. F. (1980). *At the pleasure of the board: The service of the college and university president*.Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Kerr, C. (1963). The idea of a multiversity. In C. Kerr (Ed.), *The Uses of the University* (5th ed., pp. 1-34). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kotler, P. (2005). Foreward. In A. M. Tybout & T. Calkins (Eds.), *Kellogg on branding: the marketing faculty of the Kellogg School of Management* (pp. ix-x). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Kotler, P., & Fox, K. F. A. (1985). Education and Marketing. In P. Kotler & K. F. A. Fox (Eds.), *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*.Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Kotler, P., & Fox, K. F. A. (1985). Formulating marketing strategy. In P. Kotler & K. F. A. Fox (Eds.), *Strategic marketing for educational institutions* (pp. 131-155). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. (1992a). The power of culture. In J. P. Kotter & J. L. Heskett (Eds.), *Corporate cultures and performance* (pp. 1-12). New York: The Free Press.

Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. (1992b). Strong cultures. In J. P. Kotter & J. L. Heskett (Eds.), *Corporate cultures and performance* (pp. 15-27). New York: The Free Press.

Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. (1992c). On the role of top management. In J. P. Kotter & J. L. Heskett (Eds.), *Corporate culture and performance* (pp. 141-152). New York: The Free Press.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). The five practices of exemplary leadership. In *The leadership challenge* (pp. 3-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49*(1), 1-49.

Lacan, J., & Fink, B. (2006). *Ecrits: The first complete edition in English*.New York: W.W. Norton.

Lawson, L. P. (2002). *Race, ideology, and the emergence of organizational saga.* Unpublished Ph.D. disseration, University of Chicago, Chicago.

Lindholm, J. A. (2003). Perceived organizational fit: Nurturing the minds, hearts, and personal ambitions of university faculty. *The Review of Higher Education, 27*(1), 125-149.

Locke, T. (2004a). The critical turn: Making discourse analysis critical. In T. Locke (Ed.), *Critical discourse analysis* (pp. 25-39). London: Continuum.

Locke, T. (2004b). Analysing a print text. In T. Locke (Ed.), *Critical discourse analysis* (pp. 54-73). London: Continuum.

Loverro, T. (2010). A 'poor' choice of words. *The Washington Examiner*.

Lublin, J. S., & Golden, D. (2006). Vanderbilt reins in lavish spending by star chancellor. *Wall Street Journal*.

Manning, P. K., & Cullum-Swan, B. (1994). Narrative, content, and semiotic analysis. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 463-478). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Marrison, B. (1996). Yo, Gordo! OSU president E.Gordon Gee is hailed by students, faculty, and politicians as friend. *Cleveland Plain Dealer*.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1999). Data collection methods. In C. Marshall & G. Rossman (Eds.), *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 105-141). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Martin, D. C. (1994). *The distinctive college revisted: A history of Swarthmore and Reed Colleges 1968-1991.* Unpublished Dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.

May, R. (1972). *Power and innocence*.New York: Norton.

McCarthy, E. J. (1960). Marketing management and the customer. In E. J. McCarthy (Ed.), *Basic marketing: a managerial approach* (2nd ed., pp. 23-47). Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

McLuhan, M. (1960). Myth and mass media. In H. A. Murray (Ed.), *Myth and mythmaking* (pp. 288-289). New York: George Braziller.

Moerman, M. (1988). *Talking culture*.Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Moran, J. (2005). Introduction: Waiting, cultural studies and the quotidian. In J. Moran (Ed.), *Reading the everyday* (pp. 1-28). New York: Routledge.

Mumby, D. K. (1988). *Communication and power in organizations: Discourse, ideology and domination*.Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Norrick, N. (2000). Approaching storytelling in conversation. In N. Norrick (Ed.), *Conversational narrative: Storytelling in everyday talk* (pp. 1-26). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Nye, J. S. (2008). Leadership and power. In J. S. Nye (Ed.), *The powers to lead* (pp. 27-52). New York: Oxford University Press.

Patton, M. (1990). The nature of qualitative inquiry. In M. Patton (Ed.), *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed., pp. 9-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pettigrew, A. M. (1992). On studying managerial elites. *Strategic Management Journal, 13*, 163-182.

Powers, S. (1997, December 31). Gee, OSU grew together. *The Columbus Dispatch*.

Pyle, E. (2008). It starts with me: OSU president makes personal mission of running nation's largest university. *The Columbus Dispatch*.

Rallapalli, K. C., Vitell, S. J., & Szeinbach, S. (2000). Marketer's norms and personal values: An empirical study of marketing professionals. *Journal of Business Ethics, 24*, 65-75.

Redden, E. (2006). Rallying around Gordon Gee. *Inside Higher Ed*.

Rogers, R. (2004). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*.Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rokeach, M. (1973). The nature of human values and value systems. In M. Rokeach (Ed.), *The nature of human values* (pp. 3-25). New York: The Free Press.

Sagie, A., & Elizur, D. (1996). The structure of personal values: a conical representation of multiple life areas. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17*, 573-586.

Schultz, M. (1992). Postmodern pictures of culture: A postmodern reflection on the "modern notion" of corporate culture. *International Studies of Management and Organization, 22*(2), 15-35.

Seidman, I. (1998). Establishing access to, making contact with, and selecting participants. In I. Seidman (Ed.), *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 34-48). New York: Teachers College Press.

Shapiro, M. J. (1992). *Reading the postmodern polity*.Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sheldon, T. D. (2005). *Forces and impacts of organizational change at General College, 1985-2003.* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Shi-xu. (2000). Opinion discourse: Investigating the paradoxical nature of the text and talk of opinions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33*(3), 263-289.

Simmons, A. (2001). The six stories you need to know how to tell. In A. Simmons (Ed.), *The story factor: Secrets of influence from the art of storytelling* (pp. 1-26). Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing.

Singer, L. (1991). Recalling a community at loose ends. In M. T. Collective (Ed.), *Community at loose ends*.Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Spataro, S. E., & Chatman, J. A. (2007). Identity in the competitive market: The effects of interorganizational competition on identity-based organizational commitment. In C. A. Bartel, S. L. Blader & A. Wrzesniewski (Eds.), *Identity and the Modern Organization* (pp. 177-199). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sperber, M. (2000). Admissions office scams. In M. Sperber (Ed.), *Beer and circus: How big-time college sports is crippling undergraduate education* (pp. 53-59). New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*.Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Stoddard, N., & Wyckoff, C. (2009). Design for a new selection model. In N. Stoddard & C. Wyckoff (Eds.), *The right leader: selecting executives who fit*.Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis*.Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Swann, W. B. (1983). The quest for accuracy in person perception: A matter of pragmatics. *Psychological Review, 91*, 457-4777.

Thornborrow, J. (2002). Power, talk, and institutional discourse: Some key concepts. In J. Thornborrow (Ed.), *Power talk: Language and interaction in institutional discourse* (pp. 1-12). London: Pearson Education Limited.

Threadgold, T. (2003). Cultural studies, critical theory and critical discourse analysis: Histories, remembering and futures. *Linguistik online, 14*(2).

Toolan, M. (1997). What is critical discourse analysis and why are people saying such terrible things about it? *Language and Literature, 6*(2), 83-103.

Tybout, A. M., & Sternthal, B. (2005). Brand positioning. In A. M. Tybout & T. Calkins (Eds.), *Kellogg on branding: The marketing faculty of The Kellogg School of Management* (pp. 11-26). Hoboken, New Jersey: John C. Wiley & Sons.

Unknown. (2008b). *Future students / campus life*. Retrieved December 22, 2008, from http://undergrad.osu.edu/

Unknown. (2008c). *This is Ohio State*.Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.

Unknown. (2009). Brown A-Z. *post-magazine*.

Unknown. (2009d). *Archie Griffin*, from www.ohiostatealumni.org/whoweare/griffin.php

Unknown. (2009e). Giving update: News from The Ohio State University Foundation*, 14*.

Updike, P. (1992). Coda. In E. D. Gee (Ed.), *The light around the dark* (pp. 147-150). New York: National League for Nursing Press.

Valentine, S., Godkin, L., & Lucero, M. (2002). Ethical context, organizational commitment, and person-organization fit. *Journal of Business Ethics, 41*(4), 349-360.

van Langenhove, L., & Harre, R. (1999). Introducing positioning theory. In R. Harre & L. van Langenhove (Eds.), *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action* (pp. 14-31). Oxford, Oxfordshire, England: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd.

Vinson, D. E., Scott, J. E., & Lamont, L. M. (1977). The role of personal values in marketing and consumer behavior. *Journal of Marketing, 41*(2), 44-50.

Vitell, S. J., Rallapalli, K. C., & Singhapakdi, A. (1993). Marketing norms: The influences of personal moral hilosophies and organizational ethical culture. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 21*(4), 331-337.

Ware, J. (1990). Big games. In J. Ware (Ed.), *An Ohio State profile: A year in the life of America's biggest campus* (pp. 52-63). New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Watson, J. (1992). Prelude. In E. D. Gee (Ed.), *The light around the dark* (pp. xi-xiii). New York: National League of Nursing Press.

Weber, M. (1986). Types of authority. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), *Political leadership: A source book* (pp. 232-244). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

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

Weick, K. E. (1995a). Preface. In K. E. Weick (Ed.), *Sensemaking in organizations* (pp. xi-xii). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Weick, K. E. (1995b). The nature of sensemaking. In K. E. Weick (Ed.), *Sensemaking in organizations* (pp. 1-16). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Weick, K. E. (1995c). Seven properties of sensemaking. In K. E. Weick (Ed.), *Sensemaking in organizations* (pp. 17-62). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Western, S. (2008b). Asymmetric leadership. In S. Western (Ed.), *Leadership: A critical text* (pp. 70-79). London: SAGE Publications.

Winston, M. G. (1993). Battling the rapids. *Journal of Management Development, 12*(1), 49-54.

Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis and the study of doctor-patient interaction. In B.-L. Gunnarsson, P. Linell & B. Nordberg (Eds.), *The construction of professional discourse* (pp. 173-200). New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Wood, B. W. (2002). *Identity, saga, and change: The department of music at Midwest State University.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI.

Wood, E. T., & Duncan, W. (2007). Vanderbilt Chancellor Gee and wife agree on divorce. *Nashville Post*.

Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. O. (2000a). Introduction. In L. A. Wood & R. O. Kroger (Eds.), *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text* (pp. ix-xvi). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. O. (2000b). Varieties of discourse analysis. In L. A. Wood & R. O. Kroger (Eds.), *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text* (pp. 18-33). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Woodruff, A. D. (1942). Personal values and the direction of behavior. *The School Review, 50*(1), 32-42.

Yin, R. K. (2003a). Introduction. In R. K. Yin (Ed.), *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed., pp. 1-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Yin, R. K. (2003b). Designing case studies. In R. K. Yin (Ed.), *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed., pp. 19-56). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Zahniser, M. (2003). Interview with Gordon Gee (pp. 72): The Ohio State University.

Zeff, B. A. (2000). Premature evacuation: Why did Gordon Gee abandon Brown? *The Village Voice, 45*(30), 86,124.

Zenger, J. H., & Folkman, J. (2002). Leaders must fit their organization. In J. H. Zenger & J. Folkman (Eds.), *The extraordinary leader: Turning good managers into great leaders*.New York: McGraw-Hill.