DISSERTATION

ONE MIDWEST STATE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS' LEADERSHIP STYLES: SELF-PERCEPTION AND EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION

Submitted by

Aileen J. Schacherer

School of Education

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Summer 2004

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

May 14, 2004

WE HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE DISSERTATION PREPARED UNDER OUR SUPERVISION BY AILEEN J. SCHACHERER ENTITLED: ONE MIDWEST STATE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS' LEADERSHIP STYLES: SELF-PERCEPTION AND EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING IN PART REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCE STUDIES.

Committee on Graduate Work

Adviser

Director

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

ONE MIDWEST STATE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS'

LEADERSHIP STYLES:

SELF-PERCEPTION AND EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION

This research study was designed to examine the community college presidents' leadership style in one Midwestern state. Specifically, the study examined how the presidents perceived their leadership style, and how that perception compares with that of the faculty and non-faculty employees

Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI), a two-part survey instrument developed by Kouzes and Posner, was used to gather data. The 15 presidents completed the LPI-SELF, and a sampling of 5 faculty and 5 non-faculty, completed the LPI-OBSERVER instrument. One hundred percent of those surveyed returned their completed form. Each college became a grouping variable.

The data collected was analyzed using the Statistical Products and Service Solutions (SPSS) graduate version. Research was conducted to examine, compare, and contrast the collected data regarding the similarities and differences between president and employee perceptions of presidential leadership styles. Paired sample t- tests were executed. Findings demonstrated the differences between the president's and their employee's perception was statistically significant. The descriptive and inferential

statistics indicated there was a large effect size in the analysis. Test results showed all effect sizes were more than 1, thus the range is from large to very large.

Conclusions drawn from the findings suggest that the null hypothesis be rejected. It is further suggested that research be done in the areas of leadership style on a broader basis.

Aileen J. Schacherer
School of Education
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523
Summer 2004

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The attainment of a doctoral degree is one of the more significant accomplishments of my lifetime. I had never imaged that this would someday become a reality. A commitment of this magnitude is not possible without the assistance of many others.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my children who supported and encouraged in my journey. And to my many friends and family who were always there for me, always inquiring as to my progress, and constantly encouraging me to continue.

A huge thank you to my college co-workers, they have endured my years of complaints and saw me through many crises. To my church family who constantly kept me in their prayers. Without them, I would not have come through this with a smile on my face. And to my fellow PhD cohort and classmates who nurtured and coached me, making it possible to complete this rigorous program.

The leadership of my advisor, Dr. Laurie Carlson, was critical to my success. Dr. Carlson's patience and guidance was a key factor to staying on the right path in this journey. A special thank you to Dr. Tim Davies for his insights and wisdom, who brought this opportunity to us. Thank you to Dr. John Bowden, also a committee member, who guided me through the process with his kindness and wisdom. And to Dr. Bruce Hall, the fourth member of my committee, for your time and interest invested in this dissertation. I greatly appreciate your willingness to serve. Dr. George Morgan's willingness to share

his expertise with statistics, and guide me in the right direction was a lifesaver. Also to the many librarians who assisted in collecting the necessary materials, you made the overwhelming task do-able.

To Colorado State University for offering this opportunity in a distance education format, without that convenience this would not have been possible. And to my own college institution for their cooperation and never wavering support, this was a key factor to my success. Especially to Dr. Dave Nixon, for his insight in bringing this PhD program to our area.

Without Dr. Rita Vondracek, my proofreader and new friend who put the "polish" on my words, this paper would not be near the quality it is without your guidance and wisdom. You are the best. Your way with words is a true gift. Thanks for sharing this gift with me. A "thousand thank yous" to Emily Vincelli – you make the numbers do miraculous things. Without you, I would have been counting on my fingers and toes. Also to Linda Seeger, for her willingness to share her Statistical expertise. Without her, I'd have never arrived at this point.

Last – and most importantly – I thank God.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate my dissertation to the most important people in my life, those who bring me the most joy and pride. To my children: Lori, Craig, Michelle, Dawn, and Alyson. And, to my children-in-law: Scott, Reyna, Butch, and others to join our family in the future. To my grandchildren; April, Andrea, Taylor, Kelsey, Jordan, Courtney, Katlyn, Conner, Jonathan, Caly, Max, and those yet to come

To my twin sister, Arleen Hoffman, who is my constant supporter and "side-kick." She has always been there when I need someone.

These people have richly blessed my life. Thank you, God, for family.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The community college as an institution is one of the most important innovations in the history of higher education in the United States (Pierce, 1997). This movement began the transformation of the United State's population into a learning society where any person who wishes to do so can study almost any subject, in almost any geographical region (Deegan, Tillery, & Associates, 1985). According to Cohen and Brawer (1996), there are over 1,000 community colleges in the United States. The number of these institutions doubled with the enrollment quadrupling between 1965 and 1980. Nearly 55% of all first-time freshmen begin their higher education in a community college (Pierce, 1997). A distinctly American invention, the public, comprehensive, community college is unique in purpose, scope, and design (Pierce, 1997) and has helped the United States in becoming the nation with the most educated citizens in the world. The United States was also the first to strive for universal access to postsecondary education. No other time in history, and in no other place, has there been such a cultural experiment. Higher education for everyone is a pivotal educational innovation, not just for America, but also for the whole world (O'Banion, 1989).

One of the goals of the community college is to use its unique position to bring together community members in order to assist them when they are challenged by issues relating to critical local needs. Community colleges play a vital role with necessary follow-up by assisting with the implementation of cost-effective, accountable solutions

(Pierce, 1997). Community colleges are striving to fulfill their purpose of undergraduate education, workforce training and retraining, remedial programming, general education, and personal enrichment (Deegan, 1985).

Higher education is currently facing complex and visible, but uncharted issues, which could influence the success or demise of community colleges. With today's challenges, good qualified leaders are vital. In the search for leaders, one needs to focus on the leader-follower relationships (Pierce, 1997). That issue is the focus of this study. Other aspects of leadership have previously been examined at great lengths, while the aspect of leader-follower perceptions has received only scattered attention. One consistent theme in the literature is that leadership is one of the most researched and least understood topics. When the total staff does not share the same vision, it produces a defeating environment; an environment in which the mission of the institution fails to be carried out, and consequently growth and expansion of the college is unlikely (Pierce, 1997).

Leaders passionately believe that they can make a difference. They have a desire to make something happen, to change the way things are, to create something that has never existed before. They have a sense of what the results will look like even before they have started working on a project. They are driven by this clear image of what the organization can become. Just having a vision of the future isn't enough. Others must share that vision. To enlist constituents in a vision, leaders must know and care about the hopes and dreams so that constituents can see the exciting possibilities that the future holds. They must forge a unity of purpose by showing constituents how the vision can meet their needs and serve the common good (Kouzes & Posner, 1997). This study will

seek to increase knowledge concerning the possible disparity between leader and follower perceptions of the same leadership style.

Studies of leadership on community college campuses are extremely important because of their presidents' role in charting the educational, social, and economic life of thousands of communities across the nation. The men and women who serve as presidents of our nation's public community colleges lead schools that spend billions of dollars each year and employ thousands of full and part time staff (Vaughan, 1996). These presidents' leadership styles affect curriculum, organization, and student service, in addition to the morale and mood of an institution. This mood, through its effect on students, can even indirectly affect the mood of society (Vaughan, 1996).

Based upon a large number of interviews with presidents and trustees, extensive reading related to the college and university presidency, and his own observation, Vaughan (1989) has concluded that three major functions should provide the focus for today's community college presidents: (1) managing the institution, (2) creating the campus climate, and (3) interpreting and communicating the institution's mission. Community college presidents have the toughest responsibility of any leadership group in America (Roe & Baker, 1989). Appropriate leadership may be the key variable in determining which of these directions community colleges will follow (Amey & Twombley, 1992). This fact under-girds the value of any study on community college leadership; including this particular study.

What makes leadership studies especially pertinent right now is the turnover among community college leaders presently occurring and expected to continue throughout the next ten years. Members of its veteran workforce will need to be replaced.

Media reports in this specific Midwest state shows a record 40% of current educational leaders indicated their retirement would begin between 2002 and 2005. Of this state's 15 community colleges, five current presidents will be retiring within the next year according to our State Dept. of Education report. These facts give reason for concern. Who will be our future educational leaders? Preparation is a vital factor. The pool of qualified applicants is declining, while the task of securing quality leadership is escalating.

The American comprehensive community college is currently encountering a complex array of issues that call for insightful, informed, and visionary leadership. These issues include the importance of rapid development, wide legislative swings, and increased expectations for developing an educational environment that delivers state-of-the-art learning experiences. There is also a significant trend toward larger numbers of non-traditional students who bring a wide range of cultural beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. These challenges must be addressed as the current leadership creates new institutional dimensions that meet the needs of today's learner along with that of future learners (Pierce, 2000).

Another challenge facing the community college system is to create an alternative leadership style that reflects the tradition of the community college. Shawn (1999), from the California Center for School Restructuring, participated in *The Policy Forum on Educational Leadership*. He said that many aspects of our educational system "are almost toxic to teaching and learning" (U.S. Department of Education, 1999, p. 6). Shawn (1999) went on to say that in this environment, it takes more than instructional leadership to keep good teaching alive and well. The system must meet the demands of

organizational renewal and eliminate the contention of commander and subordinate. More promising images of leaders are found when leadership is viewed as a process of empowering, facilitating, collaborating, and educating; rather than a position of dictating (Amy & Twombly, 1992). As Houston (1999), Executive Director of the American Association of School Administrators remarked, "Today's leaders must shift their focus from the B's (budgets, books, bonds, and buildings), to the C's (communication, collaboration, and community building)" (U.S. Department of Education, 1999, p. 6).

Another shift in focus deals with Alternative Leadership. During the *Forum on Educational Leadership* (U.S. Department of Education, 1999), case studies indicated that, "Presidents devote the bulk of their time, energy and talents to improving the quality of their institution. People follow effective leaders because they share the leader's dreams, not because they are afraid of what would happen if they did not follow them" (p. 9). There appears to be a perception that community college president's lead on the premise that they themselves and their employees both view the president's leadership styles in the same way. Studies by Scott (1989), Plowman (1991), Kuehler (1992), Bauer (1993), and Dauffenbach (1995), and numerous others who have focused on higher education leadership perceptions each conclude there is a need to further examine this issue.

Statement of the Research Problem

This study examined the perceived leadership styles of community college presidents in one midwestern state. Specifically, this study examined how the participating college presidents perceived their own leadership styles as compared to how their employees perceived the same. The goal of this study was to present documentation

that reveals whether or not there is a substantial difference between these perceptions. The possibility that there may be a difference between the presidents' self-perception and the employees' perception could prove to enlighten leader and follower relationships

Previous studies have focused on what leadership is and the variations of leadership styles. Studies on similar topics in higher education focus on the position of community college department chairs (Coats, 1996; Law, 1995), vocational directors (Young, 1993), athletic coaches (Wardell, 1977), and college administrators (Yang, 1994). Numerous research studies analyze the college presidency position (Coats, 1996). Still other national studies focused on community college presidents' leadership styles and the relationships between those styles and business, industry, and organizational concepts (Wen, 1999). Previous studies address the country as a whole, four-year colleges and universities, colleges located in the North, South, East, and West. Peters and Waterman (1982) maintained that characteristics of a leader are the same no matter whether the leader's occupational field is education, business, politics, health occupations, or any other profession.

Even previous K-12 school studies relating to leadership and comparing the many styles drew no consistent conclusion (Hickey, 1995). Studies have focused on college presidents, on faculty specifically, or all other college employees as one group. President's leadership styles and substance, effectiveness of college presidents, and strengthening leadership have been topics of previous study. Because higher education is able today to reach greater numbers of citizens than ever before, the president's leadership abilities have been a topic of interest (Benezet, Katz, & Magnusson, 1981; Fisher, 1984; Kauffman, 1980; Kerr, 1972). Studies that have noted the importance of the

president's relationship with faculty include Bennis (1973), Corson, (1975), Elmore, (1977), Hesburgh, (1977), and Kauggman, (1980). Through the years leadership studies have undergone varying degrees of examination as researchers used a variety of approaches to study the subject. One such study has been through a historical approach (Schriesheim, Tollive, & Behling, 1980). Another study focused on the relationships between leader and subordinates (Gube & Getzels, 1956). Yet another, the situational phase emphasized the need for action depended on the situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). Although some studies have focused on leadership styles of community college presidents, no specific study has researched the community college presidents' self-perception of their leadership styles and the differences and similarities between their perception and that of their employees. This appears to be a missing piece of the literature.

Helgeson (1995) clearly defined the advantage of using every organizations member's skills as each situation demands. Numerous studies of leadership styles in the field of education have been conducted with community college presidents (Bax, 1994; Garrison, 1985; Harrison, 2000; Lappas, 1996; Nwafor, 1991; Wen, 1999). These studies were completed for a variety of reasons. Some proved there was a relationship between the presidents' leadership styles and different organizational contexts (Wen, 1999), while others compared the leader's self-perception to that of community business leaders (Sheski, 1999). Earlier studies relating to the field of higher education have used the Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI) to examine similar yet different avenues. These studies will be discussed in detail in chapter two. In addition, previous research studies have focused on Alabama, Louisiana, Texas, several southern states, and the nation as a

whole. However, the midwestern region has received minimal study related to its community college presidents. There is a lack of research data pertaining to these fifteen community college presidents and their leadership styles.

Research Questions

This study examines community college presidents' self-perceived leadership styles and the relationships between self and employee perception. More specifically, to understand, "What are the self-perceived leadership styles of the community college presidents?" This one research question, along with the following subsequent hypotheses guided the study:

Hypotheses 1: There are significant differences in the self-perception of community college presidents and their faculty's perception on any of the five leadership practices measured by the LPI.

Hypotheses 2: There are no significant differences in the self-perception of community college presidents and their non-faculty employee's perception on any of the five leadership practices measured by the LPI.

Definition of Terms

For understanding of this study and consistency throughout, the following definitions are found to be relevant.

The community college is a publicly supported, two year, post-secondary education, accredited institution. The community college's purpose is to offer adult and continuing education, lifelong learning, community education, the associate in arts of science and the associate in applied science degrees. Pierce (1987) wrote that these colleges were previously known as "junior college," "two-year college," or "city-college."

FTEE is an abbreviation for the full time equivalent enrollment. In this particular state, one FTEE is equal to 24 semester credit hours or 600 non-credit clock hours.

Initiating Structure is when a leader believes that everything good that happens within an institution, flows from one's own leadership. The focus is on the stakes rather than on the people (Northouse, 1997).

Management, for the purpose of this study indicates hands on; planning, organizing, directing, and controlling (handling things) (Kouzes & Posner, 1997).

Leadership, also for the purpose of this study, is a process of guiding, establishing momentum, and mobilizing individuals to action towards accomplishing the organization's goals (Kouzes & Posner, 1995).

Leadership styles are the behavior and action used by an individual to influence and demonstrate how to reach the goals of an organization (Kouzes & Posner, 1995).

Primary style is the leadership style that is used the majority of the time by an individual (Kouzes & Posner, 1995).

Secondary style is a leadership style that a person tends to use on occasion. A secondary style tends to be one's "back-up" style or supporting style, when one is not using their primary style (Kouzes & Posner, 1995).

Perception is the understanding that the community college presidents have as they observe the behavior of other presidents as they function in their roles (Halpin, 1996).

Delimitations

The scope of this study had at least four delimitations. The study involved only one midwestern state. The research conducted was limited to a population of fifteen

community college presidents (two females and thirteen males). To maintain confidentiality, no gender specific data were collected. The research was specific to community college presidents, rather than all college presidents from this state. This study was not used to measure the accomplishments of community college presidents nor the success of the participating community colleges.

Limitations

There were at least six limitations of this research study. Using mailed questionnaires to collect data presents limitations. The researcher must trust that the individual designated to complete the form was in actuality the one who did fill in the survey. The target population and select sample were limited to community college presidents in this particular state. The information gathered is limited as to the individual biases and prejudices of both the presidents and their employees. Therefore, sweeping generalizations are ill advised. Furthermore, this research study analyzed only the respondents' perceptions at the time they completed the inventory tool. The subjects were invited to participate in a study, and in turn they determined the response time by their participation rate. Thus, there was no control over the subjects' willingness to participate, which reflected the end results.

Significance of the Study

Community colleges are currently searching for the leaders of tomorrow. There is no formula for successful presidential leadership (Covey, 2001). Green (1996) pointed out that leadership is always situational. An era, a context, or a particular set of circumstances calls for one kind of leadership; a different context calls for another. Green, Hersey, and Blanchard (1988) all believe the key for effective leadership is to

match the situation with the appropriate leadership style. When a community college seeks a new president, the potential president's leadership style must be matched with the needs of the college.

With the increasingly complex college environment it is vital to recognize the potential success of future leaders. This is of particular importance because community college presidents are recognized as leaders in their community. Strong presidents have a presence in making a difference in both the future role of higher education and in shaping society as a whole (Benezet, Katz, & Magnusson, 1981).

Researcher's Perspective

Currently I serve as a community college administrator. For the past eight years my responsibilities have been to oversee our smallest, but fastest growing campus. Leadership styles and the perception of these styles have always been of great interest to me. I have attended conferences in Arizona, California, Texas, Washington, DC, and have heard David Pierce, Steven Covey, Zig Ziglar, and Tom Peters, along with having participated in the *Gallup Conference on Leadership*. There is an unlimited diversity of styles in which one can choose to lead. What especially piques my curiosity is why an individual prefers to be led by one style, but leads by another? Why do some leaders perceive their leadership style differently from how their employees perceive this same style?

This study will examine data relevant to these areas of leadership. It will take a look at the similarities and differences between how a college president perceives their own leadership style and how their employees perceive this same leadership style.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter contains a review of literature and research relating to the relationship between community college presidents' self-perception of their leadership style and their employees' perception of that leadership style. It is divided into sections focusing on: (a) community college historical development, (b) community college leadership studies, (c) community college presidents' role, (d) leader-follower relationships, (e) previous LPI studies, (f) leadership theories, (g) comparison studies focusing on college presidents' leadership styles contrasted with that of their employees' perception of their leadership styles, and (h) the call for the future.

Community College Historical Development

Knowledge of the background and development of the community college is helpful to gain insight into the leadership styles of college presidents. The community college has undergone many changes during its lifetime. From a modest beginning as a liberal arts junior college, to today's multifaceted, comprehensive community college; one which embraces liberal arts by offering both the Associate of Arts and the Associate of Applied Science degrees, along with numerous certificate/diploma programs and fully developed continuing education programs.

Community college philosophy has focused on: (a) equal access to educational opportunities regardless of race, sex, and socioeconomic status; (b) changing curricula that meets community needs; and (c) life-long learning (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). David

Pierce (1996), past president of the AACC, believes the goal of the community college should include community development. This goal is not simply to weave together a few traditional transfer or vocational programs balanced by the occasional non-credit or contract course. Rather, to use its unique position to bring together members from all walks of life, to help them reach a consensus on critical local needs, and to monitor local resources to implement cost-effective, accountable solutions (Pierce, 1996).

Obviously, the community college philosophy has served American education well. One sees this in the rapid growth of its system since the inception over 100 years ago. This not only includes the number of students enrolled, but also the number of programs and services offered. These colleges thrived on the new responsibilities. They had no traditions to defend, no alumni to question their role, no autonomous professional staff to move aside, no statements of philosophy that would militate against their taking on responsibility for everything (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). According to the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the development of the community college occurred in three stages (Thornton, 1996). The first stage was 1901-1949, the second stage between1949-1970, and the third stage began in the 1970s and continues today. Following are significant aspects of each era.

Junior college 1901-1949. In 1900 only a handful of two-year colleges existed in the United States. By the second decade of the twentieth century, many four-year colleges and universities were dropping the first two years of instruction due to increased enrollment (over 100 students in a class), increased program demands, and limited funding (Vaughan, 1989). The two-year college was used to "divert" students away from the university, to allow the pure university freedom to pursue its preparation of the

professional elite. The universities saw themselves as selective agencies and the junior colleges as a means by where the under-achieving students could begin their college work until such time as they were ready for university study. Criteria considered included such issues as: grade point average, class standing, motivation level, family history of higher education, and special needs. In this way, the drop out rate was greatly reduced for the four-year colleges, thereby increasing their success rate. The universities supported junior colleges as a filtering device without sharing any of the costs involved (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Thornton, 1996).

These "filtering devices" or junior colleges were in actuality an extension of the high schools. The early twentieth century saw numerous examples of high schools developing their new plans and programs which offered the thirteenth and fourteenth grades to qualified students (Diener, 1986). The founders of the junior college, as an extension of the secondary school, hoped to extend the educational opportunities for youth by adding these two additional years. Thus, the public high school was a force supporting the growth of the junior college, and as a result, the junior colleges were viewed as a curricular reform within the high school system, rather than a new and separate entity (Ratcliff, 1994).

Desiring to establish the junior college as a separate entity, the American Association of Junior Colleges provided a national focus along with the necessary leadership for the nation's junior colleges. Emphasis centered on geographic distribution, enrollment and programs of study. The 1930s saw the concept of the junior college clarified as a community institution; their purpose was to meet the needs of the local community. One particular and very real need became apparent in 1944 with the passage

of the GI Bill of Rights. Newly released servicemen had both the desire and wherewithal to attend college. The only question remaining for some of them was, where could they attend school close to home? The junior college provided the answer; the place they could reach their educational goals. The passage of the G.I. Bill of Rights in 1944, also known as the Servicemen's Readjustment Bill, provided financial assistance for veterans of World War II who were pursuing higher education. This bill certainly was a milestone in providing education to those World War II veterans. In addition, it helped the national development of the junior college system; a system designed to break down the economic and social barriers, and enabled millions of Americans, veterans and non-veterans alike, to attend college (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

Junior College, the name itself appears to belong to another era, and it does. In credit to the Truman Commission Report of 1947-1949, junior colleges became known as community colleges.

Community college 1949-1970. The Truman Commission Report (1947-1949) changed junior colleges to community colleges. Along with a new name, the system gained a set of clarified goals. These were to reduce tuition to minimal or no cost, to serve as cultural centers, to be comprehensive in their program offerings with emphasis on civic responsibilities, and to serve the area in which they were geographically located (Vaughan, 1979). The community college, also known as "democracy's college," was to become the institution that manifested the American dream of post-secondary education to all. To a great extent, the hopes of the Truman commission have been fulfilled.

The community college leaders determined early on that to serve a greater number of students, they must be more accessible. Community colleges are continually

challenged to embrace unprecedented numbers and extraordinary diversity of student abilities and educational experiences (Robles, 1998; Trent & Medsker, 1968; Vaughan, 1992). The 1950s brought increased automation requiring technical skills. In response to such demands, the community colleges developed a wide variety of curriculum, maintaining demanding standards of student achievement (Cohen & Brawer, 1994; Kinlaw, 1998). Vocational education was exploding. The community college was a natural recipient of those high school students who were not primarily interested in academics, but desiring a career and job placement skills. As before, community colleges provided the critical link in the continuum of education between the public high school and higher education. For many, they became the point of first access for people entering higher education (Richardson, 1972).

Two driving forces laid the foundation for this institutional growth: the belief that higher education was the right of any person who could benefit, and the belief that colleges exist to serve the American people. The comprehensive educational system that fostered the development of community colleges was a direct outgrowth of basic, democratic, philosophical assumption; education is necessary for the maintenance of a democracy and is essential for the improvement of society by helping to equalize opportunity for all (Roueche, 1989).

While the expansion brought about by both the Truman Commission and the GI Bill is of historic importance, this expansion pales when compared to the tremendous growth of the community colleges during the 1960s to 1970s. This rapid growth was the driving force behind the Higher Education Act of 1965 (AACC, 1996). Special contributions and needs of the community college were recognized by this Act in making

available special provisions for junior college grants. These funds opened up new opportunities for the expansion of the college's role. With the increased demand for vocational programs, affordable tuition charge, strategically located colleges, and the availability of student aid; almost every American found new reason and means to attend college (Thornton, 1996). Thus, the stage was set for a growth and development that has not since been witnessed in higher education (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

Comprehensive community colleges 1970 – present. Previous to 1970, the community college applied typically to colleges that were lower-division branches of private universities, privately supported two-year colleges and the more comprehensive, publicly supported institutions (Cohen & Brawer, 1982). The goals of the comprehensive community college were to provide general education, transfer courses, and remedial education.

In addition, new responsibilities were added to provide training and retraining for the nation's workforce. These included compensatory education and lifelong learning opportunities for everyone. Community colleges facilitated economic development by providing the necessary connection between the needs of business, industry, and education (Roe & Baker, 1989). For example, training and retraining for new job skills was developed as automation was incorporated into the workplace. The expanded services of the community college can best be illustrated by considering the community college's demographics; it is primary in addressing the needs of minority students along with those students deemed not ready for regular university work.

By the late 1970s, 40% of all first-time, full-time freshmen and about two-thirds of all ethnic, minority students were enrolled in two-year institutions. The function of

relieving the universities from dealing with freshmen and sophomores was less pronounced because the universities would not relinquish their lower level divisions. Instead, community colleges made it possible for them to maintain selective admissions requirements, and thus take only the preferred freshmen and sophomores. Potential students who appeared to be at risk, either for social, economic or academic reasons, were referred to the community colleges until at which time they were "ready" for university level. This lowered the failure rate for the four-year colleges, and reduced the drain that unsuccessful students placed on a college (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

By welcoming minority students and students with special academic, social, and economic needs in the 1970s, the college was indeed beginning to focus on the "community" in its name. This emphasis continued to expand during the 1980s. Community in the 80's would not only refer to a region to be served, but also to a climate to be created (Bass, 1985). Community colleges would continue to play an important role in creating the climate and serving the region. They realized the task of providing a full scope of service and making higher education available to everyone (Thornton, 1996). Emphasis was placed on moving students academically from high school into and through four-year colleges. Continuing education, community service, business and industry contract training, and numerous vocational courses were offered. Community colleges facilitated economic development by proving the necessary connection between the needs of business, industry, and education (Roe & Baker, 1989). This new level of consciousness to community needs manifested itself in a number of developments. In response to the increased level of interest in vocational education, new programs spread across the state.

By the late 1990s, it was obvious colleges must work together, networking in pairs or teams to become successful while continuing to economically meet the needs of the students (Bawer, 1997; Biggerstaff, 1992; Kinlaw, 1998). In offering a program where a smaller student enrollment is evident, community colleges have combined to offer a segment of that program at each school. Networking of two and four-year colleges to establish articulation agreements has become a key factor. Students must be assured that their community college credits will transfer to the universities. Community colleges and four-year colleges have formed partnerships to offer the 2+2 degrees. Students receive the freshman-sophomore courses at a community college, and then transfer to a four-year college for the junior-senior course work, such as elementary and secondary education degrees. Major reoccurring criticisms of community colleges were that by attempting to serve everyone, regardless of interest, achievement, and ability, and by spreading themselves thin along a continuum of programs and function, these colleges were serving all students unsatisfactorily (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

As one can see by this brief history of the community college system, the purpose is to make readily available programs of education beyond high school education (Wattenbarger & Godwin, 1982). Through the struggles to achieve equality of opportunity and to broaden the scope of higher education; junior colleges benefited by educational leaders such as Henry Tappen, William Folwell, David Jordan, and William Harper. These individuals nurtured the junior college until it was accepted as an academic institution capable of offering the first two years of an approved baccalaureate program (Brick, 1965). The two-year comprehensive community college has become the dominant model of the junior college (Diener, 1986). A period of change that has evolved within

the overall community college system fostered changed leadership qualifications as well. No longer could leadership be taken for granted.

Leadership of community colleges, in terms of how it is defined, is helpful in understanding the community college as a whole. "Leadership is one of the most crucial ingredients in creating a culture for excellence in community colleges," (Peters, 1999, p. 4). "Leaders do not need to know all the answers; however they do need to ask the right questions," (Heifetz, 1997, p. 11).

Community College Leadership Studies

The writings on leadership tend to define leadership broadly. Rather than focus solely on top-level executives, they often present leadership as a behavior that applies in many of life's contexts, both at work and at home. For this reason, readers are able to generalize many of the authors' concepts to their own situations. Leadership is not about what one knows; it is about what one does with what one knows; the emphasis is on action.

Leadership defined. Leadership is defined by researchers in the manner that fits their respective perspective and contains the factors of interest to the researcher (Yukl, 1981). There are those who confuse management and leadership, using them interchangeably. There is a vast difference between these two terms. Management is the handling of people, giving orders and direction from the top down with little or no input from personnel (Yukl, 1989).

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) said leadership is contingent upon an individual's concept of what constitutes a leader, as well as on how followers contribute to the leader. The effective leader blends into the group and engages the followers into strategic

positions. "Today there are almost as many different definitions of effective leadership as there are researchers who have studied the concept" (Lunenbutg & Ornstein, 1991, p. 23).

Perhaps what makes leadership difficult to define is the fact that it's taken from the common vocabulary and incorporated into the technical vocabulary of a scientific discipline, without being precisely redefined (Yukl, 1998). Following is a sampling of the vast number of definitions of leadership that relates to community college culture. The definitions are listed in chronological order for the purpose of presenting a clearer picture of the key events that occurred in the history and development of the community college.

More than 3,000 empirical investigations that examined leadership were documented by Bass (1981). He stated that leadership must be defined broadly, and that leadership is an interaction between members of a group. Furthermore, leaders are agents of change; persons whose acts affect other people more than other people's acts affect them. When one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in the group, leadership happens (Bass, 1981). Misumi (1984) defined leadership as the role behavior of a specific group member who, more than other members, exerts some kind of outstanding, lasting and positive influence on the nature and direction of group activity. Bennis and Nanus (1985), in their review of 1,000 studies, pointed out that research has produced more than 350 definitions of effective leadership, with no "clean and unequivocal understanding as to what distinguishes leaders from non-leaders, and perhaps more importantly, what distinguishes effective leaders from ineffective leaders" (p.27).

For Gardner (1986), "Leadership is the process of persuasion and example by which an individual or team induces a group to take action that is in accord with the leader's purpose or the shared purpose of all" (p. 24). Rost (1993) collected 110 definitions of leadership in the 312 books, chapters, and articles he reviewed. He then grouped the definitions into identifiable, conceptual frameworks that will be explained in detail under the leadership theories heading. "Do the leader's wishes," delivers the message that leadership is basically doing what the leader wants done. The second conceptual framework, "Leadership as achieving group or organizational goals," expresses the thought that leadership involves the process of influence between a leader and follower to attain group, organization or societal goals. The third framework of leadership is, "Leadership as management." Leadership is defined as the design, change, development of and giving direction to, social subsystems embedded in their environment. Fourth, "Leadership as influence," involves a social influence process in which a person steers members of the group toward a goal. Fifth is "Leadership as traits." These traits may include physical characteristics, personality, social background, and ability. Sixth is, "Leadership as transformation." The transformational leadership goes beyond meeting the basic needs of subordinates, and followers are engaged in such a way as to raise them to new levels of morality and motivation.

However one defines leadership, one thing is certain; developing a new generation of leaders for America's community colleges is vital if these institutions are to successfully operate in increasingly complex environments (Cohen & Brawer, 1998). For the past two decades, the topics of college president's leadership styles, relationship of leadership styles, desired personal traits and variables such as stress, burnout and gender

of college presidents have been the focus of many studies (Bennett, 1987; Crawford, 1992; Gubanich, 1991; Riley, 1990; Thomas, 1993). Writers have viewed leadership as a means of social control, social influence, and social identification. These processes occur as part of, or separate from, the actions of a formal group. Persons involved with groups are more likely to believe in like norms, values, share attitudes and beliefs, and to work together in decision-making. A skilled leader can find ways to shape these processes to support desired objectives (Yukl, 1998).

Studies show colleges and universities have grown in complexity, decentralized in structure and have become more competitive for funding (Barker, 1984; Cantu, 1997; Martin, 1993). As a result of institutional changes, presidential roles have expanded leaving them with less time to devote to the internal affairs of their institution (Cantu, 1997; Martin, 1993). There has been extensive research on leadership behavior resulting in many concepts of leadership from which to choose to investigate and interpret results of leadership behavior (Bensimon, Newmann, & Birnbaum, 1989; Yukl, 1981). Leadership styles are often as diverse as the leaders themselves (Dreilinger, 1982; Guskin & Bassis, 1985; Hill, 1973; House, Filley, & Gujarati, 1971; Ricker & King, 1985). To better understand leadership, Halpin (1966), suggested that researchers concentrate their inquiries on leader behavior.

Results were disappointing to Roueche (1989) as he attempted to identify writings associated with the leadership styles of community college presidents from the past 20 years. He found that much had been written about community, technical, and junior colleges presidents' leadership styles and qualities; however, literature reviews were

deficient when researchers focused on specific leadership styles of community college presidents.

In a case study of the community college presidents in Arizona, Fridena (1998), used a Delphi survey and content analysis to explore the power networks. He concluded the following: (a) community college leadership can be understood as the result of group or class interests; (b) community college presidents are powerful and dominant actors in the system; (c) the presidents can be shown to have organized into elite power networks; (d) the presidents shape institutional decisions across individual community colleges; and (e) the presidents do not embrace democratic mechanisms.

Why are some community colleges consistently more successful than others in effecting student learning, sustaining staff morale, presenting a positive public image, managing growth, raising funds and answering every challenge promptly and efficiently (Yukl, 1998)? Many believe the answer is attributed to leadership. Leadership is a transaction between people, not a quality or set of traits held by a person who is in a position of authority. Power is an interactive state (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

Personal traits. Through the years researchers have used a variety of approaches to study this subject; leadership studies have undergone phases. The behavior phase emphasized the relationship between leader behavior and subordinate behavior (Gube & Getzels, 1956). Bingham (1974) contended that personality is a key variable of leadership. He defined a leader as a person who possesses the greatest number of desirable traits of personality and character. Eddy and Inchassi (1986) believed traits that described leaders included: inner directed, spontaneous, pragmatic, self-accepting, and integrated characteristics.

Leadership studies have examined the relationship of leadership styles and personal characteristics of the leader (Bensimon, 1989). Leadership research has included several demographic variables including gender, length of service, and age. Several feminist scholars proposed there are gender differences involved with leadership, and they professed that women are more people oriented, therefore more suited for this role. Women are particularly suited for leadership because they are "more intuitive, creative, adaptive, flexible, people orientated, and sensitive to the needs of others" (Gardner, 1990, p. 112). Thomas (1993) in his study to determine whether gender affects the willingness to accept a community college president found that there is a difference in expectations of male and female presidents when they are first appointed. He also discovered that women presidents were more likely to have a participatory style. He went on to say, however, the most successful presidents had an approach to leadership that blended traits traditionally attributed to males with those also traditionally attributed to females. Concluding that although stereotyping of female leaders persists, it is the individual's personality and the type of training one received that determines the style that is practiced once they are in a position of leadership.

From the multitude of studies that have been conducted through the years on individuals' personal characteristics, it is clear that many traits contribute to leadership. Some of the important traits in true leaders that are consistently identified in many of these studies are: intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability (Ankeny, 1997; Fiedler, 1967; Hershey & Blanchard, 1969; Mann, 1959; Maslow, 1954; Morris, 1985; Reddin, 1970; Vaughan, 1995; Wen, 1999; Wenrich, 1976).

Background factors common among outstanding community college presidents as researched by McFarlin, Crittenden, and Ebbers (1999), concluded nine factors that may contribute to the development of exemplary, community college leaders: (1) possession of an earned doctorate; (2) the specific study of community college leadership as an academic major; (3) an active personal research and publication agenda; (4) preparation as a change agent; (5) previous career position; (6) relationship with a mentor; (7) development of a peer network; (8) previous participation in a leadership preparation activity; and (9) knowledge in the area of technology.

In summary, effective leadership can move organizations from current to future states, create visions of potential opportunities for organization, and develop commitment within employees to change and instill new cultures and strategies in organizations that mobilize and focus energy and resources.

Community College Presidents' Role

Effective leadership is that which centers upon correct values with decision making (Covey, 1989; Rest, 1986; Sergiovanni, 1992). "Principle centered leaders realize that growth comes from the inside out, therefore they focus first on changing themselves and then on expanding to other areas of influence in the organization" (Covey, 1991, p. 216).

Just as the role of the college changed over the years, so did that of the president. As the college grew, responsibilities increased for the president. The development of this office is referenced using the same timeframes as the historical development of the comprehensive community college.

Junior college 1901-1949. The founding presidents were active individuals with little time for reflection. Every minute of their day was devoted to building colleges and selling their mission to legislators, the faculty, and the public, often simultaneously. Their focus was narrow, with the vast majority of leaders exhibiting an authoritative, bureaucratic, leadership style (Pierce, 1996).

Junior colleges in rural areas had different needs than urban ones. As pointed out by Lovell and Miller (1998), rural colleges had the potential to greatly improve the quality of life in southern rural communities. They also contended that the majority of the rural colleges across the nation have been ignored and under-funded. Leaders of these institutions, under the demands associated with cost-effective accountability, may have to exert leadership power that is different from that required by their urban counterparts in order to accomplish the same set of specific goals.

Community college 1949-1970. Community college presidents at the earlier period knew that the community college was democracy's answer to the call for universal higher education, to opening the doors of opportunity to everyone. Their role was to increase enrollments, to make the campuses grow, and to win the applause of the public (Vaughan, 1989). Vaughan also stressed visionary leadership as the key to community college success. He asserted, "The successful president must spend more time creating a vision for the institution and identifying trends and issues in the broader society which will affect that vision" (p.17). During this timeframe, community college presidents broaden their focus to include community relations. They became more sensitive to those around them while continuing to maintain control of their turf. Leadership followed the top down structure.

Early community college presidents sensed that the moment was right for taking higher education to the masses. Roueche, Baker III and Rose (1989) described the community college as vital to the future of this nation. They saw it as the main force that would influence America's workforce. It would be the community college that would keep America working. The community college would be the force that transfers the technology developed in partnerships between the American corporation and American colleges into operational reality. Presidents realized it was their job to provide colleges that were accessible to almost everyone.

Indicating that management talent and leadership talent are not the same; Parnell (1988) wrote, "It is a blessing when these two attributes are combined in the same person (p. 37)." The key to maintaining the vitality of the community college is to insure that community college presidents posses the combination of management talent and leadership talent in conjunction with the necessary knowledge and skills to fulfill the competencies of the presidential role. Thus in order to be effective presidents, they must be wiling to adapt, to be flexible, thoughtful, and act as strong visionaries.

During this period from 1949-1970, collective bargaining had perhaps been the most significant issue to affect community college leadership. Claims have been made that unions weaken administrative control; that collective bargaining creates competition rather than cooperation between faculty and administrators. Studies show that a collective bargaining contract, which outlines the duties and responsibilities of faculty, can make faculty more accountable. Community college presidents must adapt to their new role as managers of the decision-making process (Lewis, 1989).

If community colleges are to raise standards, status, and improve the overall campus environment, advanced and improved leadership practices for higher education, leaders are needed in the 21st century. Eddy, Murphy, Spaulding, and Chandras (1997) studied areas in which new leadership practices were necessary. Included in these areas were: ethics, collaboration, accountability, privatization, international, distance education, volunteerism, and multiculturalism.

Comprehensive community colleges 1970-present. In the 1970s community college presidents were described as the "Man in the Middle" (Vaughan, 1986, p. 7). During this period, the presidents were confronted with sorting out the dilemmas of the past two decades that included a reduction in the number of 18-22 year olds, declining dollars, and a lessening of public support. Bound by these Gordian knots, "The Man in the Middle" needed an expanding repertoire of talents and skills to maintain initiatives within and on behalf of their institutions (Vaughan, 1986). These men saw the role of the community college president in the 1970s as a manipulator, an educational leader, a marketer, a money manager, and a politician.

This era brought new leadership styles; well-rounded individuals who were capable of wearing many different hats, were hired as presidents. They adapted their leadership styles to the situation and brought their flexibility to a new level. The open door policy brought more accessibility. The president became more available to the students and staff. In the 1990s, with the practice of empowering others, the president's position gained new dimensions of strength and respect. With the creation of an all-inclusive culture, people skills were a high priority. It was vital that communication flowed in all directions.

As an educational leader, the president interprets and communicates a picture of the college's total needs to its constituents (Kerr, 1972). Continued and increased funding was important for faculty, staff, supplies, equipment, buildings, for expanded programs and services, for eliminating programs and positions, and for ensuring that the community college is an integral part of the educational fabric of the community, the state and the nation. Roueche (1989) stated, "The primary function of the president has been identified to raise money, balance the budget, participate in the establishment of institutional goals, work with faculty to create an environment that encourages learning, recruiting and maintaining a high quality of faculty" (p. 87). Richardson (1989) wrote, the president is becoming less visible at the institution, but a more pronounced figure in the community.

While McClenney (1978) suggested that a community college president who is presently in touch with reality has been confronted with concerns about accountability, retrenchment, consumerism, and competition, loss of autonomy, government regulation, collective bargaining, attacks on traditional accreditation, court decision, energy conservation, affirmative action, higher education spending, and faculty pessimism. The response to these issues has been to become "management conscious" (Lilly, 1987, p. 69). For this reason then McClenney writes, strong management capabilities are what a president needs in order to deal with the heavy responsibilities.

A different perspective came from Bickford (1978) who saw the president's role from another viewpoint. He was less concerned about management and more concerned about the president's interaction with the college public. This could encompass those internal to the institution (faculty, students), and those external to the institution (business

community, media, and agencies). He suggested that the president's primary function is that of marketer.

On the other hand, Wygal (1978) believed that the future role of the president is that of manipulator. He contended that much of the power of the college president is mythical and that the primary role was that of manipulator. Furthermore, he argued that the president must work through others to attain institutional goals by being involved in decision-making as well as mobilizing support for the institution.

From the 1980s to the 1990s, the role of the president changed. Limited financial resources, changes in enrollment, diversity in student demographics, all called for accountability. Collective bargaining has signaled for a profound change. The most important issue that faced American higher education, according to Stadtman's (1980) study, was financing higher education. Other issues frequently mentioned were: redefining the goals of higher education, maintaining enrollments, maintaining autonomy, and strengthening career education and public confidence in both higher education and continuing education.

Parnell (1980) also claimed, "community college president's most important task then is to continuously clarify and emphasize the mission of the community college" (p. 44). Rushing (1976) discussed the changing role of the community college president, claiming that the president may expect "intensified pressures in finance, governance, public confidence, the employee's search for security and governmental control" (p.1). He further discussed the president's role in relationship to the economy, public attitudes, collective bargaining, and government relations. However, the most important role he said assigned to the community college president is that of leader.

The importance of community college presidents was summarized by Harold Stoke (1984). "One thing is clear, colleges must have presidents, and it makes a great deal of difference who is the president," (p. 77). A Carnegie-supported *Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership* (Campbell, 1985) concluded that, "Strengthening presidential leadership was one of the most urgent concerns on the agenda of higher education in the United States" (p. 84).

When one considers the various factors and groups impacting the presidents, it is clear that the support of "top leadership" is essential in order for a formal collaboration or partnership to succeed (Ascher, 1998, p. 23). The support of high level administrators and their associated power of office is a vital factor in successful, collaboration development; but this alone does not guarantee the participation of faculty, or the success of the outcomes. While the top of the organizational hierarchy must be supportive, that alone is not sufficient to develop effective collaboration. The role of faculty leadership in the successful development of collaboration should not be underestimated. For collaboration to succeed, it is necessary to have leaders at both the top and the bottom of the traditional organizational pyramid.

Compounding the president's problems is the fact that presidential authority has been challenged by most constituents including students, faculty, and various state and local political officers. The contributors to the changing role of the president as pointed out by Mayhew (1996) were: (a) the de-localization of presidential interests; (b) the creation of supra-institutional boards of control; (c) the reduction of internal control and power; and (d) the loss of legitimacy. The greatest change during the past 20 years is that the decision-making process, once exclusively the domain of the president, has evolved

into a more democratic, participatory process. Trustees, students and especially faculty have begun participating in decision-making. Shared authority and increased government regulations mean that the president must now deal with state legislatures, finance committees, coordinating boards, and even local constituencies. Consequently, the president's role has become increasingly political.

In summary, to create a market, a college must have leaders with vision and ideas. A key component is having a broader focus; the ability to change with the changing needs, wisdom enough to appoint the right people to do the job, and knowledge of technology. Some individuals have greater ability than others and can accomplish things beyond the power of others with lesser endowment. Covey (1991) says, "The people who are transforming education today are doing it by building consensus around a common set of principles, values, and priorities" (p. 90). Our nation needs to effectively use its intellectual resources. To do this means to use its brightest people; whether they come from the farm, city, slum or country club area, regardless of color, religion or economic differences; but not regardless of ability (Covey, 1999). The primary task of leadership in the future will be to create new markets by reinventing the institution (Alfred, 1999).

Leadership Theories

The study of leadership in education has evolved over time, with the earliest studies focusing on leadership traits and behavior. Beginning with the leadership studies of Lewin and Lippitt (1938), there have been numerous studies of leadership resulting in the development of many leadership theories. Major theories posited include Trait Theory, Situation Theory, Behavior Theory, Contingency Theory, Power and Influence Theory, and a variety of Dimensional Theories.

Trait theory. Mann (1959) conducted a study that examined more than 1,400 findings regarding personality and leadership in small groups. Although tentative in his conclusions, Mann suggested that personality traits could be used to discriminate leaders from non-leaders. His results identified leaders as strong in the following traits: intelligence, masculinity, adjustment, dominance, extroversion, and conservatism.

Additional contributors to the human relations aspect of leadership in the 1950s and 1960s were theorists Maslow, McGregor, Argyris, and Likert. Maslows' (1954) theory suggested that a president's job was to provide avenues for the satisfaction of employees' needs and to support organizational goals and remove impediments that block need-satisfaction and cause frustration, negative attitudes or methods used by workers. According to Maslow, the driving force that causes people to work in an organization, stay in it, and achieve its goals is a hierarchy of needs. As the lowest order of needs in the hierarchy is satisfied, a higher-order need appears. These needs occur in the following order: (a) physical, (b) safety, (c) social, (d) esteem, and (e) self-actualization (Maslow, 1954).

Contingency theory. Contingency leadership theory emerged in 1967. The idea that effective leadership behavior is contingent on the situation is more prevalent today than the idea that there is one best set of leader traits and behaviors. Fiedler (1967) and his associates have spent two decades developing and refining a contingency theory of leadership. According to the contingency theory, the effectiveness of a leader in achieving high group performance is contingent on the leader's motivational system and the degree to which the leader controls and influences the situation. The three situational factors include leader-member relations, task structure, and the leader's power position.

The Contingency Theory (Fiedler, 1964, 1967; Fiedler & Chemers, 1974; Fiedler & Garcia, 1987) is a "leader-match" theory. This means it tried to match leaders to appropriate situations. It suggested that a leader's effectiveness depended on how well the leader's style fits the context. Effective leadership was contingent on matching a leader's style to the right setting. Fiedler assessed leaders' styles, the situations in which they worked, and whether or not they were effective. Following the analysis of hundreds of leaders and their styles, who were both good and bad, he made empirically grounded generalizations about which styles of leadership were best and which styles were worst in a given organizational context. Contingency theory was concerned with styles and situations which provided the framework for effectively matching the leader and the styles (Northouse, 1997).

Elaborating on the leadership styles, by conceiving of a continuum that runs between boss-centered leadership at one extreme and subordinate-centered leadership at the other was the focus of a study by Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973). Between these extremes are five points representing various combinations of managerial authority and subordinate freedom. They identified five typical patterns testing of leadership behavior: (a) telling, (b) selling, (c) testing, (d) consulting, and (e) joining. Another similar theory was developed in 1970.

Situational theory. Another useful model for identifying the leadership styles of practicing school administrators was developed by Reddin (1970). By adding an effectiveness dimension to the task behavior and relationship behavior dimensions, Reddin attempted to integrate the concepts of leadership style with situational demands of a specific environment. According to Reddin, when the style of a leader is appropriate to

a given situation, it is termed effective; when the style is inappropriate to a given situation, it is termed ineffective.

The Situational Approach is a widely recognized approach to leadership developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1998). They have refined and revised it several times and used it extensively in training and development for organizations throughout the country. The basic premise is that different situations demand different kinds of leadership. This perspective views leaders as needing to adapt their style to the demands of different situations in order to be effective. Situational Leadership says there is no best way to influence people. The key for leadership effectiveness in Hersey and Blanchard's model is to match the situation with the appropriate leadership style. This research led to the development of the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description Self and Other (LEAD-Self and Other) instruments (Hersy & Blanchard, 1988).

Behavior theory. Ohio and Michigan State studies (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988) identified two key leadership behaviors: task behavior and relationship behavior. Much of their research was carried out with the intent to find the best way for leaders to combine task and relationship behaviors. The goal was to find a universal set of leadership behaviors capable of explaining leadership effectiveness in every situation; however, the research has been inconclusive. Heresy and Blanchard incorporated the maturity of followers as a key situational variable in the model. Management and leadership skills are both needed at the organizational, team and personal levels; leadership is about people. Researchers at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research developed a method in which to identify leaders who were rated as either effective or ineffective.

They then studied the behavior of these leaders in an attempt to develop consistent patterns of behavior that differentiated the two groups.

The Leadership Behavior Description and Measurement (LBDQ) developed at the Ohio State University was used to compile data to assist in studying leader behavior (Stogdill & Coons, 1957). The original LBDQ contained 15 items pertaining to consideration and an equal number for initiating structure. The instrument tool revealed descriptions of leader performances and how others perceived their performance. The categories of Initiating Structure and Consideration were measured by observed leader behavior that resulted in separate scores for each category.

Power and influence theory. A group of researchers at the Ohio State University began to analyze how individuals act when they were leading a group or organization. This analysis was conducted by having subordinates complete questionnaires about their leaders. They were asked to identify the number of times their leaders engaged in certain types of behaviors. The original questionnaire used in these studies was constructed from a list of more than 1,800 items describing different aspects of leader behavior. From this long list of items, a questionnaire composed of 150 questions was formulated. Later, this was called the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), (Stogdill, 1963).

One-dimensional theory. Two theorists recognized for their influence in this theory are Fredrick W. Taylor (1947) and Henry Fayol (1949). Their leadership styles focused on the one-dimensional theory, solely concerned with getting the task accomplished. Faylo (1949) claimed that all managers perform five basic functions: " (1) planning, (2) organizing, (3) commanding, (4) coordinating, and (5) controlling" (p. 42). He was the first to recognize management as a continuous process.

One of the most influential contributors to the one-dimensional theory was German sociologist Max Weber (1920). He first described the concept of bureaucracy as based on a comprehensive set of rational guidelines believed to constitute an ideal structure for organizational effectiveness. Weber felt that the bureaucratic apparatus would be very impersonal, thereby minimizing the irrational personal and emotional factors and leaving them free to work with a minimal level of friction and confusion.

Two-dimensional theory. During the 1920s and 1930s the two-dimensional theory evolved. Along with task orientation, human relationships became an important dimension for consideration in effective leadership. This movement is considered to have begun with a series of studies widely known as the Hawthorne Studies; so called because they were conducted at the Hawthorne Plant of Western Electric near Chicago. These studies prompted one of the most far-reaching series of experiments in the study of human behavior. The original experiment, conducted by Elton Mayo, was designed simply to determine the optimum level of illumination for maximum production efficiency of its factory workers. What resulted was with the increased lighting, the level of production efficiency escalated. Researchers discovered the driving force behind the increased production was with the improvement of the quality of light in the workplace, the employees felt someone cared about them; thus they responded by caring about their work, resulting in increased productivity. Researchers discovered that the improvement in productivity was due to human-social factors such as: morale, a feeling of belongingness, and effective management in which such interpersonal skills as motivating, leading, participative decision making, and effective communications were used. The importance

of understanding human behavior from the perspective of management was then firmly established (Yukl, 1981).

A graphic portal of a two-dimensional view of behavioral leadership was developed by Blake and Mouton (1981). They proposed a "Leadership Grid." This approach is based on four factors that have been found to be present in academic organizations: (1) the purpose the organization served by organized action; (2) the people who constitute the organization; (3) the power which emerges relative to the leader which influences other people in their organization; and (4) the philosophy of how tasks are done and how people are to be valued (Blake & Mouton, 1981; Blake, Mouton, & Williams, 1981; Hall & Williams, 1986). "Leadership is conceived as reflecting the interplay among th previous four factors" (Hall & Williams, 1986, p. 10). The grid focuses on five leadership styles: (1) the strategic leadership style, (2) directive leadership style, (3) supportive leadership style, (4) bureaucratic leadership style, and (5) the collaborative leadership style (Blake & Mouton, 1981; Blake & Mouton & Williams, 1981; Hall & Williams, 1986).

The Michigan studies (1988) identified two distinct leadership behaviors that were very similar to the initiating structure and consideration dimension. These dimensions evolved from the Ohio State studies. The two dimensions identified were production-centered leadership and employee-centered leadership. The production-centered leader emphasized employee tasks and the methods used to accomplish them; while the employee-centered leader emphasized the employees' personal needs and the development of interpersonal relationships.

Multi-dimensional theory. Major contributors to the tri-dimensional theories and models were Reddin (1976) and Hersey and Blanchard (1988). Reddin's 3-D Management Style Theory added the "effectiveness" dimension (1976, p. 38), while Hersey and Blanchard (1988) added the "readiness" dimension (p. 29). Both models emphasized that the effectiveness of leaders depends on how their leadership style interrelates with the situation in which they are operating.

The leadership frame theory developed by Bolmand and Deal's (1984) combines the existing research on organization, leadership and management by classifying the types of leadership into four frames or styles. The four frames are structural, human resource, political, and symbolic (Bolmand & Deal, 1984). The structural frame derived from sociology, the human resource frame derived from psychology and organizational behavior, the political frame derived from political science, and the symbolic frame derived mainly from anthropology. Each frame is centered on different aspects of organizational behavior (Bolmand & Deal, 1994). These four distinct classifications relate to the way leaders think and respond to problems (Bolmand & Deal, 1991).

Bolmand and Deal (1984) and Bensimon (1989) suggested that organizations have multiple realities; and that managers need multiple lenses or perspectives to deal with problems. Managers should be able to examine problems from different perspectives wrote Lombard (1971).

Likert's theory. In 1961 Likert introduced his theory on leadership. He conducted extensive empirical research at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, for the purpose of examining the effect of management systems on employees' attitudes and behavior. He discovered that the most successful leaders were employee relationship-

oriented; also described as being employee-centered. The leaders who were task-oriented or job-centered were found to be less successful. His study revealed that the leadership and other processes of an organization must insure a maximum probability that in all interactions and relationships with the organization, each member will, in light of his background, value, and expectations, view the experience as supportive and as one which builds and maintains a sense of personal worth and importance. Likert (1961) suggested that leadership is a relative process; leaders must consider the expectations, values, and interpersonal skills of individual group members. Also, they must behave in such a way as to prove supportive of their subordinates' efforts and sense of personal worth. Ultimately, a leader's primary role is to build group cohesiveness and motivation for productivity by allowing freedom of decision-making and individual self-initiative. This statement is based on many years of research conducted in various organizational settings (industrial, government, health-care, and education). Likert (1961) proposed four basic systems of organization: (1) exploitive-authoritarian, (2) benevolent authoritarian, (3) consultative, and (4) participative.

In contrast to the scientific theory of management focusing on the organization, the human relations theory focused on the individual needs of the workers. The scientific management was based on task or output, while the human relations theory was based on people and their relationships.

Transactional vs. transformational theory. Transactional leadership was viewed by Burns (1979) as a relationship between leaders and followers based on an exchange of valued things. These things could be economic, political, or psychological in nature. He distinguished between the two types of leadership; transactional leadership referred to the

bulk of leadership models, which focused on the exchanges that occur between leaders and their followers. Transformational leadership referred to the process whereby an individual engaged with others and created a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower. This type of leader is attentive to the needs and motives of followers and tries to help followers reach their fullest potential.

According to Bass (1985), while the transactional leader has accepted organizational culture as it exists, the transformational leader invents, introduces, and advances new cultural forms. Three factors associated with transformational leadership are charismatic leadership, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation. Such leadership is more likely to emerge in times of rapid change and distress, and in organizations that have unclear goals and structure. There is as much variance in theories as there is in researchers. Although there are similarities of thought, the differences vary widely.

Leader-Follower Relationship

The leadership of institutions of higher learning has been a societal concern since their inception. A plethora of relevant concepts, theories, and ideas exist (Muhammad, 1996). The relationship between leaders and followers has been the foundation for much literature; it is seen as an interactive process that involves the leader and followers. It is not something just the leader possesses. Leadership requires leaders to be major directive agents. They must have a grasp of the vision of their institution's mission and share that vision with their followers. "Leadership is a process of morality to the degree that leaders engage with followers on the basis of shared motives, values and goals" (Burns, 1979,

p.17). It is seen as an interactive process that involves the leader and followers, requiring leaders to be major directive agents. Leaders are supposed to have a greater grasp of the vision of their institution's mission and share this vision with their followers (Hollander, 1987). The degree of confidence, trust and respect followers have in the leader, assesses the quality of the relationship between them. Gardner (1986) suggested that influence and pressure must flow both ways and that effective two-way communication is essential in order to have a properly functioning leader-follower relationship. Sergiovanni (1989) wrote that leadership is the process of persuasion by which a leader or leadership group induces followers to act in a manner that enhances the leader's purposes or shared purposes (p. 9).

The importance of leadership in the development of successful inter-institutional collaboration is well documented (Asher, 1988; Christiansen, Goulet, Krentz, & Maeers, Eds., 1997; Greenburg, 1991; Grobe, 1993; Gross, 1988; Sirotnic & Goodlad, Eds., 1988; Trubowitz & Longno, 1997; Tushnet, 1993). They found that without leadership, collaboration has little chance for initial development or ultimate success. That collaboration requires the presence of a champion, broker or official worrier who is highly committed to the collaboration's goals and is willing to devote considerable personal time and energy to making it a success. Levine (1983) stressed the value of "the presence of an inter-organizational champion," (p. 8) and that "individuals create partnerships; institutions do not" (p.15). The support of top leadership (Ascher, 1988) is essential for a formal collaboration or partnership to succeed. The support of high level administrators and their associated power of office is an essential factor in successful collaboration development (Gross, 1988). While the top of the organizational hierarchy

must be supportive, that support alone is not sufficient to develop effective collaboration. Organizations must have constant support throughout the entire organization.

Sirotnik and Goodlad (1988) clearly state that the largest source of power and energy for educational improvement is at the base of the organizational pyramid. Without support and participation by faculty who are in the classrooms, collaboration could be nothing more than another organizational chart. The leader's primary contribution is in the recognition of good ideas. Leadership that has the ability and willingness to live with ambiguity, remain flexible and to value process as equally important as the product, is necessary for the sustainability of college collaboration (Bozeman, 1991).

Leaders must understand the needs of their followers and have the ability to include these people in the decision making process. With every college having different needs, leaders must have faith in the human possibilities of their followers (Gardner, 1989). To quote Burns (1979), "Leadership is a process of morality to the degree that leaders engage with followers on the basis of shared motives, values and goals" (p.17). A competent leader is not intimidated by experts or by others who appear to know more than he does. The leader must be decisive and able to produce results. Problems must be recognized and solutions for solving those problems put into action (Tead, 1995). Today's college presidents must be problem solvers and risk takers.

Fisher and Tack (1990) assessed the need for effective presidents to mold the mission of the institution into a cause for those they lead. Communication between the presidents of institutions and all involved parties is deemed vital when implementing any process of change (Riggs & Akor, 1992). The president of an institution of higher

education must be perceived as communicating effectively with their staff and faculty, and allow them the freedom to be involved in school management.

The phenomenon of leader activities and behaviors has intrigued individuals and interested historians, philosophers, and scholars for thousands of years. Much of early recorded history was concerned with great leaders of the time, as well as the dimensions and techniques of their leadership. Some claim that never has there been a time when higher quality leadership was required than today. A plethora of research studies on leadership have been conducted over the past three decades, along with a host of books that focus on leadership and leaders. Currently, the leadership field is in transition about the essential behaviors of leaders, moving from earlier versions of initiating consideration and structure. The field lacks consensus around issues as just what leadership is, how it differs from management, and whether it can be measured. Even though practicality requires that organizations attempt to define and understand it in order to be successful. The concept of leadership has become one of the most difficult to define. Attempts do need to be made to measure it however, in order for organizations to succeed.

Previous LPI Studies

The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) was developed as an empirical measure of the conceptual leadership framework generated from the case studies reported by Kouzes and Posner (1987) of managers' personal best experiences as leaders. The LPI is also intended as a management development instrument and in this capacity was useful for assessing individuals' leadership actions and behaviors, and subsequently enhanced their leadership capabilities. Previous research substantiated the reliability and validity of the LPI. This updated analysis provided continuing strong evidence of the ability of the

LPI to assess leadership behaviors and skills, and offered evidence on how such practices are linked with other important individual and organizational consequences. The reliability of the LPI over time is strong. Researchers have shown how leadership practices, as measured by the LPI, are related to organizational effectiveness, work group vitality, and individual levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Numerous studies have used the LPI designed by Kouzes and Posner for gathering data and examining higher education leadership issues. Research found to be most pertinent to this study, is as follows. Scott's (1989) study analyzed community college leaders' thinking styles and behavioral practices in their current environment. She selected the LPI in conjunction with the Human Information Processing Survey. California community college presidents were asked to nominate two individuals who they felt were leaders, as well as five additional persons who were familiar with the nominated persons. The sample population consisted of 70 nominated leaders and 214 observers of these leaders. The results showed no significant relationships between the thinking styles and leadership practices. In addition, no difference could be found between self-perceptions of the leadership practices and the perceptions of those familiar with these leaders. Both of these instruments were consistent with the findings.

Even previous K-12 school studies relating to leadership styles drew no consistent conclusions. Using the LPI, Hickey (1995) compared leadership characteristics to performance base in Nationally Recognized Schools of Excellence. Results of his study found congruency between the principals' and employees' perceptions. He concluded, "There is no single leadership style which ensured effective leadership, however there is a core of leadership characteristics that are possessed in varying degrees by effective

leadership" (p. 262). In 1999, Floyd investigated administrative leadership styles in relation to faculty perception of school mission and student achievement. The administrator's perception was inversely related to the performance of their school, while the opposite was true of the faculty. Faculty rated high LPI scores in the schools that performed at a high level, and low scores in those schools performing at a low level.

Other K-12 studies using the LPI instrument are listed below in chronological order. Miller (1994) found no significant correlation between leadership practices and demographic characteristics of schools or its officials. Nyquist (1997) studied elementary teachers vs. leadership, finding find no significance difference. In 2000, two studies examined perceptions of leadership styles and school performance. Dunn found the ranking of leadership practices was consistent with administrators and employees. McBroom studied the relationship between principal's leadership practices and their impact on the job satisfaction of teachers. There were significant correlations between principals' leadership practices and the five practices. Encouraging the heart practice was highly related to overall job satisfaction. .

Differences in the perceptions of effective leadership practices were the focus of Oumthanom's dissertation (2001). He examined the relationship between private, elementary school teachers and principals and concluded that all participants perceived leadership practice as a means to achieve educational reform. A study of factors used by superintendents to achieve their best, found that leadership action challenges traditional thinking to take a look at what constitutes effectiveness (Long, 1991). *Enabling* others to act was the most important leadership strategy, followed by *Inspiring, Modeling, Encouraging,* and *Challenging*. Faculty perceptions of principal's leadership behaviors

by Leech (1999) discovered a somewhat promising view of the current status of school leadership. Over half of the responding teachers' perceived principals as demonstrating effective leadership practices of 'fairly often' to 'almost always.' And finally, Burleson (1998) in her doctoral dissertation identified and described leadership practices that superintendents used resulting in improved student learning. Key factors included: communicating the importance of student learning by making the goals more meaningful, building alliances within the community, and demonstrating follow-through that student learning was a priority.

The first national recognized workbook on presidential assessment and evaluation was published by Munitz (1977). He discussed the procedures, condition, and objectives involved in evaluating a college president. The LPI was helpful in gathering data. Munitz contributed to president assessment programs through his research and writings.

To explore whether a relationship existed between perceived presidential leadership behavior and institutional effectiveness, Morton (1983) used the LPI tool. He found significant positive relationships between presidential behavior and several dimensions of institutional effectiveness. He did conclude that no significant differences were evident between presidents and executive level cabinet members in perception regarding presidential leadership behaviors.

One of the well-publicized studies of college presidents, which spent two years interviewing and surveying 800 presidents, was Kerr (1984). He used the LPI plus other techniques to evaluate presidential selection, evaluation, and the routine workings of a college presidency. The results suggested recommendations for energizing and fortifying presidential leadership.

Blau (1973), who considered himself a social theorist, examined data from 115 colleges. He concluded the personal qualities of the president can decisively influence the fate of an academic institution, for better or worse. Using the LPI, he related administrative structure to faculty and student performance.

A national study on presidential effectiveness was conducted by Fisher, Tack, & Wheeler (1988). They compared 412 presidents who had been nominated as effective with 412 other presidents who had not been nominated. Their research concluded that a distinct difference existed between the groups. The nominated effective leaders group was highly confident and categorized as goal orientated and visionary persons.

The traditional and non-traditional leadership practices between male and female leaders were studied by Tarazi (1990). Results showed no significant differences by age, or marital status. She did find, however, that "initiating structure" was significantly correlated with "challenging the process", "modeling the way", and "encouraging the heart". She also found that "consideration" was significantly correlated with "modeling the way", and "encouraging the heart". And that "consideration" was significantly correlated with "modeling the way" and "inspiring a shared vision". Since Tarazi's results do not align "consideration" and "initiating structure" with "envision" and "implementation", respectively, it appears that any distinction Tarazi did find is unique and probably relevant to a more general level of analysis.

The perceptions of presidential leadership behavior and institutional environment of presidents and vice presidents from selected four-year colleges and universities in Florida, was studied by Plowman (1991). The purpose of his study was to rate the leadership practices, to assess the college environment, and to explore the relationship

between that environment and the leadership style. The sample was comprised of the nine state-supported, four-year public institutions that embodied the Sate University System of Florida and the 20 private, four-year institutions that comprised the Independent Colleges and Universities also of Florida. Twenty-five presidents and 82 vice-presidents completed the survey. This instrument served as a proxy for organizational effectiveness. No statistical, significant relationships were found between the President's leadership assessments and perceptions of institutional environment. However, there were consistent significant differences in the relationships between the Vice President's perception of their President's leadership practices and institutional environment. Higher LPI (LPI-OTHER) scores were associated with higher institutional environment assessments. The president's perceptions of their leadership practices were all significantly higher than those provided by their administrative team members. These differences opened the door for further research, such as will be explored in the State X study.

Also in 1991, Xu studied the relationship between leadership behavior of academic deans in public universities and job satisfaction of department chairpersons. He assessed the leadership behavior of the deans, and how this was related to the job satisfaction of department chairs. The study involved a random sample of 50 academic deans and 285 department chairpersons at public universities in Tennessee. The LPI-SELF (deans) scores were significantly higher than those from the LPI-OBSERVER (chairpersons) on all five leadership practices. The more effective the chairperson perceived the deans' leadership behavior to be; the more satisfied they were with their jobs. This study suggests the value of a State X study in which faculty and non-faculty's

perception would be given as much attention as the Deans and Department Chairs were given.

In order to determine if the leadership practices of presidents of higher education institutions in the economically challenged Northeast were different from those of leaders in business and industry, Bauer 91993) distributed the LPI to all college presidents in the New England states. A large sample provided by Posner and Kouzes (1993) was used for comparisons of profiles of leadership practices. Therefore, Bauer found no need for new data collection from the population of business leaders. No significant differences were found in leadership, management, or decision-making skills by age, gender, or geographical location.

The psychometric properties of the LPI were examined by Posner and Kouzes (1993) as to its sensitivity to individual differences. One of their goals was to test the reliability and validity of the LPI as an instrument for assessing leadership behavior, individual differences and their effects on leadership behavior. Accurately assessing leadership behavior continues to be important to both researchers and management development practitioners. The purpose of this study was twofold: to provide updated normative information about the LPI, including means and standard deviations and internal reliability coefficients; and to explore the sensitivity of the LPI to individual differences due to respondent gender, functional field, ethnic and cultural background. The sample for analyses consisted of 36,000 persons. Both quantitative and qualitative studies were performed. No statistical differences were found for *Inspiring, Enabling*, or *Encouraging*; with statistically significant interaction for *Challenging and Modeling*.

Extending the use of the LPI to non-managers and individual contributors was another topic of study by Posner and Kouzes (1994). This encompassed evaluation for internal consistency and test-retest reliability estimates; comparisons between self and observers.

Again in 1994, Posner and Kouzes reported on the extension of the LPI for use with non-managers and individual contributors. The LPI was modified. Subjects included 1,651 individual contributors along with 7,073 of their colleagues. Satisfactory internal consistency and test-retest reliability estimates were found. The differences between the self and observer scores and between male and female respondents were both minimal and consistent with those reported for the LPI. Comparisons between the leadership practices of managers and non-managers within the same organization were relatively similar. Few significant differences were found based on any of the variables.

A national study of women presidents by Wesson (1994) presented findings that examined the leadership practices of this group to determine if their practices fit a new paradigm of administrative leadership. The interviews indicated that most of the urban and rural presidents were hired to be change agents and that these women viewed their leadership qualities in the same way. These women were successful at building collegiate organizations. Both groups of respondents used leadership skills that fit a new paradigm, one which values change and connectiveness, along with enjoying the human relations component of their job.

The relationships between academic deans and department chairpersons were examined by Dauffenbach (1995) and Bauer (1993). Dauffenbach looked closely at leadership perception and job satisfaction. He studied a random sample of 300 academic

deans and 300 department chairpersons from colleges and universities in four upper Midwest states. The leadership practices of deans were rated significantly higher than those reported by department chairs across all five leadership practices. Deans were more satisfied than chairs on some items, while on other items they were not. Correlations were found between various leadership practices and various facets of job satisfaction for both deans and department chairs. However, no correlations were found between the deans' leadership practices and the job satisfaction of department chairs. No significant differences were found for department chairs in relation to age, type and size of institution, or length of services. For department chairs, there were no significant differences between job satisfaction and demographic variables. Bauer (1993) did however conclude that the academic deans and department chairpersons differed significantly in their perceptions of their leadership practices. The Deans consistently saw themselves engaging in the leadership practices under study more frequently than did the department chairpersons.

Even though this study focuses on community colleges in this Midwestern state, it is worthwhile to review Muhammad's (1996) analysis of public and private universities. He developed a comparative analysis of scientific research administrators' leadership practices in both public and private universities, which examined the leadership ability, managerial skills, and decision-making skills of members of the National Council of Administration of Research. From a random sample of 850, a total of 629 were usable surveys. They were equally divided by geographic regions and the nature of the research affiliation. No significant differences were found in leadership, management or decision-making skills by age, gender, or geographical location. Research administrators affiliated

with universities reported higher levels of management ability than did those associated with independent research centers. Those with more experience and those in public institution reported greater levels of decision-making skills than did their counterparts. Muhammad wrote; "Leadership behavior has often been the crux of the problems which tend to confound or raise the ire of many individuals, organizations, corporation and institutions of higher education. Leaders who "do the right thing" and who have the proper vision to guide people, employ four main leadership strategies. These are: attention through vision; meaning through communication; trust through positioning; and the deployment of self, (p. 43)." One of the most interesting findings of this study was the influence of research affiliation on the leadership of research administrators.

To determine the perceptions and misperceptions about trust vs. mistrust in academic administrators and possible identification of situations that either cement or destroy relationships, Krasowki (1997) involved administrators of two-year colleges. She selected the LPI because it offered the greatest simplicity, practicality and applicability for her study. All of the college presidents surveyed were from one particular state along with a sampling of administrative level employees. The first goal was to identify common terminology of trust concepts and the second was to confirm the themes evident in the review of the trust-related literature. The data did not indicate a gap in perceptions of trust. There was a high return rate of responses from both the administrators and supervisors. The prediction had been that few would return the completed survey. This proved to be totally inaccurate, and even more surprisingly was the seemingly high level of interest in the study and the positive feedback. There was a high interest in this issue.

The LPI was used to study educational and psychological measurement in the research done by Fields and Herold (1997). They investigated whether broader dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership can be inferred from studying the results of leadership behaviors subordinate reports. This study was conducted by the joint effort of George Washington University and Massachutes Institute of Technology. The results suggested that subordinate assessments made using the LPI could also be used to measure transformational and transactional leadership. This suggested that transformational and transactional leadership approaches may be thought of as underlying dimensions, with particular leadership behaviors, such as those described in the five practices. The transactional leader-follower relationship is based on an exchange model, where the follower makes contributions in anticipation of, or in response to, rewards, support, and various accommodations from the leader. Transformational leadership, on the other hand, reflects followers' strong personal identification with the leader and a shared vision of the future, resulting in followers' attitudes and behaviors that go above and beyond those linked to an exchange of reward of compliance. The data used in this study was collected from a population of 1,892. Because organizations may want to differentially emphasize transformational and transactional leadership approaches as well as the five LPI leadership practices, the ability to use the LPI to measure both sets of behaviors might prove useful for management development programs in community colleges.

The examination of relationships between the leadership styles, organizational cultures, and post-graduate leadership development training of women identified as holding leadership position in two-year and four-year colleges was completed by

Burkhart (1999). Her purpose was to discover why women in two-year colleges have had more success than in the four-year environment in obtaining senior leadership positions. The sample consisted of 713 women leaders in Florida's higher education system. Nearly half of these women held doctoral degrees, and most were between 20 and 60 years of age. The results showed no differences between the two groups of women in their leadership practices as measured by their LPI scores.

And finally, Carless (2001) studied the theories of transformational leadership in an attempt to describe leadership behaviors which are associated with above average performance by subordinates. Kouzes' and Posner's (1987) visionary leadership describes five key transformational leadership behaviors which can be assessed by the LPI. This study examined the construct validity of the LPI by using confirmatory factor analysis to test three alternate conceptual models.T he sample consisted of 1400 subordinates. It was concluded that the LPI assessed an over-arching, higher order, of transformational leadership. The implications of the findings suggested that it is possible to identify meaningful differences among transformational leader behavior; however, Carless concluded there was a need for further research.

One of the most important attributes of group and organizational effectiveness is leadership. Despite its obvious importance, how leadership should be measured remains controversial. The leadership field has been moving more prominently to the idea that leadership is not a position in an organization, and that it requires neither formal authority nor position power, but rather that it can be exercised by any individual. No previous studies using either the LPI instrument or a similar tool have involved this specific state. Nor have any studies considered the perceptions of both the college presidents and their

employees. Prior research has demonstrated that a correlation between demographic statistics and leadership styles has minimal, if any significant difference. However, leader-follower relationship has been virtually an untapped subject. Studies that have addressed this issue are not consistent with their conclusions, nor do they relate to this Midwestern state.

While Scott's (1989) study is the most similar to this study, this study will give particular attention to both faculty and non-faculty perceptions. Plowman (1991) summarized it well when he wrote that there is not a prolific amount of research studies that have explored the relationship between academic leaders, their behavior, and their relationship with that of their employees. He goes on to say, leader-follower research has rarely focused on the college president. It is in light of Plowman's conclusion that this study is being done.

Perception vs. self-perception. Easily misunderstood, perception is the process of organizing and interpreting sensory information; enabling one to recognize and interrupt one's own abilities. Perception is based on what we know, what we've experienced. Psychologists define perception as the act of perceiving the ability to grasp a mental picture of objects, an awareness, understanding, and knowledge as interpreted by one's own abilities. Sociologists define self-perception as one's perception of his or her own person which forms as a result of other people's response in the course of socialization.

A study of Alabama Junior and Community College presidents' leadership styles as perceived by the president, faculty, and staff by Garrison (1985) used the Ohio State University Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. The conclusions drawn were: (a) statewide perceptual differences of presidential leadership styles were not significant

between presidents and their faculty and staff; (b) the majority of the presidents perceived stronger presidential leadership than did their subordinates; and (c) the majority of the presidents perceived their greatest leadership strengths to be the initiating structure, believing that everything good that is in the institution flows from their leadership, emphases are on the stakes, not the personal needs of the employees.

A similar study of community college presidents' leadership styles as perceived by the presidents, faculties, and staff found exactly the same three results (Bennett, 1987). In another 1987 study by Bennett, he researched leadership styles of community college presidents as self-perceived and as perceived by the administrative council members in public two-year colleges in Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee. Using the Leadership Behavior Analysis II, in this study he found the younger and less experienced administrators tended to perceive the presidents' leadership styles, effectiveness, and flexibility similar to the way the presidents themselves perceived their leadership styles. Administrators who were 40 years and older, and who had more experience, perceived the presidents to be less effective and more flexible than how the presidents perceived themselves. The presidents' self-perceptions of their leadership styles were higher. The presidents also rated themselves higher on effectiveness and lower on flexibility than their administrators had rated them.

Rural and urban community college presidents' self-perceived leadership styles were examined by Crawford (1992). He concluded that the tenure of a president does not influence their leadership style. His study proved there was a relationship between community college presidents' leadership styles and the length of their higher education

work experience. The longer community college presidents had worked in higher education, the more they tended to demonstrate a caring and considerate leadership style.

The perception of the community college president's leadership as studied by Thomas (1993), found the most successful presidents had an approach to leadership that blended traits traditionally attributed to males with those traditionally attributed to females. Her conclusion was, that it is the individual's personality and the type of training previously received, that determines the leadership style one practices.

Interestingly enough, self-perceived administrative leadership styles of presidents in Texas colleges (Ali, 1994) revealed that the personal characteristics were not significant factors in president's choice of a leadership style. However, it was found that the educational level and number of years in administration were significant factors. The recommendation, as a result of this study, was in dealing with the recruitment process. That new, inexperienced, presidents should be considered for employment; and that the hiring process included a wider range of diversity within administrators.

Statistical analyses studies by Eaves (1997) indicated there was no significant relationship between the self-perceived leadership styles and the employee's perception. He concluded: (a) many presidents have little formal leadership training in relation to present descriptors of how leadership differs from management concepts; (b) there is a training need in the area of participative leadership to understand the relationship of subordinate involvement in decision making for organizational success; (c) transactional and transformational leadership theory offers clarity to the full range of leadership as a continuum; and (d) the issue is not the change process or the reform and restructuring dogma being presented that is the most important. Rather, the issue is effective leadership

practices that are used within the organization and the identification of what constitutes good leadership.

The following conclusions were drawn from Ankeny's (1997) study of leadership styles of community college presidents and their personal characteristics and experiential background: (a) community college presidents perceive themselves as collaborative leaders regardless of personal characteristics, institutional characteristics and experimental background; (b) community college presidents with a doctoral degree are more likely to be collaborative than presidents without a doctorate; (c) community college presidents are more likely to have post-secondary administrative experience than K-12 school system or non-academic administrative experience; and (d) community college presidents perceive themselves as having a collaborative leadership style.

Interestingly enough, a new concept of leadership was introduced that emphasized leaders' knowledge of the future. Wenrich (1976) and Morris (1985) contended that leaders must live ahead of others in their chosen area; they must have a vision and be able to perform on the cutting edge.

A different angle was pursued by Wen (1999). He developed a profile of community college presidents' self-perceived leadership styles and examined possible relationships between their perceived leadership styles and a number of variables that helped describe organizational variations among different community colleges. The Leader Effectiveness Adaptability Description Self (LEAD-Self) instrument was used to determine the self-perceived leadership styles. The target population included 1,271 public community colleges across the country; from this the sample of 350 presidents/institutions was identified. Of the 50% returned, the results implied that no

relationship existed between community college presidents' leadership styles and their personal/personnel characteristics. Variables included: the number of years at present position, total years of experience as a college administrator, and personal influence on organizational culture. There were no relationships existent between community college presidents' leadership styles and their institutional characteristic; such as single or multi-campus, number of full-time faculty, and the geographical region. The findings did suggest however, that the longer the tenure a president has at his present college, the more likely he is to lead with one or two leadership styles.

After a review of literature, it would appear that gifted leaders are keenly aware of the relationship they have with their followers. The perception they have of themselves as leaders and how their followers perceive them will determine the success of their leadership. The literature suggests how important the relationships between leaders and followers are. Gardner (1986) suggested, in fact, that leadership is essentially the power of the leader persuading the followers. Rost (1993) emphasized the importance of the leader being able to achieve organizational goals; ones belonging to both leader and follower; not merely individual goals. Gube and Getzels (1956) placed a greater emphasis on the important relationship between all behavior of both the leader and their subordinates. All of these researchers seemed to echo Lezotte (1994), who asserted that effective leadership involves engaging subordinates in a vision and not threatening them if that vision is not followed. Little of the research clearly states what effect differing perceptions of a college president's leadership style has on the actual success of the president as a leader.

Call for the Future

Much has been written about the leadership role of today's college president. However, there remains a lack of consensus about the distinctiveness of leadership styles of community college presidents. The effectiveness of the institution and viability of its programs are projected by the leadership of its president. Perhaps the most visible indicator of changed expectations for college leaders is the emergence of new standards for administrators. A dramatic shift has taken place on community college campuses as their leaders move from traditional, hierarchical forms of leadership to participatory models (Peters & Waterman, 1982).

Many researchers have indicated that developing a new generation of senior leadership for American's community colleges was imperative if these institutions are to successfully operate in increasingly complex environments (Banach, 1994; Cohen, Brawer, & Assoc., 1994; Hammer & Champy, 1993; Harris, 1996; Vaughan, 1986; Vaughan, 1989; Vaughan, 1995). These resources show nine factors which contributed to the development of exemplary community college leaders: (1) possession of an earned doctorate; (2) the specific study of community college leadership as an academic major; (3) an active personal research and publication agenda; (4) preparation as a change agent; (5) previous career position; (6) relationship with a mentor; (7) development of a peer network; (8) previous participation in a leadership preparation activity; and (9) knowledge of technology.

With the myriad of factors in mind, Vaughan (1989) made a clear distinction between educational leadership and academic leadership. In order to be the institution's educational leader, the president must offer solutions to problems and issues that are

compatible with the college's mission. They must offer solutions that gain understanding and support from members of the college community and the community at large. The distinguishing characteristic of the president as the leader of an academic institution needs to be a devotion to and appreciation of scholarship, including the encouragement of scholarly activities by themselves and by others. However, community college presidents have a greater obligation to see that the college responds to local educational needs than that of their four-year counterparts. The ability of community college presidents to influence the educational process is enhanced by the flexibility of the community colleges and by a more centralized approach to curriculum development than often exists in four-year colleges and universities.

According to Wenrich (1980), community college presidents recognized that they could not be all things to all people; "not if they want to maintain sanity and avoid serious conflicts" (p. 37). The most important role of the community college presidents according to Wenrich, is to maintain institutional integrity through their own ethical behavior.

Community college presidents have the grandest responsibility of any leadership group in America (Roe & Baker, 1989). The importance of leadership is heightened because most community colleges are entering stages at which they are on the verge of renewal or decline. Appropriate leadership may be the key variable in determining whether the community college movement is able to engage in effective renewal or whether they will enter a period of decline (Amey & Twombly, 1992).

Not surprisingly, community college presidents have an ever-increasing need to be coalition builders. The hierarchical model of the industrial period will no longer

suffice. Moving beyond day-to-day operations, future community college presidents must be able to collaborate, bring together various constituencies, build consensus, and encourage others within the college community as well. They will need to be creative leaders who can inspire others; whose vision is imbued with a larger sense to educational purpose and guided by clear education practices for the institution (Duncan & Harlacher, 1991).

Steven Covey (1998) wrote: "The world has changed in a very profound way. This change continues to happen all around us, constantly, with people being more enlightened and aware. There are more dynamic, competitive forces operating. The "leader of the future will be the same leader of the present" (Covey, 1998, p. 22). There will be no change in personnel, rather an internal change within the person who becomes the leader of the future by an inside-out transformation. "The leader of the future has the humility to accept principles and the courage to align with these principles. Out of this humility, courage and sacrifice comes integrity. Leaders of the future will have the courage to align with principles and go against the grain of old assumptions or paradigms. The leader of the future will be a leader in every area of life, life is a mission not a career" (Covey, 1998, p.23).

Presidents' leadership styles can be traced to their credentials, states Cooper (2002). He writes, in these times of dramatic change, it is more important than ever for presidents to align their colleges more positively with their local communities and to keep their institutions globally focused. Communities need to be in close contact with business and industry, and to work in partnership with the employers. Cooper's study (2002) concluded that presidents need to work in close harmony, and respect their faculty

to ensure that high standards are being met. Both the presidents' and faculty's positions are becoming more and more demanding. At the same time, the importance of the community college in America is growing rapidly. No matter how they are categorized and evaluated, community college presidents need to be excellent servant-leaders who provide direction and support.

The Community College Week (2002) article, *What Flavor is Your President?,* states, the final selection for the college president must be one who fits the community best; however, finding the fit is no easy feat. There are as many kinds of leaders as there are colleges. The article goes on to cite Vaughan's (1983, 1989, 1996, 1997, 1992) research on the community college presidency stating there are now more women presidents than ever before in college history. His research also shows that most presidents are former academic administrators who have served as college faculty.

"Who personifies the leader of today?" asked Bennis (1995, p. 11). Being in charge doesn't necessarily have the same connotations of "absolute power" that it used to have. Today's leaders find themselves benefiting from a more collaborative approach to management. "By checking their egos at the door, so to speak, leaders find they could tap into endless sources of potential from the people they lead" (Bennis, 1995, p.13).

Kezar's (1998) study summarizes the president's role by drawing the conclusion that community college leaders appear to be at a crossroads where they need to think in new ways about leadership. To meet the challenges, they need to embrace a pluralistic leadership model that insists on respecting differences and perspectives. It is important for a leader to teach their followers the importance of making mistakes and how not to be afraid of obstacles. Norman Lear (1996) once said, "To be an effective leader, you not

only have to get the group of followers on the right path, but you must be able to convince them that whatever obstacle stands in the way, whether it's a tree or a building that blocks the view; you are going to get around it"(p. 5). Bensimon (1989) states, "To lead effectively the president must be flexible and willing to listen" (p. 19). Great leaders take people to places they've never been before wrote Wenrich (1976).

As the movement to teams, empowerment, and involvement intensifies, leadership becomes even more critical as does having a set of shared expectations concerning leader/follower relationships. Unfortunately, many people in so-called leadership positions aren't leaders. Leadership is an action, not a position. A leader doesn't just react and respond, but rather takes the initiative and generates action. A leader doesn't just say, "Something should be done," but ensures something is done. Leaders develop the skills of supercharging logic, data, and analysis with emotion, pride, and the will to win. With passion and enthusiasm for the vision and purpose, they fire the imagination, develop the capabilities, and build the confidence of people to "go for it." "Leaders help people believe the impossible is possible, which makes it highly probable" (Covey, 1999, p. 37).

Summary

Literature reveals a series of studies on leadership by both the researcher and theorists who have attempted to define or classify the concept into various subsets according to the background of the research. Chapter 2 has provided a review of this related literature and research necessary for understanding this study. In an effort to determine how a particular style affects or is affected by many variables, researchers have

examined the effects of different leadership styles. Bensimon (1989) sums up his thoughts: a research agenda for leadership in higher education must recognize that leadership is multidimensional; and that its definition and interpretation will legitimately differ among observers according to their background.

A review of the literature on community colleges establishes an understanding of the historical development of the community colleges, and of the evolution and need for leadership at the community college level. The literature impacts the reader with the vast responsibilities of the community college president and the vital role needed for a healthy leader-follower relationship to exist.

The leadership theories reviewed established an understanding of the relationship between leader and follower. It would appear that leadership, to meet the call of the future, must embrace the existing college culture and transform the whole without losing its voice. The community college president must have a relationship that leads others to embrace the vision of the college. Understandably, colleges continue to struggle with this dilemma (Yulk, 1989).

It appears that Yukl was correct in his writings; there is no magical formula that equates to the ideal president. After careful analysis of existing literature, there appears to be a void in comparison studies, specifically dealing with the president's self-perception of his leadership style and that of his employees' perception of that style. A review of the literature reveals a missing piece addressing whether there is a significant difference between that of the community college president's self-perception of their leadership style and that of their employees' perception. Previous studies of perception recommend further study needs to be done in the area of leadership practices. No previous studies

focused on comparing and contrasting employer-employee perception. This study will attempt to mesh the perception of the community college presidents' self-perception of their leadership style with that of their employee's perception of that same leadership style.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains a description of the methodology, sampling procedure, instrumentation, data collection, and the data analysis procedure for this study. The purpose of the study was to compare community college presidents and employee perceptions of presidential leadership style. A statistical analysis of the data will be discussed in this chapter.

Research Design and Rationale

This research focuses on the opinions of others and therefore can best be measured by the use of a cross-sectional survey research design. This design is used to study one point in time, and often addresses attitudes and practices, community needs, program success, and group comparisons (Creswell, 2002). Survey research is popular in education because of its many applications and is frequently used to describe trends, determine opinions, identify characteristics of a group, and evaluate the success of programs (Creswell, 2002). Survey instruments provide an economical and efficient means of data gathering from a large number of persons. Survey researchers typically administer a survey to either a sample or an entire population of people. Because survey designs differ from experimental research in that they do not involve a treatment given to participants by the researcher, researchers do not experimentally manipulate the conditions. Therefore, survey researchers cannot explain the relationship between independent and dependent variables as well as experimental researchers can. Survey

research describes trends in the data, putting the focus on learning about a population, rather than on relating variables or predicting outcomes (Creswell, 2002).

Mailed questionnaires were used to collect the data for this study. While mailed questionnaire is one of the most used research tools, it also has the greatest potential for abuse. For example, responses can vary depending on the mood of the participants, the negative or positive experiences they've encountered, whether they allow someone else to complete the form, plus numerous other variables. In spite of potential abuse, the survey, when properly administered, provides an abundance of data (Emory, 1976; Zemke & Kramlinger, 1982). Other advantages to using a survey include: surveys can be administered in a short period of time; they are an economical means of data collection; they reach a geographically dispersed population; and the participants can be canvassed anonymously without being influenced by others (Creswell, 2002). These factors helped to formulate the rationale for using a mailed questionnaire in order to gather data for this study.

This research was conducted to examine, compare, and contrast collected data regarding the similarities and differences between president and employee perceptions of presidential leadership styles. Because of these qualities, cross-sectional survey research is an appropriate method that met both the needs and requirements of this study.

Participants

The population of this study consists of one Midwestern state's community college presidents and their employees. Data was gathered using both the holistic and segmentation approaches. "The holistic approach attempts to survey every member of the

group; the segmentation approach examines a representative segment of the population of which we wish to make inferences" (Emory, 1976, p. 135).

Community college presidents in this Midwestern state are limited in number and constitute a finite population. This made it feasible to administer the survey instrument to the entire target population for two reasons: they were limited in size and easily accessible. The list of current community college presidents was obtained from the State Department of Education. Following an introduction to this study at their statewide meeting, each community college president received a packet containing a letter of introduction to the researcher and to the proposed study, an outline of the process, the SELF-perception portion of the survey instrument, and a return, self-addressed envelope. Consent was implied by return of the completed survey instrument along with a letter of support for their employees to participate in this study. Each president was asked to express their support in a letter stating their understanding of the study and their willingness to allow their employees to participate. This study was strengthened by choosing to use all possible members of this group (a holistic approach).

It is common in survey research to draw a sample of participants from a larger population. Sampling, the process of selecting part of a larger group of participants with the intent of generalizing from the smaller group (Gliner & Morgan, 2000), is based on the premise that there is enough similarity among the elements in a population that a few of these elements will adequately represent the characteristics of the total population (Emory, 1976). The intent of surveys is to make inferences that describe the whole population, a methodology that ensures accurate representation and return rate (Gliner & Morgan, 2000).

The employee perceptions of presidential leadership style were measured using a representative sample, a segment of the target employee population. For the purpose of this study, the employee group was divided into faculty and non-faculty groups. This decision was based on the premise from past research (Dauffenback, 1995; Posner & Kouzes, 1994; Wen, 1999) that faculty has a different view of administration than do non-faculty. Convenience sampling was used to select designated contact persons from the members of a statewide Community College Deans and Directors' committee. Members of this group represent individuals, who in their roles know and work with all levels of personnel, both faculty and non-faculty.

Two separate lists, one of faculty and one of non-faculty, were obtained from each community college's Human Resource Office. The designated contact person then invited five faculty and five non-faculty personnel to participate by drawing their names. This process provided each employee, faculty or non-faculty, an equal and independent chance of being selected. The non-parametric, random sample was used because of the large body of members and due to the fact that the data were scaled at the ordinal or nominal level (Gliner & Morgan, 2000). Should participants have wished to withdraw from this study at any time, they could do so without penalty. The designated contact person would discard that individual's survey, and draw another name.

Data Collection

This section discusses the process which was used to collect the research data. Initially, the community college presidents were approached at their state meeting to determine their willingness to participate in this study. A brief introduction to both the researcher and the proposed study, followed by a question and answer period resulted in

100% endorsement. Each president then received his or her individual packet. This packet contained a letter which introduced the researcher, described the purpose of the study, and detailed the study process (Appendix A). Also included in this packet were the LPI-SELF survey instrument (Appendix B) and a return, self-addressed envelope. Community college presidents' willingness to complete and return their survey along with their letter of endorsement served as an indication of consent for their participation and that of their employees. As each president's response was received, a letter was mailed to the designated contact person from that college (Appendix C). Also included with their letter were the survey questionnaire OBSERVER forms. They were then given two lists; one containing names of the college's faculty, the other names of the non-faculty employees. The designated contact person then cut each list into slips, placed the slips in a container, and drew out five names from each container. The study was explained to each individual whose name had been drawn. Upon their willingness to participate in the study, the LPI-OBSERVER survey instrument (Appendix D), along with a letter of introduction to the study (Appendix E), and a return, self-addressed envelope were provided. As selected individuals chose not to complete the survey, an additional name was drawn, until five faculty and five non-faculty from each community college had returned a questionnaire.

The responses were recorded in the data collection file. Form coding increased the level of confidentiality and the ability to track responses should a particular college not return its surveys. Each college was coded with all forms identified with "NF" if they were distributed to non-faculty or "F" if they were distributed to faculty. Each school was also randomly assigned a number on every form relating to that college. This also

provided a meaningful match for each college within all three levels of personnel, including the president, faculty and non-faculty. Each institution became a covariate, again insured by the coding process. Presidents not responding to the request within thirty days received a follow-up letter. One time follow-up telephone calls were also made to the contact person from any college that hadn't returned its survey forms within thirty days.

The process used in the selection of participants offered a high level of external validity (Creswell, 1994; Gliner & Morgan, 2000). Participants were readily accessible with all responses returned within four weeks. Receiving the packet from someone they knew, the survey form could easily be completed within a 15 minute timeframe in their own work place. The Deans and Directors' group represented individuals, who in their roles, worked with all levels of personnel, both faculty and non-faculty; another means of strengthening this study. This entire study occurred within a one-year time span. All of these factors equated for a high, external validity outcome (Creswell, 1994; Gliner & Morgan, 2000).

Individuals were asked to complete this survey on their own with no input or influence from others. It was important that the responses be representative of the responder's perception. A wide base of similar characteristics among the participants, coupled with random selection, enhanced the level of internal validity (Gliner & Morgan, 2000). Because 100% of all colleges participated, a high level of validity and reliability was achieved (Creswell, 1994; Gliner & Morgan, 2000).

Measures

Numerous studies and tools were examined to determine which instrument would be most appropriate for this study. The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) is broad-based and lends itself well to examining effective leadership behaviors at higher education institutions. Permission was obtained from the authors of the LPI for use with this research (Appendix G).

The LPI was first developed in the early 1980s as a result of testing 120 MBA students and over 3,000 managers and their subordinates (Kouzes & Posner, 1993). Managers and their subordinates who represented a variety of disciplines and organizations from the public and private sector were used to investigate the reliability and validity of the LPI (Kouzes & Posner, 1993). These development studies evaluated the interpretability and factor loading of thirty leadership statements. Professionals in the field of psychology, human resource management, and organizational behavior were asked to comment on psychometric issues, the conceptual framework, and management development (Kouzes & Posner, 1997). Kouzes and Posner studied the research results, and later those results were validated by other researchers working independently. Kouzes and Posner found that they had been right on target about leadership; that it's not a mystical quality; it's a pattern of behavior that anyone can use to create extraordinary results.

Procedurally, the LPI-SELF (Appendix B) is completed by the leader, and LPI-OBSERVER (Appendix C) is completed by five individuals who are in a position to have observed the leader's leadership behaviors. For the purpose of this study, there were five

individuals who represented faculty group and five who represented the non-faculty group from each participating college.

The LPI went through major revisions in 1997. The LPI-SELF form and scaling process was redesigned by Kouzes and Posner to prove more effective for leaders wanting to check their progress over time. The new scale assesses changes with great accuracy, and significant changes are more readily perceived as such (Kouzes & Posner, 1997). The LPI-OBSERVER was redesigned to offer a greater range of choices to describe how often a leader uses each behavior. This increased both the accuracy and interpretability of the responses (Kouzes & Posner, 1997).

Kouzes and Posner (1997) identified five characteristics common to most extraordinary leadership achievements. *Challenging the Process:* leaders search for opportunities to change the status quo. They look for innovative ways to improve the organization, and are willing to take risks. *Inspiring a Shared Vision:* leaders passionately believe that they can make a difference. They envision the future, creating an ideal and unique image of what the organization can become. *Enabling Others to Act* fosters collaboration and builds spirited teams. These leaders actively involve others, and have mutual respect for one another and their efforts. *Modeling the Way* establishes principles concerning the way people should be treated and the way goals should be pursued. Leaders demonstrating this characteristic create standards of excellence and set an example for others to follow. Leaders who demonstrate the characteristic of *Encouraging the Heart* accomplish extraordinary things in organizations and keeps hope and determination alive by recognizing contributions that others make. These leaders make people feel like heroes.

After identifying the five leadership practices, Kouzes and Posner developed the LPI so that people could get feedback on how frequently they use those practices. These five practices are measured by 30 questions that use a 10-point Likert-type scale (Kouzes & Posner, 1997). The ranking of these items are based on a scale ranging from 1 (almost never) to 10 (almost always). The LPI-SELF and LPI-OBSERVER questionnaires use a five point Likert-type item format to measure the frequency with which the leader engages in specified actions and behaviors. The numeral "1" is assigned to *rarely*; "2" to *once in a while*; "3" to *sometimes;* "4" to *fairly often*, and "5" to *very frequently*. Every sixth item on the questionnaire refers to a particular factor. For example, the "E*ncouraging the Heart*" factor consists of responses to questions 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30.

Reliability

Kouzes and Posner (1997) speak about the high, internal reliability found by the instrument containing statements for each practice that correlate with one another. Factor analysis is used to determine the extent to which the instrument items measure common or different content areas. The results of these analyses consistently reveal that the LPI contains five factors, the items within each factor relating more to one another than to the other factors. According to Kouzes and Posner (1993), " Internal reliabilities on the LPI-SELF ranged between .70 and .85, and on the LPI-OBSERVER, between .81 and .92" (p. 7). Internal reliabilities for the five leadership practices are consistent over time.

The history of scores on the LPI demonstrates significant test-retest reliability coefficients at levels greater than .90 (Kouzes & Posner, 1997). Reliability is enhanced when an instrument asks about a behavior more than once (Kouzes & Posner, 1997).

Therefore, a two-item scale is inherently more reliable than a one-item scale, and three-item is more reliable than a two-item, and so on. The LPI scale contains six items or statements for each of the five key leadership practices, giving it an elevated level of reliability (Kouzes & Posner, 1997). The fact that the LPI is so reliable and valid is important because it means that scores really do make a difference. The LPI results can differentiate between high and low performing leaders (Kouzes & Posner, 1997).

A questionnaire is considered reliable when it consistently measures what it is supposed to measure. Kouzes and Posner (1997) found that the LPI is internally reliable, meaning that the six statements for each practice are highly correlated with one another and that the statements associated with each practice are more correlated with one another than they are with statements for the other practices. Another important finding is that the five scales correspond to the five leadership practices are orthogonal in that they don't measure the same kind of behavior, rather they measure the five different practices, as they should (Kouzes & Posner, 1997).

Validity

Validity addresses the question of whether or not an instrument truly measures what it purports to measure and, accordingly whether its scores have meaning or utility for a respondent. Kouzes and Posner (1997) state there are three kinds of validity present with this instrument. First, results of the compiled comparisons make sense to those involved with the tool, thus giving the instrument face validity (Brodsky, 1988; Dauffenbach, 1995). Second, the instrument has concurrent validity by the relationship between high scores on the survey and positive outcomes such as staff commitment to the leader (Elliot, 1990; Plowman, 1991). Third, the instrument has productive validity

because the results demonstrate a difference between leadership characteristics and have been used by hiring committees to determine fit between a presidential candidate and a particular community college presidency (Bauer, 1993; Riley, 1991).

The LPI has sufficient predictive validity, as shown by studies of the relationship between LPI scores and such variables as work-group performance, team cohesiveness, member commitment, loyalty, upward influence, and credibility (Kouzes & Posner, 1997). The LPI instrument has been used successfully with previous studies (Bauer, 1993; Blau, 1973; Dauffenback, 1995; Jautzi, 1996; Kerr, 1984; Nirtibm, 1983; Nybutzm 1977; Plowman, 1991; Tarazi, 1990; Xu, 1991) and indications are that it is also an appropriate instrument for this study. The LPI is consistently rated among the best regardless of the criteria. Correlations with other sociological and psychological instruments, further enhances confidence that the LPI measures what it purports to measure and not some other phenomenon.

Data Analysis Procedure

This study set out to compare the LPI scores of community college presidents to the scores of their faculty and non-faculty. The Statistical Products and Service Solutions (SPSS) program was used to organize, summarize, and manipulate the data. Descriptive statistics were calculated for each of the scale variables. The mean and standard deviations were obtained for all dependent variables. Due to the limitations in the graduate version of the SPSS package, all instrument data were hand scored using the protocol outlined by Kouzes and Posner (1997). As the employee responses were documented on the appropriate scale they were identified by the letters *a* through *e* representing the faculty scores, and *f* through *j* representing the non-faculty scores. Each

scale represented a possible range of 10-30. The minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation statistics were used to determine the normality of the responses so that the researcher can decide whether to use parametric or non-parametric inferential statistics.

The scores were divided into data according to the following categories: community college president, community college faculty, and community college non-faculty. The research question, "What are the self-perceived leadership styles of the community college presidents?" guided the study along with two subsequent hypotheses.

Hypotheses 1: There are no significant differences in the self-perception of community college presidents and their faculty's perception on any of the five leadership practices measured by the LPI.

Hypotheses 2: There are no significant differences between the self-perception of community college presidents and their non-faculty perception on any of the five leadership practices measured by the LPI.

The Leadership Practices Inventory summary scores were compared using three groups for each community college. Each college also had their own composite score for each leadership practice. Descriptive statistics included the minimum, maximum, mean, standard deviation, and frequency. Correlation analyses and sample paired t tests constituted the inferential statistics used to examine relationships and comparative data. Each school served as a grouping variable. Comparison of the scores was based on the independent variables; the community college presidents, their faculty and non-faculty employees. The five dependent variables are C*hallenging the process, Inspiring a shared*

vision, Enabling others to act, Modeling the way, and E*ncouraging the heart.* Effect sizes were computed for all comparisons.

Summary

Chapter 3 has described the research methodology used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between the perceived leadership styles of community college president self-reporting and their employees reporting. The inventory tool selection was described in detail with documentation of validity and reliability. The procedure for establishing the population and sample of community college presidents and their employees was outlined in detail along with the explanation of the data collection and statistical analysis of data procedure. Chapter 4 will present the specific results of the data analysis with respect to the research question and subsequent hypotheses.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

This research study examined the leadership style of the 15 community college presidents in one Mid-western state. This study focused on how community college presidents perceived their own leadership style compared with their faculty and non-faculty. To accomplish this goal, the study was based on one research question, followed by two subsequent hypotheses. The research question asked, "What are the self-perceived leadership styles of the community college presidents?" The two subsequent hypotheses which guided the study were:

Hypotheses 1: There are no significant differences in the self-perception of community college presidents and their faculty's perception on any of the five leadership practices measured by the LPI.

Hypotheses 2: There are no significant differences between the self-perception of community college presidents and their non-faculty perception on any of the five leadership practices measured by the LPI.

This chapter presents the collected data and an analysis of that data. Chapter four is organized into three sections: (a) a description of the sample, (b) results of the main analyses, and (c) the summary.

Participants

The participants for this study consisted of 15 community college presidents, 70 faculty and 70 non-faculty. The group of presidents consisted of only 15, while both the

faulty and non-faculty groups consisted of 70 participants each. Thus, a total of 140 employees participated in this study. The 15 community college presidents were comprised of 13 males and two females. Years of service as a college president range from two years to 21 years, with the age of the presidents ranging from 44 to 63. Faculty and non-faculty completing the survey had been employed in their specific community college for a minimum of two years and a maximum of 32 years. All study participants were mailed a cover letter for this study.

The cover letter for this study (Appendix A) states that all participation would be voluntary. Participants could choose at any time during the process to withdraw from the study without penalty to them. Their form would simply be discarded and another name would be drawn. This researcher serves on a statewide committee with other Deans and Directors who each represent their college. These individuals agreed to act as the contact person for their college with this study. These designated contacts were mailed the instructional survey packets. Several colleges responded relatively quickly to my cover letter. In fact, within thirty days each college had returned five faculty and five non-faculty survey responses. I was very sensitive to the confidentiality of all study data. Due to the location of this study, it was imperative that I maintain strict confidentiality for the program participants.

Within this small midwestern state, the importance of confidentiality throughout this study required that limited demographic information be gathered. Therefore, the following information offers the reader a better understanding of the colleges themselves. Two of the colleges reside in an urban setting, with the remaining thirteen in rural areas. Every college offers the Associate of Arts (AA) and Associate of Applied Science (AAS)

degrees, plus a variety of diploma programs. Student enrollment ranges from 1,585 at the smallest college to 20,736 attending the largest college. A total student enrollment of 105,700 exists for the entire state. Full-Time Equivalency Enrollment (FTEE) ranges from 1,573 to 14,233, with a total of 81,583 for the state and a median of 5,438.90. All but one college is multi-campus, with five being the average number of campuses per college.

To further understand the nuance of this sample, additional information relating to this state and its history is provided. Over the last decade, State X reported a growth of 5.4% in population, recovering from a loss of 4.7% the previous decade. This growth concentrated in and around the metropolitan areas. The Midwest population tends to grow more slowly than the nation as a whole, due primarily to domestic immigration to other parts of the United States. This state ranks fourth in our nation in percent of persons 65 and older. Unemployment is at 3% and the poverty level at 7%, while the average weekly wage is $537.00. High school graduates comprise 86% of the state's population; while 28% receive an Associate in Arts (two year) degree; only 19% receive their Bachelor's (four year) degree. In addition to understanding the background of the participants, it is also important to understand why timeliness was a key issue in the success of this study.

The quick response of the participants, both from the presidents and their employees, played an important role in the success of this study. Within ten days of contacting the community college presidents, all but one president had returned their completed surveys along with their letters of endorsement for this study. Following a reminder letter (Appendix E), the final president responded, equating to a 100% percent

response rate from the community college presidents. This response rate allowed me to be confident that I had enough data to effectively analyze.

Data Analysis

Section two of this chapter analyzes the results of the data from the completed survey instrument. The two-tailed hypotheses are stated in the null form and analyzed for significance at the .05 confidence level. Descriptive statistics, frequency distributions and *t*-tests with paired sample correlations were used. I will begin by discussing the LPI instrument that was used in this study.

The LPI designed by Kouzes and Posner (1997) was selected as the measurement instrument. This 30-question survey focuses on five practices of leadership. These practices are: E*ncouraging the heart*, *Modeling the way*, *Enabling others to act, Inspiring a shared vision*, and C*hallenging the process.* Responses to the thirty questions were coded by using the Likert Scale, with 1 representing almost never, and 10 representing almost always. Respondents indicated the degree to which each leadership statement reflected their perception of their president. I will now discuss how I scored the instruments used for this study.

Due to the limitations in the graduate version of the SPSS package, all instrument data was hand scored following the procedural outline in the Kouzes and Posner LPI manual. The total SELF rating and the average rating of all the OBSERVERS scores for each summary scale were entered in the SPSS data bank. Each of the five sub-scales generated three scores, one for each group by college.

The 15 presidents' SELF scores were recorded, analyzed and categorized according to the five practices (Tables 1 & 2). Results from the OBSERVER portion of

the survey resulted in two separate sets of analyses (Tables 3 & 4). The analyses compared each individual president with the average of their group of five faculty, then with the average of their group of five non-faculty. In both of these analyses the college was used as a grouping variable to insure meaningful matches. These summary scores were analyzed according to each of the five practices, calculating the minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation (See Tables 3 & 4). The dependent variables: *Encouraging the heart*, *Modeling the way*, *Enabling others to act*, *Inspiring a shared vision*, and *Challenging the process* were compared based on the independent variables: the community college president, faculty and non-faculty (Tables 1, 2, 3, & 4).

The presidents' perception was recorded from initial data gathered and analyzed focusing on the research question: "What are the self-perceived leadership styles of the community college presidents?" A summary of the results from the analysis is found in Table 1. The presidents most commonly perceived themselves as *Enabling others to act* ($M = 8.77$, $SD = .89$), followed closely by *Modeling the way* ($M = 8.73$, $SD = .49$). *Modeling the way* had the lowest standard deviation with .49 of the five practices, indicating the least variability among the submitted scores by the presidents. A 95% confidence interval for *Modeling the way* indicated that the true mean could be anywhere from 8.45 to 9.00. The presidents least commonly saw themselves as *Encouraging the heart* ($M = 8.19$, $SD = .85$), followed by *Inspiring a shared vision* ($M = 8.38$, $SD = .90$) and *Challenging the process* ($M = 8.36$, $SD = .52$). *Inspiring a shared vision* had the highest standard deviation at .90; this indicated the largest variability among the submitted scores. A 95% confidence interval indicated the true mean could fall somewhere within 7.86 to 8.86. For all five practices of leadership, the 15 president's

scores averaged above 8 on a 10-point scale. The standard deviation among these scores was relatively small. Only two areas, *Encouraging the heart* and *Inspiring a shared vision* have a lower bounds of the 95% confidence interval that falls below 8.00. *Encouraging the heart's* confidence interval includes numbers from 7.71 to 8.66. *Modeling the way* and *Enabling others to act* had upper limits of 9.00 and 9.26 respectively. These scores indicated that all 15 presidents had similar perceptions about the strength of their abilities in all five practice styles and viewed themselves on the high end of the LPI.

Table 1

Leadership Practices as Perceived by the Presidents

LPI Practice	*M*	*SD*
Encouraging	8.18	.85
Modeling	8.73	.50
Enabling	8.77	.89
Inspiring	8.38	.90
Challenging	8.36	.52

Note: Means and Standard Deviation were rounded to the nearest hundredth. N=15.

A Pearson correlation matrix was computed to analyze the associations among the five variables: *Encouraging*, *Modeling*, *Enabling*, *Inspiring,* and *Challenging* (Table 2). Significant correlations were found between *Inspiring* and *Challenging*, r (15) = .745, p <.001. In general, presidents who scored themselves high in *Inspiring* also scored them high in *Challenging*, and presidents who scored themselves low in *Inspiring* also scored themselves low in *Challenging*. An r value of .745 indicated a strong positive

relationship with a large effect size according to Cohen (1988). While 55.5% of the variance in the scores for *Inspiring* can be predicted by the variance of scores in *Challenging*, 44.5% are due to other factors.

There appears to be a positive linear relationship between the *Enabling* and *Modeling*, r (15) = .499, p = .0275 leadership styles. Presidents who scored themselves high in *Modeling* also tended to score themselves high in *Enabling*. This r value indicated a positive relationship with a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). An attempt to replicate this study with a larger sample may provide additional information. Two other relationships, *Encouraging* and *Inspiring*, r (15) = .454, p = .045 and *Challenging* and *Enabling*, r (15) = .421, p = .059, reflected a positive linear relationship, suggesting high scores in one practice style would also indicate high scores in the other practice style. Both of these would be considered to have medium effects.

Table 2

Intercorrelations Between Leadership Styles for Community College Presidents

LPI Practice	1	2	3	4	5
1. Encouraging	--	.113	.178	.454	.351
2. Modeling		--	.499	.131	.386
3. Enabling			--	-.006	.421
4. Inspiring				--	.745*
5. Challenging					--

N=15.
*p<=0.01level (2 tailed).

All other relationships resulted in positive r values that were not statistically significant except for *Inspiring* and *Enabling,* r (15) = -.006, p = .983. This indicated that

there was no systematic association between the presidents scores on *Inspiring* and their corresponding scores on *Enabling,* and that one score would give no indication as to what the other score might be.

Presidents' Perceptions vs. Faculty Perceptions

As I analyze the presidents' self-perceptions versus the faculty perceptions on the five leadership practices as measured by the LPI, keep in mind, hypothesis one states, there are no significant differences between these perceptions.

Five separate paired sample *t* tests were executed, each with the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the president's self-perception of *Encouraging, Modeling, Enabling, Inspiring* and *Challenging,* to the corresponding faculty's perception of their president's leadership style. The first *t* test comparing the college presidents' self-perception of *Encouraging the heart* with their faculty's perception was significant, t (15) = 5.21, p = .000, indicating that the faculty's perception was significantly lower (6.48) than their presidents' perception (8.18). The second *t* test compared the presidents' self-perception and their faculty's perception with *Modeling the way.* Again, the presidents ranked themselves higher than the faculty had ranked them, t (15) = 7.30, p = .000. The presidents ranked themselves at 8.73, and the faculty ranked them at 7.15, indicating the faculty perception was significantly lower. The third *t* test compared *Enabling others to act* with the presidents' self-perception at 8.77, and the faculty's perception at 6.75, demonstrating another significant difference, t (15) = 5.91, p = .000. The fourth *t* test compared the self-perception of the president's *Inspiring a shared vision* to that of their faculty's perception, t (15) = 4.33, p = .001, again indicating a significant difference with the college presidents' self-perception (8.38) being significantly higher than the

perception of their faculty (7.23). And the fifth *t* test compared the self-perception of presidents to their faculty's perception with *Challenging the process*, t (15) = 6.89, p = .000. Presidents ranked themselves at 8.36, while faculty ranked their president at 6.90, resulting in another significant difference.

All five tests proved to be statistically significant at the .001 level. Every *t* test resulted in a *t*-value of 4.33 or higher, with the effect size all more than 1, indicating large to very large range of differences according to Cohen (1988). Cohen states the following in his text: effect size is measured as .2 = small, .5 = medium and .8 = large. Cohen argues that a *d* of .8 is "grossly perceptible" and therefore suggests "large differences."

Table 3

President and Faculty Differences on the Five Practices as Measured by the LPI

	President		Faculty				
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*t*	*d*
Encouraging	8.18	.85	6.48	1.37	5.21*	.000	1.53
Modeling	8.73	.50	7.15	.84	7.30*	.000	2.35
Enabling	8.77	.89	6.75	1.21	5.91*	.000	1.92
Inspiring	8.38	.90	7.23	1.19	4.33*	.001	1.09
Challenging	8.36	.52	6.90	1.02	6.89*	.000	1.90

Note: Means and Standard Deviations were rounded to the nearest hundredth.
N=15.
**p*=<.001.
d=.2=small, .5=medium, .8=large.

Presidents' Perceptions vs. Non-faculty Perceptions

The second hypotheses states, there are no significant differences between the self-perception of community college presidents and their non-faculty perception on any of the five leadership practices measured by the LPI. Again five separate, paired sample *t* tests were executed, each with the null hypothesis that there was no difference in the president's self-perception of *Encouraging*, *Modeling*, *Enabl*ing, *Inspiring* and *Challenging* to the corresponding non-faculty's perception of their president's leadership style. The first *t* test comparing the college presidents' self-perception with that of their non-faculty's perception regarding *Encouraging the heart* leadership practice showed a significant difference, t (15) = 5.05, p = .000, indicating that the non-faculties' perception was significantly lower (6.15) than the presidents' self- perception (8.18). The second *t* test compared the presidents and non-faculty with *Modeling the way.* Again the presidents ranked themselves higher than the non-faculties' ranking, t (15) = 6.38, p = .000, with the presidents' self-perception at 8.73, and the non-faculties' perception at 7.22. The third *t* test compared the presidents' self-perception with that of their non-faculty with *Enabling others to act.* The results indicated a significant difference, t (15) = 5.93, p = .000, with the presidents' self-perception scoring a 8.78, and the non-faculties' perception at 6.64. The fourth *t* test compared the self-perception of the presidents' *Inspiring a shared vision* to that of their faculties' perception, t (15) = 3.80, p = .002, again a significant difference. The college presidents' self-perception (8.38) was significantly higher than their non-faculties (6.90). The fifth *t* test demonstrated another significant finding. In regard to *Challenging the process*, the presidents' self-perception

scored a 8.36, and the faculty at 6.74,(t (15) = 4.54, p = .000. In total these five tests resulted in the presidents scoring themselves significantly higher than their non-faculty.

These findings indicated that all five tests were again significant at the .01 level with four of the five significant at the .001 level; and all five effect sizes more than 1. These measurements indicated that there is a difference between the president's perception and their non-faculties' perception of their leadership style as measured by the LPI.

Table 4

Presidents and Non-Faculty Differences on the Five Practices as Measured by the LPI

	President		Non-Faculty				
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*t*	*d*
Encouraging	8.18	.85	6.15	1.43	5.05**	.000	1.78
Modeling	8.73	.50	7.22	.83	6.38**	.000	2.27
Enabling	8.77	.59	.6.64	1.36	5.93**	.000	2.19
Inspiring	8.38	.90	6.90	1.23	3.80*	.002	1.07
Challenging	8.36	.52	6.74	1.29	4.54**	.000	1.79

Note: Means and Standard Deviations were rounded to the nearest hundredth.
N=15.
**p*= <.01.
***p*=<.001.
d=.2=small, .5=medium, .8=large.

Summary

The research question that guided this study was: "What are the self-perceived leadership styles of the community college presidents?" This question was followed by two subsequent hypotheses: 1) There are no significant differences in the self- perception of community college presidents and their faculty's perception on any of the five

leadership practices as measured by the LPI, and 2) There are no significant differences in the self- perception of community college presidents and their non-faculty's perception on any of the five leadership practices as measured by the LPI.

The presentation of tables, descriptive and inferential statistical analyses, interpretation, and the results of the data collected from the 15 community college presidents and their respective employees are presented in this chapter. The data demonstrated that the differences between the presidents' self-ranking and both the faculty and non-faculty ranking were statistically significant. These results indicated a consistency of presidents ranking themselves higher than their employees ranked them. From this analysis one can be confident that both the null hypotheses should be rejected and that the differences (effect size) are very large.

These statistics therefore show that the president's perceived themselves much differently than their faculty and non-faculty. While the presidents saw themselves as *Enabling*, the faculty perceived their president's leadership style most frequently as *Inspiring*, with *Modeling* ranked as a close second. The non-faculty ranked their president most often as *Modeling*, with *Inspiring* a close second. These findings will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter 5. In Chapter 5, findings and recommendations based upon the results of this study, will be summarized. Additionally, the overview of the methodology, findings, and discuss how this study relates to the literature will be presented. Lastly, conclusions and recommendations drawn from these findings for future studies and suggested courses of action will also be discussed.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Introduction

Community colleges not only help students earn credits to transfer to four-year colleges or universities, but they also play a pivotal role in assisting persons with transitioning to the world of work. Community colleges have often been the window of opportunity for students in our society who need a second chance. For more than 30 years, community colleges have provided nurturing support systems that have empowered these students to achieve significant academic and career results (Pierce, 1996). One's understanding of the important role community colleges play in the nation's educational scheme logically leads to one's desire to improve the caliber of community colleges—and improving the caliber of an institution necessarily involves the need to improve leadership. To improve leadership, it is essential that individuals understand that leadership is a process by which one influences the behavior of others (Birnubaum, 1988; Hersey, 1984). Through measuring and comparing the perceptions of leadership on the part of leaders and followers, this study makes inroads in evaluating the success of present-day leadership in certain community colleges with the understanding that the resulting information can be used to eventually improve leadership on community college campuses.

In the past 30 years America's institutions of higher education have faced many problems and changes. Changes have affected almost everyone in these institutions;

however, the office most affected has been the president. Presidents of the past, especially those of the 1950s were the "builders"; the people who planned and developed most of the community colleges. No matter what changes the role of the president may have gone through, presidents still make a difference today, and continue to play an important role leading community colleges in the new century. Higher education leaders recognize the need for leadership training for aspiring staff (Yukl, 1994). There is a need to develop more effective top and middle level administrators who can successfully lead higher education into the future (Eddy, 1990). In addition to training for aspiring staff, retiring staff are also a challenge for local community colleges.

Again, Bryant (1992) pointed out that almost half of the current community college administrators and faculty will retire at the beginning of the 21st century. This being the case, the community college is presented with a wonderful opportunity to glean the wisdom of the institution's first thirty years and utilize that wisdom to guide the system in the future. Certainly, an instrument like the LPI was not even in use at the dawn of the community college system. Now it is, and it can be used to assess the leader-follower relationships on certain community college campuses. In order to effectively discuss this data, it is necessary to have a thorough understanding of the community college system relevant to this particular study.

Each of the 15 community colleges in this Midwestern state serves an area where Junior Colleges and Vocational Colleges have merged. These areas vary in size from four to twelve counties. The colleges are governed by locally elected board of directors that consist of five to nine members who are elected for terms of three years. These colleges comply with approved standards adopted by the State Board of Education. A

comprehensive educational program is offered at each college, along with special programs for high school students. Unique opportunities and partnerships are made available through these educational facilities. I will now discuss a brief summary of this study which will be the basis for my conclusions and recommendations.

This chapter presents a summary on the purpose of this study, along with an overview of the methodology, findings, and how the study relates to the literature. Conclusions drawn from the findings are also included. Perhaps these may be informational to other community college presidents and community college constituents.

Summary of Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the leader-follower perceptions on the community college campuses of one Midwestern state. In particular, this study sought to compare the self-perceptions of community college presidents as to their leadership style with those perceptions held by their faculty and non-faculty.

Many community college presidents have found that they needed to stand strong in their leadership role. According to one community college president," We buy into the common myth that you cannot survive a demanding leadership role without a thick skin" Heifetz, 2001, p. 23). For some community college presidents, their leadership role has been a difficult and demanding aspect of their job. How these presidents perceive their leadership role versus the way their faculty and non-faculty view them is often different and sometimes even at odds.

In fact, the quantitative analyses conducted in this study indicated that there is truly a difference of perception of the community college presidents' leadership role from that of the faculty and non-faculty. Because of the different roles and responsibilities

between faculty and non-faculty, this study has divided their responses into two separate groups, rather than one group representing all college employees. Faculty often looks to their college president to keep them informed of changes and to keep them in the loop (Northouse, 1997). The continual upgrading of technology, global networks and increased diversity can alter their security zone. Faculty need to know they are important. They want to be assured with all the changes occurring that they have the training and knowledge necessary to continue to be effective in their teaching. Excellent teachers are always needed at the community college level. Both quality teachers and quality non-faculty need effective leadership.

As already mentioned, non-faculty have workplace perceptions which can vary greatly from the teaching staff. Their responsibilities offer different insights allowing them to better observe the college organization as a whole. Employers can learn from Helgesen (1995), that organizations need to utilize the perspectives and talents of all employees, not only those at the top. This study aimed to give voice to the perspective of all employees. While distinguishing the perspectives of non-faculty employees from faculty employees was not absolutely necessary in order to address the hypotheses of this study, the differentiation may be important for anyone interested in doing further investigation about the perception of leadership styles among community college presidents.

The main purpose of this study was, of course, not to ponder why the views of faculty and non-faculty might differ. More specifically, this study sought to understand "What are the self-perceived leadership styles of the community college presidents?"

This one research question, along with the following subsequent hypotheses guided the study:

Hypotheses 1: There are no statistically significant differences in the self-perception of community college presidents and their faculty's perception on any of the five leadership practices measured by the LPI.

Hypotheses 2: There are no statistically significant differences in the self-perception of community college presidents and their non-faculty employee's perception on any of the five leadership practices measured by the LPI.

For this study, the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), developed by Kouzes and Posner (1997) was used. This two-part survey instrument (LPI) was used to gather the research data. This instrument is a 30-item inventory employing a ten-point Likert scale, evaluating the performance and effectiveness of individual leadership behaviors and styles. The five practices evaluated by this instrument included:

1. *Challenging the Process* – The ability of the leader to assess the organizational status searching for opportunities to change the system, along with the ability to search for unique and innovating ways to improve and redesign the structure of the organization.

2. *Inspiring Shared Vision* – The ability of the leader to develop a vision and to encourage others in the organization to work with that vision.

3. *Enabling Others to Act* – The ability of the leader to foster opportunities for collaboration, cooperation, and team learning.

4. *Modeling the Way* – The ability of the leader to work the correct mental model for the constituents of the organization.

5. *Encouraging the Heart* – The ability of the leader to share the victories and accomplishment of the organization's members.

The SELF portion was given to the presidents, while the second part, the OBSERVER portion was distributed to the employees, both faculty and non-faculty who represented each of the 15 community colleges. Each college was used as a grouping variable. Every survey form was completed and returned. Even though the sample population was relatively small in number, an important factor was the 100% response rate.

Although this researcher had no way of knowing when and how the surveys were completed, it is a known fact that 100% of the surveys were completed and returned. Exactly how the surveys were completed, whether at work, on down- time, while having a good day, under stress, or passed off to be completed by someone else could have affected the results. I will now discuss my findings for this study.

Findings

This study sought to compare the self-perceptions of community college presidents as to their leadership style with that of their faculties' and non-faculties' perceptions.

President's self-perception. Generally, the study's resulting data show a pattern of presidents ranking themselves at a high level in regard to most categories of the LPI. The findings documented that the presidents most commonly perceived themselves as *Enabling others to act,* followed closely by *Modeling the way. Modeling the way* also had the lowest standard deviation among the five practices, indicating the least variability.

Ranking third was *Inspiring a shared vision,* followed by *Challenging the process*. The presidents least commonly saw themselves as *Encouraging the heart.*

Another interesting aspect of the scores' pattern is the way in which certain scores correlate. The scores indicated that all 15 presidents had similar perceptions of the strength of their abilities in all five practice styles. In general, presidents who scored themselves high in *Inspiring* also scored them high in *Challenging*, and presidents who scored themselves low in *Inspiring* also scored themselves low in Challenging. A similar pattern can be seen when viewing the scores related to *Modeling*: presidents who scored themselves high in *Modeling* also tended to score themselves high in *Enabling;* presidents who scored themselves low in *Modeling* also tended to score themselves low in *Enabling.*

Although not considered statistically significant, there appears to be a positive linear relationship between *Enabling* and *Modeling.* Presidents who scored themselves high in *Modeling* also tended to score themselves high in *Enabling.* This indicated a positive relationship with a large effect size. Two other relationships, *Encouraging* and *Inspiring* and *Challenging* and *Enabling* indicated a positive linear relationship where high scores in one practice style would indicate high scores in the other practice style. These scores were considered to have medium effects.

Differences between presidential and faculty perceptions. The first *t* test compared *Encouraging the heart* leadership practice with the faculty's perception. Faculty responses were significantly lower than that of the presidents' self-perception. The second *t* test compared *Modeling the way,* with again the faculty rating the president significantly lower. *Enabling others to act* also demonstrated a significant difference;

again the faculty rated their president much lower. In regard to *Inspiring a shared vision*, the fourth *t* test reflected the faculty's lower perception of their presidents' performance in the area. Finally, *Challenging the process* resulted in another significantly lower finding: overall, every test resulted in a score of 4.33 or higher with the effect sizes all greater than 1.

Differences between presidential and non-faculty perception. The first *t* test compared the college presidents' self-perception with that of their non-faculty's perception with *Encouraging the heart*. The non-faculty's perception was significantly lower than that of their president's. The second *t* test compared *Modeling the way*, again the non-faculty ranked their presidents significantly lower. Similar results were indicated with *Inspiring a shared vision* and *Challenging the process*. *Enabling others to act* received the lowest ranking, followed closely by *Encouraging the heart.*

These findings indicated that all five tests were again significant at the .01 level, with four of the five significant at the .001 level; and all five effect sizes were greater than 1. These measurements indicated that there is a difference between the president's perception and their non-faculty's perception. This does not necessarily indicate a positive or negative outcome, rather that results demonstrated a difference of opinion. Employer and employee can benefit from differences; they should be celebrated, respected, and explored for an increased understanding in the workplace. I will now expand upon the literature review first presented in Chapter 2. This literature will provide the framework for my later conclusions.

Literature Review

In reviewing the literature, the relationship between that of the community college president and that of employees in regard to perception of the president's leadership style, has received only scattered attention (Amey & Twombly; 1992, Ankeny, 1997; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Duncan & Harlach, 1991; Roe & Baker, 1972). Leadership has multiple components that reflect the complexities of leading modern organizations. Yet, the construct is rooted in concepts that have been developed over most of this century. Leadership is not a function of the job title or organizational position writes Bolman and Deal (1991). Effective leadership takes advantage of personal traits, the context of the situation, and the interaction between the two (Bass, 1990). Bass (1998) contends that every effective leader displays leadership styles to the extent of what he called the "full range of leadership." Leadership is a process of influencing people.

Hersey and Blanchard (1988) found in their study that there is no best way to influence people; the key for leadership effectiveness is to match the situation with the appropriate leadership style. They further pointed out that the more able leaders are in adapting their behaviors to the situation, the more effective their attempts to influence followers will become. In the end, leaders appear to be successful when they provide opportunities for their employees to do good work, grow personally and professionally, and enjoy what they are doing. The relationship between college presidents and faculty members is an important element. In larger colleges, faculty may have little direct interaction with their president.

Previous LPI studies. Previous studies using the LPI did not focus specifically on presidents' perception compared to their faculty and non-faculty's perception; however,

Dauffenback (1995) studied college deans, comparing their perception to that of their department chairs. The Deans did rank themselves significantly higher on some items, while on other items they ranked themselves lower.

The most similar study to this one is Scott's (1989). She analyzed community college leaders' thinking styles and behavioral practices using the LPI. Study results showed no significant relationships between the thinking styles and leadership practices, nor could any difference be found between self-perceptions of the leadership practices and perception of their employees.

K-12 studies, also using the LPI instrument, found no significant differences with perception of leadership styles. Dunn (2000) found consistency with perceptions between administrators and employees. Furthermore, Oumthanom (2001) studied the differences in perceptions of effective leadership practice between private school teachers and administrators and found no significant difference. And finally, Morton (1983), who also used the LPI instrument with his research, found significant positive correlations between presidential behavior and leadership styles with that of their cabinet members. These previous studies have a substantial different outcome from this study which indicates a significantly statistical difference in perception with every leadership style measured. I will now discuss my conclusions as they are interwoven with the literature.

Conclusions

Leadership is a process in which one influences the behavior of others, in a group, organization, or system context. The purpose of a leader is to understand the needs of followers and respond accordingly (Birnbaum, 1988; Hersey, 1984). The method or technique that a leader employs when dealing with others, reflects his or her leadership

style. This study sought to understand the perceptions of community college president's leadership style. As this study progressed, certain findings became evident.

Within the limitations of this study, the findings indicated that the differences between the presidents' self-rankings and both the faculties and non-faculties rankings were indeed significant. The results documented a consistency of the presidents' ranking themselves higher than their employees had ranked them. Previous studies had demonstrated different findings. Two such studies included, Dunn (2000) who found consistency between administrators and employees in their ranking of leadership practices, and McBroom (2000) who found significant correlations between these two groups. Other studies using the LPI were done by Long (1991), and Leech (1999). For whatever reasons, their research showed no significant difference between the college administrators and employees who were surveyed. The results of this study however showed significant differences. Again that does not signify a good or bad relationship; it signifies there is a difference. Differences that might elude to a need for presidents to provide greater physical and psychological access to their employees. This greater access would yield increased opportunities to dialogue and, hopefully, create a comfortable environment for people to work and students to find success. I will now discuss my recommendations based upon my research findings.

Recommendations

The theme, which emerged from this study, was that community college presidents ranked themselves higher in their leadership styles than did their employees. This theme served as the basis for developing conclusions along with recommendations for the future.

The strongest findings indicate that the null hypotheses should be rejected. There is a significant difference between the perceptions of the community college presidents and their employees regarding the nature of the president's leadership style. The results of this study may provide a basis for reflection on the part of both past and present presidents. They may want to examine their own leadership style and practice

In addition, more time may need to be spent with their followers in order to clarify misconceptions. Training programs may even need to be developed to assist academic leaders in gaining a clearer picture of how they are perceived. De Pree (1989) wrote, "Leadership is more an art, a belief, a condition of the heart, rather than a set of things to do" (p. 148). He went on to say, "Leaders are servants to their followers; they give others the freedom and incentive to live up to their potential while continuing to complete themselves as human beings" (p. 11). Leaders must help to define a set of clear organizational values along with defining reality. This study is simply one method of measuring reality.

Circumstances, whether by the nature of the organization or by the societal norms surrounding the educational institution, play an important role in determining which leadership style the leader prefers. Prior researchers' highly recommended additional study; this need continues to be apparent. The need exists to warrant further study addressing self-perception of one's leadership style and practice. Leaders and followers must better understand the impact that misconceptions and misperceptions have on outcomes.

There appears to be a need to take this study a step further by comparing the president-employee perceptions of relationships with that of the success of their

particular college. How does it equate with success, or does it? Is there a need to define success?

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations could be considered:

1. The establishment of leadership training programs for leaders in higher education might include emphasis on leadership styles, such as those listed on the instrument used for this study, in order to create an awareness of leadership styles and facilitate interpersonal relationships.
2. Institutions of higher education might encourage faculty and non-faculty to find opportunities to develop leadership skills, along with encouraging continued growth through professional organizations, seminars, workshops and meetings with colleagues.
3. The Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI) could be administered to candidates before they are hired by higher education institutions to determine their dominant leadership style in order that communication could be opened up immediately, and both employees and presidents would better understand how to communicate more effectively.
4. The LPI could be administered to serving presidents and their followers, to evaluate current perceptions of leadership as to how they perceive their presidents leadership style.

Suggested Further Study

Because there have been a limited number of leadership studies in higher education that have focused on community college presidents, further study is recommended:

1. A similar study should be initiated involving community colleges nation wide.
2. A replication of this study should be conducted considering demographic and institutional variables in order to identify other possible variables that may affect an administrator's choice of leadership styles.
3. A similar study using an alternative instrument should be conducted to identify leadership styles as a means of validating the findings of this study.
4. Further study should be conducted to determine the influence of leadership styles on institutional success and the effectiveness as defined by faculty, non-faculty, community, and students.
5. Similar studies should be conducted focusing on gender of the president, and what, if any effect this has on their perceived leadership style.
6. Further research might be conducted to determine the relationship between leadership style, personal characteristics, and experiential background.
7. Finally, a study should be conducted to compare organizational effectiveness with leadership styles in order to identify goals, objectives, and activities to provide leadership in areas of research, development, and implementation of programs in higher education.

Summary

Leadership has never been easy, but at this time in history the challenge is stronger than ever before. As a society, we are expected to maintain cherished values and rights, while at the same time are able to accept change, and create cutting edge opportunities. Our vulnerability increases as the demands for service rises to new levels. Sergiovanni (1992) stressed the importance of joining the heart and the head of leadership with the hand of leadership.

Effective leadership ultimately depends on the relationship between leaders and followers sharing common core values. All of this requires us to examine our attitudes and our perceptions. Leadership must not only be visionary, but touched with compassion, as it fosters collaborative relationship among diverse constituencies. While effective leadership is critical for individuals who hold key positions in higher education, it is not the exclusive domain of the president. Leaders are needed to provide the vision and values that give institutions distinction along with encouraging their members to put forth extra effort beyond what they thought possible.

The clear, distinguishing feature about the process of leading is that leaders mobilize others to want to act because of the credibility of the leaders' actions (Kouzes & Posner, 1996). Leaders must help to define a set of clear organizational values along with defining reality. The future of leadership must revolve around the follower. The follower is the foundation for all successful leaders. Leaders of the future need to influence followers in such a way that the leaders can accomplish their goals.

In addition, the presidents must be responsive to the communities' needs and govern accordingly. Cohen and Brawer (1996), state leadership is a transaction between

people, not a quality or set of traits held by a person in a position of authority. The importance of this study is in its attempt to measure the nature of that transaction, or relationship between leader and follower. By gauging the perceptions of community college presidents held by faculty, non-faculty, and the presidents themselves, the study makes a critical step in the essential process of evaluating leadership in a meaningful manner. Evaluating leadership is, of course, only a part of the improvement process that needs to be common on community college campuses. However, it is the vital first part of improving leadership that can result in stronger community colleges. Any initiative ultimately aimed at increasing the number of community college leaders possessing the traits Cohen (1996) cites can only hold promise for community colleges and the students they serve.

This study sought to understand, what are the self-perceived leadership styles of the community college president? The results of this study indicated the self-perceived leadership styles of the community college presidents differed from the perceptions of their employees. What this means in regard to the actual success of any of the institutions involved in the study cannot be discerned and was not the focus of this study. However, the results would suggest that the leader-follower relationships on the campuses studied deserve further attention. Logic would encourage better dialogue between the leaders involved and their followers. As community college presidents generate dialogue and open communication with their faculty and non-faculty, they may create a more effective leadership dynamic that will yield positive differences for the schools they lead.

REFERENCES

Alfred, R., Ewell, P., Hudgins, J., & McClenney, K. (1999). *Core indicators of effectiveness for community colleges.* Community College Press: Washington, DC.

Alfred, R. L. (1994). Research and practice on shared governance. In G. A. Baker III (Ed.), *A handbook on the community college in America* (pp. 245-258). Westport: Greenwood Press.

Ali, Hamad Abduldareem. (1994). *Self-perceived administrative leadership styles of presidents, vice presidents, and deans in public community and junior colleges in Texas.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of North Texas, Belize.

American Association of Community Colleges. (1996). *AACC: American association of community college: Membership directory 1996.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1987). *Community and College Journal, 57.* Washington, DC.

Amey, J. J., & Twombly, S. B. (1992). Re-visioning leadership in community colleges. *The Review of Higher Education, 15*, 125-150.

Ankeny, L. A. G. (1997). *Leadership styles of community college presidents and their personal characteristics and experimental background.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota, Brookings, SD.

Astin, A.W., & Scherri, R. A. (1980). *Maximizing effectiveness: Impact of administrative style on faculty and students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Atwell, R. H., & Green, M. F. (Eds.). (1981). *New directions for higher education: Academic leaders as managers* (Vol. 36). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Yamarino, F. J. (1989*). An alternative strategy for reducing biases in leadership ratings.* Paper presented at the Academy of Management, Anaheim, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Baker, G. A., III. (1992). *Cultural leadership: Inside America's community colleges.* Community College Press.

Balcerek, E. (2000, May). *Principals' effective leadership practice in high performing and inadequately performing schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.

Ballard, G. (1978). *A study of the perceived most typical and preferred leadership styles of chief administrative officers as indicated by the faculty in the North Carolina community college system.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. North Carolina State University, Chapel Hill, NC.

Banks, S. (1990). *Elementary teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership behaviors.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Denver.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications.* (3rd Ed.) New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M.M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 49-80). New York: Academic Press.

Bauer, M. (1993, Dec.). *How are the leadership practices of college presidents in the northeast district different from those of leaders of business and industry?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of New Haven. New Haven, CT.

Bax, R. M. (1994). *An assessment of the quality improvement climate as perceived by community college leadership in Iowa.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames, IA.

Belasco, J., & Stayer, R. C. (1993). *Flight of the buffalo.* New York: Warner Books.

Belew-Nyquist, D. (1997). *Elementary teachers' perceptions of effective school leadership.* Unpulished doctoral dissertation. Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ.

Bellows, R. M. (1959). *Creative leadership.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Benezet, L. T., Katz, J., & Magnusson, F. W. (1981). *Style and substance: Leadership and the college presidency.* Washington, DC: Jossey-Bass.

Bennett, J. W., Sr. (1987). *Leadership styles of community college presidents as self-perceived and as perceived by the administrative council members in public two-year colleges in Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Alaska, Anchorage, AL.

Bennis, W. G. (1989). *Why leaders can't lead: The unconscious conspiracy continues.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge.* New York: Harper & Row.

Bennis, W., & Townsend, R. (1995). *Reinventing leadership: Strategies to empower the organization.* New York: William Morrow & Co.

Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader.* Addison-Wesley: Reading, MA.

Bennis, W., & Goldsmith, J. (1994). *Learning to lead.* Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W. (1994). *Understanding the basics on becoming a leader.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bensimon, E. M. (1994). Understanding administrative work. In A.M. Cohen, F. B. Bawer, & Associates (Eds.), *Managing community colleges* (pp. 22-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Benismon, E. M., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). *Making sense of administrative leadership: The "l" word in higher education.* George Washington University.

Bickford, R. (1978). The president as marketer. *Community and Junior College Journal, 48*(7), 14-16.

Biggerstaff, C. (1992). Creating, managing, and transforming community college culture: Presidential perspectives. In G. A. Baker III (Ed.), *Cultural leadership: Inside America's community college* (pp.45-60). Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Blake, R. R., Mouton, J. S., & Williams, M. S. (1981). *The academic administrator grid.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bogue, E. G. (1985). *Enemies of leadership: Lesson for leaders in education.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Boles, H. W. (1971). *Leaders, leading and leadership: A theory.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.

Boles, H. W., & Davenport, J. A. (1975). *Introduction to educational leadership.* New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1984). *Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bozeman, W.C., & Rothberg, R. A. (1991). Collaboration in not meeting with the enemy: An analysis of a successful university-school district's relationship. *Journal of Educational Leadership, 3,* 13-19.

Bradford, D. L., & Cohen, A.R. (1984). *Managing for excellence: The guide to developing high performance organizations.* New York: John Wiley.

Braskamp, L. A., & Ory, J. C. (1994). *Assessing faculty work: Enhancing individual and institutional performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, C. E. (1997). *A comparative study of public colleges and university presidential perceptions of effective leadership practices.*Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.

Bryant, D. W. (1992). New leadership considerations for old realities. In J. L. Ratcliff (Ed.), *Community colleges* (pp. 411-416). MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.

Burkhart, M. (1999, May). *A comparison of leadership styles and organizational cultures of women in two and four year colleges and universities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Sarasota, FL.

Burleson, S. (1998). *Getting extraordinary things done: Perceptions of behaviors that superintendents use to obtain and manage additional resources in ways that result in improved student learning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of La Verne, CA.

Burns, J. M. (1979). *Leadership*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, Harper & Row, Publishers

Burnstein, M. (2003). Elements of leadership in community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 21*(4), 447.

Cameron, K. S. (1984). The effectiveness of ineffectiveness. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior, 6*, (pp. 137-145). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Cameron, K. S., & Whetten, D. A. (1996). Organizational effectiveness and quality: The second generation. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, volume XI* (pp. 265-306). New York: Agathon.

Campbell, D. F., & Leverty, L. H. (1997). Developing and selecting leaders for the 21st century. *Community College Journal, 67* (4), 34-36.

Campbell, J. P. (1977). On the nature of organizational effectiveness. In J. K.Goodman & R. L.Pennings (Eds.), *New perspectives on organizational effectiveness* (pp. 13-55). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cantu, D. A. (1997). *The leadership frames of academic deans randomly selected and nominated as exceptionally effective at public colleges and universities.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arkansas State University.

Carver, J. (2000, March). *Toward coherent governance.* The School Administrator.

Cashman, K. (1998, December). *Leadership from the inside out.* Executive Excellence.

Childer, M. E. (1981). What is political about bureaucratic-collegial decision-making? In J. L. Bess (Ed.), *Foundations of American higher education* (pp. 553-566). MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.

Clark, G. A. (1992). Culture, leadership, and organizational systems. In G. A. Baker III, (Ed.), *Cultural leadership: Inside America's community* colleges (pp. 187-206). Washington, D.C: The Community College Press.

Clark, K. E., & Clark, M. B. (1990). *Measures of leadership.* Center for Creative Leadership: Greensboro, N C. Leadership Library of America, Inc.

Clemmer, J. (1998, December). *Managing things, leading people.* Executive Excellence.

Coats, L. T. (1996). *Higher education administrators' interpersonal behavior: A study of community college department chairpersons.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1991). Background: Evolving priorities and expectations of the community college. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), *Foundations of American higher education* (pp. 77-92). MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F.B. (1994). The challenging environment: Context, concepts, and crisis. In A. M. Cohen, F. B. Brawer, & Associates (Eds.), *Managing community colleges.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1996). *The American community college.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1996). *Managing community colleges.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J. A. (1989). *The charismatic leader: Behind the mystique of exceptional leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cooper, J. P. (2002). *The influence of outstanding leadership in improving the quality of teaching and learning through staff development.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Roosevelt University, Chicago.

Covey Leadership Center. (1998). *Personal leadership.* Provo, Utah.

Covey Leadership Center. (1999). *Executive excellence.* Provo, Utah.

Covey, S. R. (1991). *Principle-centered leadership.* New York: Fireside.

Cox, Matthew & Associates. (2002, February). What flavor is your president? *Community College Week, (Issue,* 4).

Crawford, E. (1997). *The self-perceived leadership style of community college and corporate presidents.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of New York at Albany.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* Lincoln, NE: Prentice Hall.

Crist, B. E. (1999). *A study of the relationship of the job satisfaction of chief academic officers of institutions of higher education and the perceived leadership style of the institution's president.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of West Virginia, Morgantown.

Cross, K. P. (1985). Determining missions and priorities for the fifth generation. In W. Deegan & D. Tillery (Eds.), *Renewing the American community college,* (pp.35-39*).* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling, J. R. & McNutt, A. S. (1996). Incorporating social skills into administrative team building in the community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 20,* (p.5).

Dauffenbach, V. K. (1995). *Leadership practices and job satisfaction: An examination of the relationship between academic deans and department chairpersons.* Unpublished doctorate dissertation. Western Michigan University. Kalamazoo, MI.

Deegan, W. L., Tillery, D., & Associates (1985). *Renewing the American community college.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Deilinger, C., McElhany, R., Rice, D., & Robinson, B. (1982). The promise of leadership-style training: an outdated myth? *Training and Development Journal 36*, 69-75.

Diener, T. (1986). Growth of an American invention: From junior to community college. In J. L. Ratcliff (Ed.), *Community colleges* (pp. 3-11). MA: Simon and Schuster Custom Publishing.

Drennan, P. D. (1974). *A study of Iowa community colleges' administrative leadership style as determined by the Likert classification system.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Drucker, P. F. (1995). *Managing in a time of great change.* New York. Truman Talley.

Duncan, A. H., & Harlacher, E. L. (1991). The twenty-first century executive leader. *Community College Review, 18* (4), 39-47.

Duncan, A. H., & Harlacher, E. L. (1999). The twenty-first century executive leader. *Community College Review, 12* (5), 36-41.

Dunn, V. (2000, May). *Principal leadership for equity and excellence.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Houston, TX.

Eaves, S. (1997*). Leader and subordinate perception of leadership styles and subordinate satisfaction.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Colorado State University, Fort Collins.

Ebbers, L. H., Gallisath, G., Rockel, V., & Coyan, M. N. (2000). The leadership institute for a new century: Linking women and minorities in tomorrow's community college leadership roles. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 7*, 111-117.

Eddy, P. (1990). *The role of the two-year college president in organizational change.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Michigan State University.

Emory, C. W. (1976). *Business research methods.* Homewood, CA: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

Fagan, M. (2001). *Perceived effectiveness of middle school principals and preparation for the principalship.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Sarasota., FL.

Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management.* London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Fiedler, F. E. (1972, Fall). How do you make leaders more effective? New answers to an old puzzle. *Organizational Dynamics,* (pp. 3-18).

Fiedler, F. E., & Chemers, M. M. (1974). *Leadership and effective management.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, and Company.

Fisher, J. L. (1997). *Who will lead higher education's transformation?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fisher, J., & Tack, M. (1990). The effective college president. *Educational Record,* 7, 6-10.

Fisher, J. L., & Koch, J. V. (1996). *Presidential leadership: Making a difference.* Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.

Floyd, J. (1999). *An investigation of the leadership style of principals and its relation to teachers' perceptions of school mission and student achievement.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. North Carolina State University, Chapel Hill.

Fobbs, J. M. J. (1988). *The top-line women administrators in public and private two-year institutions of higher education: Their perceptions of the managerial style and leadership skill that contributed to executive appointment.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ohio State University, Lima.

Ford, M. R. (1999). *Perceptions of superintendents on leadership skills and traits of school leaders for the twenty-first century.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Northern Arizona University. Flagstaff, AZ.

Fridena, R. H. (1998). *Community college presidents and institutional decision-making.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Arizona, Flagstaff.

Galbraith, M.W., & Cohen, N.H. (1995). *Mentoring: New strategies and challenges.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On leadership.* New York: The Free Press.

Garrison, R. H. (1985). *A study of Alabama junior and community college presidents' leadership styles as perceived by the presidents, faculties, and staffs.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Alabama, Birmingham.

Gianini, P. (1998). *Leadership abstracts*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and morality. *Harvard Educational Review, 47*, 481-517.

Gliner. J. A., & Morgan, G. A. (2000). *Research methods in applied settings: An integrated approach to design and analysis.* NE: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Godin, S. (1995). *Wisdom, Inc.* New York. Harper Collins Publishing.

Green, M. F. (1986, January/February). *Presidential leadership: Changes in styles*. AGB Reports.

Grubb, W. (1996). *Working in the middle*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gubanich, R. C. (1991). *The relationship between leadership style and burnout among college/university presidents.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of San Francisco.

Gube, E. F., & Getzels, J. W. (1956). Interests and value patterns of air force officers. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 16*, 465-470.

Guskin, A. E., & Bassis, M. A. (1985). Leadership styles and institution renewal. In R. M. Davis (Ed.) *Leadership and institutional renewal: New directions for higher education*, (49), (pp.13-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hall, R. A., & Alfred, R. L. (1985). Applied research on leadership in community colleges. *Community College Review, 12* (4), 36-41.

Halpin, A. W. (1966). *Theory and research in administration*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Harris, P. B. (1991). *Profiles in excellence-leadership styles of female principles in high schools of excellence (women principals, brain dominance)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Harris, Z. (1996). Leadership in action: Leading collectively at Parkland College. *Community College Journal, 27*, 35-47.

Harrison, D. T. (2000). *Transformational leadership and community college effectiveness. Unpublished d*octoral dissertation. Ohio University, Athens.

Heifetz. R. A., & Laurie, D. L. (1997). The work of leadership. *Harvard Business Review, 75* (1), 124-134.

Helgeson, S. (1995). *Web of inclusion.* New York: Doubleday Publishing.

Henry-Lucas, J. C. (1993). *The relationship between self-perceived psychological types of male and female community college deans of instruction and their self-perceived leadership skills.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. West Virginia University.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1998). *Management of organizational behavior.* Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hersey, P. (1993). *Lead-self: Leadership style/perception of self.* Escondido, CA: Center for Leadership Students.

Hickey, R. J. (1995). *The identification of leadership characteristics and their perceived correlation to performance as demonstrated by principals of nationally recognized schools of excellence.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Sarasota, FL.

Hill, W. A. (1973). Leadership style flexibility, satisfaction, and performance. In E. A. Fleishman & J. G. Hunt (Eds.), *Current developments in the study of leadership* (pp. 62-85). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hollander, E. P. (1978). *Leadership dynamics: A practical guide to effective relationships.* New York: The Free Press.

Hollinshead, B. S. (1936). The community college program. *The Junior College Journal,* XX11, 564-587.

House, R. J., Filley, A. C., & Gujarati, D.N. (1971). Leadership style, hierarchical influence and the satisfaction of subordinate role expectations: A test of Lickert's influence proposition. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 55, 422-432.

Howdyshell, L. (1995). Team building leadership. In G. Myran, T. Zeiss, & L. Howdyshell (Eds.), *Community college leadership in the new century.* Washington, D.C: American Association of Community Colleges.

Howe, G. S. (1988). *Listen to the heart.* Iowa City, IA: Rudi Publishing.

Iowa Department of Education. (1999). *Final report of the community college governance system study committee.* Iowa Department of Education. Des Moines, IA.

Jones, L. B. (1995). *Jesus CEO.* New York: Hyperion.

Kanter, R. M. (1983). *The change masters. Innovation and entrepreneurship in the American corporation.* New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Kerr, C. (1984). *Presidents make a difference: Strengthening leadership in colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Board of Universities and Colleges.

Kezar, A. (1998). Exploring new avenues for leading community colleges: The paradox of participatory models. *Community College Review,* 8, 17.

Kinlaw, M. O. (1998). *The examination of differences of community college climate variables in a rural setting*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. North Carolina State University, Chapel Hill.

Knudson, L. S. (1997). *Team leadership in three mid-western community colleges: The president's cognitive frame of reference and its relationship to real versus illusory teams.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 378 326).

Kostner, J. (1994). *Virtual leadership*. New York: Warner Books.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The leadership challenge.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1997). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lazotta, L. (1994). The nexus of instructional leadership and effective schools. *The School Administrator.*

Leech, D. (1999). *Faculty perceptions of shared decision making and the principal's leadership behaviors in Duval county secondary schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of North Florida.

Lentz, M. B. (1997). *Transformational leadership of principals in a district grounded in shared decision making.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Colorado State University, Fort Collins.

Lewis, M. D. (1989). *The role of the community college president: A review of literature from 1869-1989*. Long Beach City College, CA.

Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lilly, E. R. (1987). The American college president: The changing roles. *Planning & Changing*, 4, 3-14.

Lombard, G. (1971). Relativism in organizations. *Harvard Business Review,* 49, 55-65.

Long, David. (1991). *Identifying and analyzing the factors utilized by superintendents in achieving their "personal best" in education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, Ames.

Lorenzo, A., & LeCroy, N. (1994). *A framework for fundamental change in the community college: Creating a culture of responsiveness*. Warren, MI: Macomb Press.

Lovell, N. B., & Miller, R .P. (1998). *Mid-south center for rural community colleges: An investment in human resource development*. Hinds Community College, Raymond, MS.

Lowe, K. K., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness of the correlates of transformational and transactional leadership. A meta-analytic review of the MLQ Literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385-425.

Lucas, F. D. (1996). *The relationship between the self-perceived educational philosophy profile of public community college presidents and their self-perceived leadership style*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. West Virginia University.

Manzo, K. K. (1996, October). Building leaders. *Black Issues in Higher Education,* 13, *7-9.*

Martin, J. L. (1993). *Academic deans: An analysis of effective academic leadership at research universities*. Paper presented at the 1993 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA. (Eric Document Reproduction Service, No. ED 362 079).

Mata, D. N. (1997). *A profile of Latino community college presidents: A multi-method study of leadership development and functioning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Arizona State University, Phoenix.

McBroom, K. D. (2000). *The relationship of principal's leadership practices and teachers' job satisfaction in North Carolina public middle schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR.

McClenney, K. M. (1998, August). Community colleges perched at the millennium: Perspectives on innovation, transformation and tomorrow. *Leadership Abstracts,* 11, 23-27.

McFarlin, C., & Ebbers, L. (1998). Preparation factors common in outstanding community college presidents. *Michigan Community College Journal*, 20, 25-27.

McFarlin, C. H., Crittendon, B. J., & Ebbers, L. H. (1999). Background factors common among outstanding community college presidents. *Community College Review,* 4, 17-21.

McKee, J.G. (1990*). Relationship between community college presidents' leadership styles and faculty job satisfaction.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Marshall University, Huntington, WV.

McKee, J. G. (1991*).* Leadership styles of community college presidents and faculty job satisfaction. *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice,* 15, 33-46.

Miller, K. (1994, Dec.). *Leadership roles and characteristics of selected northeastern Ohio school business officials.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Kent State University, Salem, OH.

Misumi, J. (1985). The *behavioral science of leadership. An interdisciplinary research program.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Mittelstet, S. K. (1994). A synthesis of the literature on understanding the new vision from community college culture: The concept of community building. In G. A. Baker III (Ed.), *A handbook on the community college in America* (pp. 549-564). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Muhammad, A. (1996*). A comparative analysis of scientific research administrators' leadership practices in public and private universities.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Texas Southern University, Houston.

Myran, G. (1995). Leadership pathways to the new century. In G. Myran, T. Zeiss, & L. Howdyshell (Eds.), *Community college leadership in the new century.* Washington, D.C: American Association of Community Colleges.

Nanus, B. (1992). *Visionary leadership creating a compelling sense of direction for your organization.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Northouse, P. G. (1997). *Leadership: Theory and practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nwafor, S. O. (1991*). A study of administration leadership style of the senior administrators of public universities in Texas.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of North Texas, Belize.

O'Banion, T. (1989). *Innovation in the community college.* New York: Macmillan.

Okorie, A. (1990, Dec.). *A comparison of the perceptions of school-based and centralized-management administrators and teachers toward leadership practices.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Baylor University, Waco, TX.

Oumthanom, P. (2001). *Principal leadership behaviors: Differences in perception.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Illinois State University at Chicago.

Pappas, R., & Shaink, M. (1994). Strategic marketing: The president's perspective. *Community College Journal,* 64, 29-34.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Pierce, D., & Pedersen, R. P. (1997, Summer). The community college presidency: qualities for success. *New Directions for Community College,* 98.

Plowman, R. J. (1991). *Perceptions of presidential leadership behavior and institutional environment by presidents and vice-presidents of selected four-year colleges and universities in Florida.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Mississippi, Jackson.

Pope, M. L, & Miller, M. T. (2000). Community college faculty governance leaders: Results of a national survey. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice,* 7, 11-13.

Preston, K. M. (1993). *Leadership styles and ethical views of presidents of small community colleges.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma City.

Reddin, W. (1970). *Managerial effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Reichard, D. (1995). The small rural community college, 1994 and beyond: One president's view. *New Directions for Community Colleges.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rest, J. R. (1986). *Moral development advances in research and theory.* New York: Praeger Publishers.

Rhoads, R., & Valdez, J. (1996). *Democracy, multiculturalism and community college.* New York: Garland.

Richardson, R. C., Jr., & Wolverton, J. (1994). Leadership strategies. In A. M. Cohen & F. B. Brawer (Eds.), *Managing community colleges* (pp. 40-59). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Richardson, R. C., Blocker, C. E., & Bender, L. W. (1972). Administrative organization: chief executive officer. In J. L. Ratcliff (Ed.), *Community colleges* (pp. 91-104). Boston, MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.

Roberts, W. (1987). *Leadership secrets of Attila the Hun.* New York: Warner Book.

Robles, H. J. (1998). *Leadership in higher education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Southern Texas, Houston.

Roe, M. A., & Baker, G. A. (1989). The development of community college leaders: A challenge for our future. *Community College Review,* 21(6), 7-9.

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

Roueche, J. E., & Baker, G. A.,III., & Rose, R. R. (1989). *Shared vision: Transformational leadership in American community colleges.* Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Rushing, J. B. (1976). *Changing role of the community college president in the face of new administrative pressures.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Schwede, N. W. (1994). *The relationship between the perception of leadership behavior and organizational climate in a statewide community college system.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of South Dakota, Vermillion, SD.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sheehy, G. (1995). *New passages.* New York: Random House.

Shelton, K. (1996). *In search of quality.* Provo, UT: Executive Excellence Publishing.

Shesk, H. D. (1999). *Leadership, collaboration, and transformation.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI.

Smith, A. (1994) Teaching for learning: Institutional development and change in two-year colleges. In G. Baker (Ed.), *A handbook on the community college in America* (pp. 350-359). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Solomon, W. (1997, March). *21st Century leadership, 6,* 3.

Spanbauer, S. (1996). *Reengineering education with quality.* Indianapolis: USA Research Institute.

Spivey, L. (1983). *An analysis of the perceptions of leadership styles and behavior of college/university presidents by deans at selected institutions of higher education in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Texas Southern University, Houston.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature.* New York: Free Press.

Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (Eds.). (1957). *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement.* (Monograph No. 88). Ohio State University at Columbus. Bureau of Business Research.

Sweeney, P. J. (2000, Aug.). *The leadership practices of exemplary superintendents that influence principals to lead school-based improvement.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Educational Management, University of La Verne, Los Angelas, CA.

Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. (1973). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review,* 51, 162-180.

Taylor, F.W. (1947). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Tebbano, M. (2002). *A study of the relationship between the preferred leadership styles of school district superintendents and the capability of school districts to become professional learning organizations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Seton Hall University, NJ.

Tedrow, B., & Rhoads, R. A. (1999). A qualitative study of women's experiences in community college leadership position. *Community College Review,* 37, 4-7.

Teitel, L. (1991). The transformation of a community college. *Community College Review,* 19(1), 7-14.

Terry, R. W. (1993). *Authentic leadership: Courage in action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Thomas, C. A. (1993). *Gender and the perception of the community college president's leadership.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.

Townsend, B. K. (Ed.). (1995). *Gender and power in the community college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Truschel, J. (1997). *A comparative study of perceived leadership styles of the Pennsylvania state system of higher education university presidents*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.

Twombly, S. B., (1992). What we know about women in community colleges. In J. L. Ratcliff (Ed.), *Community colleges* (pp. 439-456). MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publisher.

Twombly, S. B., & Amey, J. J. (1994). *Leadership skills for participative governance.* Simon & Schuster.

U.S. Department of Education (1999). *National instruction on education, government and management.* Effective Schools Today. Washington, D.C.

Vaughan, G., & Associates. (1983). *Issues for community colleges in a new era.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Vaughan, G. B. (1989). *Leadership in transition. The community college presidency.* New York City, NY. American Council on Education: Macmillan.

Vaughan, G. B. (1992). Dilemmas of leadership: Decision making and ethics in the community college. In J. L. Ratcliff (Ed.), *Community colleges,* (pp. 417-430). MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.

Vaughan, G. B. (1996). *The community college presidency.* New York. American Council on Education: Macmillan.

Vaughan, G. B. (1997). *Leadership in transition: The community college presidency.* New York. American Council on Education: Macmillan.

Wardell, D. B. (1977). *A cross-sport comparison of leadership styles and team success.* University of Oregon: Microform Publications, College of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

Wen, Hung -Yueh, D. (1999). *A profile of community college presidents' leadership styles.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Mississippi State University, Starkville.

Wenrich, J. W. (1980). Can the president be all things to all people? *Community and Junior College Journal, 51,* 36-40.

Wharton, L. E. (1997). Observations on community college leadership. *Community College Review, 6,* 19.

Whatley, L. (1991). *The relation of vocational administrator's self-esteem to their leadership styles and practices.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Colorado State University, Fort Collins.

Wygal, B. R. (1978). The president as manipulator. *Community and Junior College Journal, 48,* 6-8.

Xu, Z. L. (1991). *The relationship between leadership behavior of academic deans in public universities and job satisfaction of department chairperson.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. East Tennessee State University, Johnson City.

Yang, C. (1994). *The effects of perceived directors' leadership behaviors and selected demographic variables on physical education instructors' job satisfaction.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Oregon: Middleton Microforms.

Young, F. R. (1993). *The relationship between Mississippi post-secondary district vocational directors' leadership styles and faculty job satisfaction.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Mississippi State University, Starkville.

Yukl, G. A. (1981). *Leadership in organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G. A. (1994). *Leadership in organizations* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yukl, G. A. (1998). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management, 15* (2), 251-289.

Zemke, R., & Kramlinger, T. (1982). *Figuring things out: A trainer's guide to needs and task analysis.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO PRESIDENTS

July 13, 2003

Dear Community College President,

I am requesting your support in conducting a short survey for the purpose of gathering data for my doctoral dissertation at Colorado State University. The title of this study is: Perceptions of One Midwest State's Community College President's Leadership Styles: Self-Perception and Employee Perception. The purpose of this study is to assess the relationship between community college presidents' self perceived leadership style and their employee's perception of their presidents' leadership style. The results of this research should be of value in matching community colleges with their presidential candidates and securing the appropriate leadership style for their college. Communication and teamwork skills may be enhanced from data found in this study. Compiled results will be made available to all those who request a copy of the findings.

A designated contact person from each community college will draw the faculty and non-faculty names from a list provided by your Human Resource office. Individual will be invited one time to participate, should they choose not to participate, another name will be drawn until five faculty and five non-faculty represent each college. The research format is to collect data by the means of a 30 question, multiple choice, and survey instrument tool completed by each of Iowa's fifteen community college presidents. This paper-pencil form should be able to be completed within 15 minutes. A similar tool will be sent to a random sample population of faculty and non-faculty staff, for a total of no more than ten employees per community college. Participation in this research is voluntary. If one decides to participate in this study, they may withdraw their consent and stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which they are otherwise entitled.

There are no known risks to the participants. Confidentiality will be secure as no names will be used throughout the communication procedures or study process. All names of individuals and institutions shall remain anonymous. Your consent is implied by the return of the completed questionnaire along with a letter of cooperation on your college letterhead stating that your organization is familiar with the scope of the project, that you are satisfied the individuals involved are adequately protected as human research subjects, that you are aware the subjects' participation is completely voluntary, and that you are in support of the involvement of your institution's employees. Questions about participants' rights may be directed to Celia S. Walker at 970-491-1563.

The code number that appears on the return envelope is for the purpose of tracking which colleges have responded and reducing unnecessary follow up. The code letter "F" indicates faculty, while the "NF" is for non-faculty. The number code will signify to the tracker which college is responding. Colleges not responding within a 30 day period will receive a follow-up contact from the designated contact individual from their college.

This study is being conducted under the leadership of my Dissertation Committee Chairs, Tim Davies, Ph.D. and Laurie Carlson, Ph.D., both of whom are on staff at Colorado State University. Your participation will help ensure a complete representation of the community colleges in Iowa.

Please accept my appreciation for your cooperation in this project. Your support is a key factor to the success of this study. Please return this completed survey in the return, self-addressed stamped envelope by September 1, 2003. Questions and concerns can be addressed by contacting me at 800-21st Spirit Lake, IA. 51360, telephone number 712-336-3439 ext. 501. Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Aileen Schacherer

APPENDIX B

LEADERSHIP PRACTICE INVENTORY – SELF

JAMES M. KOUZES/BARRY Z. POSNER

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

SELF

Your Name:_____

INSTRUCTIONS

Write your name in the blank above. On the next two pages are thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each carefully. Then look at the rating scale and decide *how frequently you engage in the behavior* described.

Here's the rating scale that you'll be using:

1 = Almost Never	6 = Sometimes
2 = Rarely	7 = Fairly Often
3 = Seldom	8 = Usually
4 = Once in a While	9 = Very Frequently
5 = Occasionally	10 = Almost Always

In selecting each response, please be realistic about the extent to which you *actually* engage in the behavior. Do *not* answer in terms of how you would like to see yourself or in terms of what you should be doing. Answer in terms of how you *typically* behave—on most days, on most projects, and with most people.

For each statement, decide on a rating and record it in the blank to the left of the statement. When you have responded to all thirty statements, turn to the response sheet on page 4. *Make sure that you write your name on the response sheet in the blank marked "Your Name."* Transfer your responses and return the response sheet according to the instructions provided.

For future reference, keep the portion of your LPI-Self form that lists the thirty statements.

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

SELF

To what extent do you typically engage in the following behaviors? Choose the number that best applies to each statement and *record it in the blank to the left of the statement.*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Almost Never	Rarely	Seldom	Once in a While	Occasionally	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Usually	Very Frequently	Almost Always

____ 1. I seek out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities.

____ 2. I talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.

____ 3. I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with.

____ 4. I set a personal example of what I expect from others.

____ 5. I praise people for a job well done.

____ 6. I challenge people to try out new and innovative approaches to their work.

____ 7. I describe a compelling image of what our future could be like.

____ 8. I actively listen to diverse points of view.

____ 9. I spend time and energy on making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards that we have agreed on.

____ 10. I make it a point to let people know about my confidence in their abilities.

____ 11. I search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.

____ 12. I appeal to others to share an exciting dream of the future.

____ 13. I treat others with dignity and respect.

____ 14. I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make.

____ 15. I make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Almost Never	Rarely	Seldom	Once in a While	Occasionally	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Usually	Very Frequently	Almost Always

_____ 16. I ask "What can we learn?" when things do not go as expected.

_____ 17. I show others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.

_____ 18. I support the decisions that people make on their own.

_____ 19. I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.

_____ 20. I publicly recognize people who exemplify commitment to shared values.

_____ 21. I experiment and take risks even when there is a chance of failure.

_____ 22. I am contagiously enthusiastic and positive about future possibilities.

_____ 23. I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.

_____ 24. I make certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.

_____ 25. I find ways to celebrate accomplishments.

_____ 26. I take the initiative to overcome obstacles even when outcomes are uncertain.

_____ 27. I speak with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.

_____ 28. I ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.

_____ 29. I make progress toward goals one step at a time.

_____ 30. I give the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.

Now turn to the response sheet and follow the instructions for transferring your responses.

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

SELF

RESPONSE SHEET

_____

Instructions: Write your name in the blank above. Separate this response sheet from the rest of the LPI by tearing along the perforated line. Transfer the ratings for the statements to the blanks provided *on this sheet.* Please notice that the numbers of the statements on this sheet are listed from *left to right.*

After you have transferred all ratings, return the form according to the "Important Further Instructions" below.

1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____	5. _____
6. _____	7. _____	8. _____	9. _____	10. _____
11. _____	12. _____	13. _____	14. _____	15. _____
16. _____	17. _____	18. _____	19. _____	20. _____
21. _____	22. _____	23. _____	24. _____	25. _____
26. _____	27. _____	28. _____	29. _____	30. _____

Important Further Instructions

After completing this response sheet, return it to:

_____

_____

_____

0-7879-0971-8

APPENDIX C

LEADERSHIP PRACTICE INVENTORY – OBSERVER

JAMES M. KOUZES/BARRY Z. POSNER

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

OBSERVER

Name of Leader:_____

INSTRUCTIONS

You are being asked by the leader whose name appears above to assess his or her leadership behaviors. On the next two pages are thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each statement carefully. Then look at the rating scale and decide *how frequently this leader engages in the behavior* described.

Here's the rating scale that you'll be using:

1 = Almost Never	6 = Sometimes
2 = Rarely	7 = Fairly Often
3 = Seldom	8 = Usually
4 = Once in a While	9 = Very Frequently
5 = Occasionally	10 = Almost Always

In selecting each response, please be realistic about the extent to which the leader *actually* engages in the behavior. Do *not* answer in terms of how you would like to see this person behave or in terms of how you think he or she should behave. Answer in terms of how the leader *typically* behaves—on most days, on most projects, and with most people.

For each statement, decide on a rating and record it in the blank to the left of the statement. When you have responded to all thirty statements, turn to the response sheet on page 4. *Do not write your name on the response sheet.* Transfer your responses and return the response sheet according to the instructions provided.

For future reference, keep the portion of your LPI-Observer form that lists the thirty statements.

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

OBSERVER

To what extent does this person typically engage in the following behaviors? Choose the number that best applies to each statement and record it in the blank to the left of the statement.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Almost Never	Rarely	Seldom	Once in a While	Occasionally	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Usually	Very Frequently	Almost Always

He or She:

____ 1. Seeks out challenging opportunities that test his or her own skills and abilities.

____ 2. Talks about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.

____ 3. Develops cooperative relationships among the people he or she works with.

____ 4. Sets a personal example of what he or she expects from others.

____ 5. Praises people for a job well done.

____ 6. Challenges people to try out new and innovative approaches to their work.

____ 7. Describes a compelling image of what our future could be like.

____ 8. Actively listens to diverse points of view.

____ 9. Spends time and energy on making certain that the people he or she works with adhere to the principles and standards that have been agreed on.

____ 10. Makes it a point to let people know about his or her confidence in their abilities.

____ 11. Searches outside the formal boundaries of his or her organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.

____ 12. Appeals to others to share an exciting dream of the future.

____ 13. Treats others with dignity and respect.

____ 14. Follows through on the promises and commitments that he or she makes.

____ 15. Makes sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of projects.

[redacted]

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Almost Never	Rarely	Seldom	Once in a While	Occasionally	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Usually	Very Frequently	Almost Always

He or She:

____ 16. Asks "What can we learn?" when things do not go as expected.

____ 17. Shows others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.

____ 18. Supports the decisions that people make on their own.

____ 19. Is clear about his or her philosophy of leadership.

____ 20. Publicly recognizes people who exemplify commitment to shared values.

____ 21. Experiments and takes risks even when there is a chance of failure.

____ 22. Is contagiously enthusiastic and positive about future possibilities.

____ 23. Gives people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.

____ 24. Makes certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.

____ 25. Finds ways to celebrate accomplishments.

____ 26. Takes the initiative to overcome obstacles even when outcomes are uncertain.

____ 27. Speaks with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.

____ 28. Ensures that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.

____ 29. Makes progress toward goals one step at a time.

____ 30. Gives the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.

Now turn to the response sheet and follow the instructions for transferring your responses.

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

OBSERVER

RESPONSE SHEET

Your Relationship to This Leader:

☐ Manager ☐ Direct Report ☐ Coworker ☐ Other

Instructions: If the leader's name does not appear in the blank above, please write it in. *Do not write your name on this sheet.* Separate the response sheet from the rest of the LPI by tearing along the perforated line. Transfer the ratings for the statements to the blanks provided *on this sheet.* Please notice that the numbers of the statements on this sheet are listed from *left to right.*

After you have transferred all ratings, return the form according to the "Important Further Instructions" below.

1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____	5. _____
6. _____	7. _____	8. _____	9. _____	10. _____
11. _____	12. _____	13. _____	14. _____	15. _____
16. _____	17. _____	18. _____	19. _____	20. _____
21. _____	22. _____	23. _____	24. _____	25. _____
26. _____	27. _____	28. _____	29. _____	30. _____

Important Further Instructions

After completing this response sheet, return it to:

_____

_____

_____

0-7879-0972-6

APPENDIX D

LETTER TO EMPLOYEES

August 1, 2003

Dear Community College employee,

I am requesting your participation in a survey for the purpose of gathering data for my doctoral dissertation through Colorado State University. The title of my dissertation is: Perceptions of One Midwest State's Community College President's Leadership Styles: Self-Perception and Employee Perception. Each Iowa Community College president has returned a completed survey and granted permission for their employees to participate in this study. The focus of the study is to assess the relationship between Iowa Community College president's self-perception of their leadership style and their employees' perception of this leadership. Future community college presidents and employees will be able to study this research for the purpose of improving areas of leadership, communication, and teamwork. Access to research data comparing how each group views similar issues may lay the groundwork for a clearer perspective of one's own leadership style.

A designated contact person from your college will draw five faculty and five non-faculty names to participate in this project. The 30 question, multiple choice survey form should be able to be completed within 15 minutes. If for any reason you wish not to participate in this study, please inform your contact immediately. You will only be asked once, should you not wish to participate, and another name will be drawn. Your participation in this research is voluntary. If you decide to participate in this study, you may withdraw your consent and stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. No information will be divulged to your college president.

There are no known risks to the participants. Confidentiality will be secure as no names will be used throughout the communication procedures or study process. All names of individuals and institutions shall remain anonymous. Your consent is implied by the return of the completed questionnaire. Questions about participants' rights may be directed to Celia S. Walker at 970-401-1563.

The code number that appears is for the purpose of tracking which colleges have responded and reducing unnecessary follow-up. Code numbers are marked at the bottom of your return envelope. The code letter "F" indicates faculty responding, while "NF" is for the non-faculty. The number code will signify to the tracker which college is responding. Colleges not responding within a 30-day period will be follow-up through the designated contact individual.

This study is being conducted under the leadership of my Dissertation Committee Chairs, Tim Davis, PhD and Laurie Carlson, PhD, both of whom are on staff at Colorado State University. Your participation will help ensure a complete representation of the community colleges in Iowa.

Please accept my appreciation for your cooperation in this project. Your support is a key factor in the success of this study. Please return this completed survey in the return, self-addressed stamped envelope by Sept.1, 2003. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Aileen Schacherer
800 21st St. Spirit Lake, IA 51360
712-336-3439 ext. 501

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PRESIDENTS

August 24, 2003

Dear Community College President,

About three weeks ago you were given a survey concerning a research to assess the self -perception of community college presidents and their leadership style. Please take a few minutes out of your busy schedule to complete and return the survey form.

Your response is essential to the success of this research effort. If you have already returned the requested information, please disregard this reminder.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Aileen Schacherer
800-21st St.
Spirit Lake, IA 51360
712-336-3439 ext. 501

APPENDIX F

LPI APPROVAL LETTER

KOUZES POSNER INTERNATIONAL
15419 Banyan Lane
Monte Sereno, California 95030
FAX: (408) 354-9170

April 10, 2003

Ms. Aileen Schacherer
1611 Chals[tr]om Beach B101
Okoboji, Iowa 51355

Dear Aileen:

Thank you for your request to use the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) in your dissertation. We are willing to allow you to reproduce the instrument as outlined in your letter, at no charge, with the following understandings:

(1) That the LPI is used only for research purposes and is not sold or used in conjunction with any compensated management development activities;
(2) That copyright of the LPI, or any derivation of the instrument, is retained by Kouzes Posner International, and that the following copyright statement be included on all copies of the instrument: "Copyright © 1997 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved. Used with permission.";
(3) That one (1) **bound** copy of your dissertation and one (1) copy of **all** papers, reports, articles, and the like which make use of the LPI data be sent **promptly** to our attention; and,
(4) That you agree to allow us to include an abstract of your study and any other published papers utilizing the LPI on our various websites.

If the terms outlined above are acceptable, would you indicate so by signing one (1) copy of this letter and returning it to us. Best wishes for every success with your research project.

Cordially,

Barry Z. Posner, Ph.D.
Managing Partner

I understand and agree to abide by these conditions:

(Signed) Aileen Schacherer Date: 4/15/03